

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

Vladka Kirschner¹

¹ Czech University of Life Sciences Prague

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Introduction:

The Introduction should focus more on the issue of why this study is needed. There are many connections between green spaces and health, but the article aims to discuss a relationship between green space and activities. In addition, there are some inaccuracies. For instance: „Green spaces increase physical activity [18] and positively influenced the longevity of older adults“. Are you sure that they are green spaces? Isn't it rather physical activity? Last, the Introduction should not finish with methodology.

Overall: It would be good to say a bit more about research focusing on the same topic rather than underlining the health benefits of greenery.

Literature Review:

I do not understand the hypothesis, not even the basis of them. For instance, if a hypothesis regards geography differences, the previous text should mention differences in at least some countries/regions. This chapter should be part of the Introduction.

Methods:

Before information about data, it would be great to present overall methods in connection with the objectives shortly. It would make the article more straightforward. Ideally, any splitting of data should be justified by literature. For example, why did you use all the data in the database? Do you really need all of them? Are you sure there is no difference between the British and others? Why not avoid other groups while the British are in the majority?

Who were the participants of the survey? Are they people visiting green spaces? Are they people in surrounding offices? Where the survey was conducted? How were the participants chosen?

It would be good to say a bit more about the data, their background, and previous use.

Results:

Comparing local and non-local green space, you must first specify precisely what "local" means. The information about the

hypothesis should not be part of the Result section.

Discussion:

I would not argue with illnesses, as the data did not consider illnesses at all. It would be interesting to discuss the results regarding the accessibility and activity of green spaces concerning your results and hypothesis confirmations.

Other:

I am not a native English speaker, but I do not think that the word „connectedness“ exists. Therefore, I am not very sure what the second sentence means. „can facilitating“ seems like a grammar mistake. I recommend an English revision before the article is published.

There are also some formal mistakes, such as omitted spaces between words and brackets and multiplied references in more brackets.

The topic is actual and interesting. The results will be more attractive while discussed with similar results in the Discussion section.