



## Letter to the Editor

# Letter to the editor concerning: Exploring mindfulness interventions for stress resilience in newly graduated nurses: A qualitative study

Dear Editor,

It is with great interest that we read the recently published original article entitled “Exploring Mindfulness Interventions for Stress Resilience in Newly Graduated Nurses: A qualitative study” in the *Tzu Chi Medical Journal* [1]. The authors have addressed a timely topic and we extend our appreciation to authors for their insightful qualitative study, where they have explored the real-time effect of the Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program on recently graduated nurses [1]. Wang *et al.* concluded that the MBSR course has been linked with multiple advantages and that workplace support is crucial for the optimization of their work potential [1]. We agree that in today’s era, with immense clinical workload and pressure of multiple environmental stressors, we must expose nursing professionals to some kind of course or program to improve their resilience and their output at the workplace.

After systematically explaining the need for the study, the authors have framed two objectives, namely, to investigate the learning experiences of study participants and to assess how these participants plan to implement mindfulness strategies in their lives both on the personal and professional front. In simple words, this is like a program/course evaluation using the Kirkpatrick Model of program evaluation [2]. The first objective of the study resembles Level 1 (Reaction – Whether the participants found the program engaging and relevant to their work profile), while the second objective is almost like dealing with Level 3 (Behavior – How participants applied their learning during the program) of the Kirkpatrick model [2,3]. I feel that authors should have employed some kind of questionnaire to assess the baseline knowledge (pretest) and knowledge level after the completion (posttest) of the entire 8-week program. This would have added quantitative value to your study, and it would have also helped you enhance the credibility of the study through data triangulation [4]. Moreover, this would have also helped you to successfully evaluate Level 2 (Learning – Change in knowledge, attitude, and skills due to the intervention) of the Kirkpatrick Model [2,3].

In the participants subheading, the authors mentioned that out of the 31 volunteers who enrolled for MBSR, 25 and 14 participants completed half and complete sessions, respectively [1]. I am unable to understand this as the total amounts to 39 and not 31. Please explain, if it is a typographical mistake or if I have misunderstood. Even though the authors have mentioned some justification for not adhering with the standard recommendations (8–12), it is not convincing [1]. This is primarily because the authors did mention that some participants attended some sessions while others did not. To get a better understanding, it would be good if the authors could indicate the number of participants in each

of the focus group discussions. In continuation, authors should also look to add a sociogram to give readers an inference about the richness of discussion between different participants.

In the data analysis sub-heading, the authors took efforts to explain the process of transcription and involved six steps. However, the type of transcription (such as verbatim, verbatim with dialect, and selective) has not been specified and thus readers cannot be sure whether the research assistants took into consideration how it was said and under which circumstances it was said. Further, the entire process lacks a member-checking (namely, where participants could review transcripts for accuracy) step [5]. The inclusion of member checking would have immensely contributed to enhancing the credibility and confirmability of the collected data and added lots of weightage to the overall trustworthiness [5,6]. In continuation, the authors have not adequately mentioned reflexivity, except for the second author, as it is an essential aspect of trustworthiness.

We do appreciate the authors for accepting the limitations of the study. Finally, the article could have proven to be of extreme value, if the authors had specifically addressed various steps, they took to enhance the credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability in the qualitative study, as together they define trustworthiness.

### Data availability statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

### Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

### Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

Saurabh RamBihariLal Shrivastava

Department of Community Medicine, Datta Meghe Medical College, Datta Meghe Institute of Higher Education and Research, Wanadongri, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

### Address for correspondence:

Dr. Saurabh RamBihariLal Shrivastava,  
Department of Community Medicine,  
Datta Meghe Medical College, Off-campus Centre of Datta Meghe  
Institute of Higher Education and Research, Hingna Road, Wanadongri,  
Nagpur - 441 110, Maharashtra, India.  
E-mail: drshrishri2008@gmail.com

### REFERENCES


1. Wang SC, Shih SM, Kuo LC. Exploring mindfulness interventions for stress resilience in newly graduated nurses: A qualitative study. *Tzu Chi Med J* 2024;36:452-9.
2. Huang X, Wang R, Chen J, Gao C, Wang B, Dong Y, et al. Kirkpatrick’s evaluation of the effect of a nursing innovation team training for clinical nurses. *J Nurs Manag* 2022;30:2165-75.
3. Badran AS, Keraa K, Farghaly MM. Applying the Kirkpatrick model to

evaluate dental students' experience of learning about antibiotics use and resistance. *Eur J Dent Educ* 2022;26:756-66.

4. Amin ME, Nørgaard LS, Cavaco AM, Witry MJ, Hillman L, Cernasev A, et al. Establishing trustworthiness and authenticity in qualitative pharmacy research. *Res Social Adm Pharm* 2020;16:1472-82.
5. Birt L, Scott S, Cavers D, Campbell C, Walter F. Member checking: A tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation? *Qual Health Res* 2016;26:1802-11.
6. Adler RH. Trustworthiness in qualitative research. *J Hum Lact* 2022;38:598-602.

**Submission :** 31-Oct-2024    **Acceptance :** 06-Nov-2024    **Web Publication :** 18-Feb-2025

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Access this article online	
<b>Quick Response Code:</b> 	<b>Website:</b> <a href="http://www.tcmjmed.com">www.tcmjmed.com</a>
	<b>DOI:</b> 10.4103/tcmj.tcmj_283_24

**How to cite this article:** Shrivastava SR. Letter to the editor concerning: Exploring mindfulness interventions for stress resilience in newly graduated nurses: A qualitative study. *Tzu Chi Med J* 2025;37(4):457-8.

© 2025 Tzu Chi Medical Journal | Published by Wolters Kluwer - Medknow