



Manuscript: **“Perception of Body Image Among Sportspersons”**

Submitted: 19 August 2020

Accepted: 20 October 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Róbert Szűcs

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p23

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Saeed Javed
Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia

Reviewer 2: Kata Foldi
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Nasreen Khan
SZABIST, Dubai

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 09/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/09/2020
Manuscript Title: Perception of Body Image Among People Engaged in Sports on a Regular Basis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0915/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is apt, and it captures the interest of the reader. No need for revision.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Abstract explains objects, methodology and however the sample size is not mentioned. Results could be mentioned in terms of practical and theoretical implications.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

<i>Please do not start your article with “However...” Kindly revise the language.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Methodology is explained briefly. A justification is not found for the chosen method however for a preliminary study it is acceptable.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Not many errors have been found throughout the article.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusions are supported by the data and practical implications for the industry is mentioned clearly.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Up to date references are used.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 21/9/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/9/2020
Manuscript Title: PERCEPTION OF BODY IMAGE AMONG PEOPLE ENGAGED IN SPORTS ON A REGULAR BASIS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0915/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Title can be revised specifically the part of “Regular basis”)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Formatting need to be as per guidelines)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4.25
<i>(satisfactory)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3.5
<i>(Specify sampling technique used .Provide a brief on sample size and sampling frame)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(satisfactory)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Need to add references)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
<i>(Need to be consistent using APA format)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Formatting guidelines to be followed

Consistency in referencing and in text citations as per the format (APA)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Saeed Javed	
University/Country: Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 08-09-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15-09-2020
Manuscript Title: Perception of Body Image Among People Engaged in Sports on A Regular Basis	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>Title was not fully cleared. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Objective, methods, and results were missing. (Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Grammatical mistakes were found. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The study methods were not cleared. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>The body of the paper was not clear. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Conclusion were 50% accurate and supported by the content. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references used in text were inappropriate. (Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Revise the abstract, references in text and reference list, methodology and conclusion portions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Kata Földi	Email:
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 08. 09.	Date Review Report Submitted: 15. 09
Manuscript Title: Perception of Body Image Among People Engaged in Sports on a Regular Basis	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title precisely give back the content of the article and concise enough.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

The abstract list the new results appropriately and concise enough.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There aren't grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are explained clearly.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The structure of the article is appropriate for publication. The setting up of the article is logical and clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are mostly comprehensive and appropriate, but there is (Putra et al., 2019) reference in the body image and sport chapter, but missing from the references. There is WHO (2018) is in the references, but missing from the text reference.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The references are mostly comprehensive and appropriate, but there is (Putra et al., 2019) reference in the body image and sport chapter, but missing from the references. There is WHO (2018) is in the references, but missing from the text reference.

Table 2 and Table 3 some row total is not 100.0, more 100.1 or less 99.9

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: