

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

Robert Van Dongen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Eindhoven University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear author, I believe you have a potentially very interesting study, but must say that your introduction and literature review need to become stronger. For instance, it remains unclear why neighborhood diversity and marital status may be of interest. It also remains unclear why you specifically look at employed people. Moreover, your work can become more consistent and accurate in terminology. For instance, do you aim to discuss physical activity for transport or as activity? Do you look at physical activity or at choosing active mobility? Single status or marital status? You use concepts or acronyms without introducing and defining them, e.g. LGS, nature connectedness, restoration, ecosystem services, socio-economic inequities, and many more. Your hypotheses in most cases do not seem to logically follow from the text before, e.g. only for the first hypothesis do you address literature on geographical features and health outcomes. All other hypotheses include such geographical features, but no or limited or implicit literature support for including them (e.g. hypothesis 2: the literature review is about daily exercise and health effects of it, but there is no link to the environment in which the exercise takes place. Stating that you 'therefore' hypothesize that geographical features of green spaces have associations with daily visits, is odd. Such associations have been shown in the literature, but you do not mention those studies and associations in the review). I will happily look at a new improved version and then also review the rest of your manuscript. Good luck!