

Review of: "Could geographical features of green spaces influence physical exercise? Examining the roles of neighbourhood diversity and single status"

Sandra Wajchman-Świtalska¹

¹ Poznan University of Life Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors, thanks for the invitation to review this study. The research problem presented in the submitted paper is important, interesting, and worth to be studied. However, the manuscript in its current form calls for an improvement.

Introduction. In my opinion, the Introduction lacks coherence and consistency. The Introduction doesn't briefly place the study in a broad context. It should define the purpose of the work and its significance, including specific hypotheses being tested. The way you cite references is a bit confusing for a reader e.g. "Two meta-analyses showed persons with nature connectedness were significantly happier[1] and healthier[2] than those without." - 1/ Many more studies have confirmed that. 2/ Why don't you cite in the way it is widely recommended e.g. Capaldi et.al. [1] confirmed that... . What is more, the literature review should be a part of the Introduction and cite studies more appropriate to your research aim.

Method. This section could be clarified. It would be more reader-friendly with a research flowchart.

Results. The way you present results should logically follow your hypotheses.

Discussion. The authors should have discussed the study's results and how they can be interpreted from the perspective of previous research. Unfortunately, I don't find it in this text.

Additionally, throughout the text, you don't provide any definitions or explanations for concepts you mention, e.g. nature connectedness, restoration, ecosystem services, etc.

Wish you all the best.

