

Paper: “The Impact of the COVID-19 Lockdown Restrictions on Physical Activity Levels in European Adolescents: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis”

Submitted: 03 March 2023

Accepted: 24 July 2023

Published: 31 July 2023

Corresponding Author: Tanya O’Brien

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n21p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n21p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohammed Alameen
Ummulqura University, Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 2: Elton Chavura
Mzuzu University, Mzuzu, Malawi

Reviewer 3: David Kihara Kirongo
Murang'a University of Technology, Kenya

Mohammed Alameen
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Need to be improved

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

No the abstract needs rewriting

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Must be improved

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Should be revised for many errors

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Not accurate, must be re-written

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer P:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

None

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Paper well done.

Reviewer R:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

adequate

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

It is advisable to begin a statement with a word rather than numerics. Please revise the first statement under findings within this abstract

The overall quality of studies included in this review were deemed to be very poor except one. I therefore urge you to exercise caution in your conclusion to avoid misleading the readers. Please reconstruct this section to avoid sensationalizing conclusions. This is critical and must be addressed.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Negligible

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

methods are clear and adequate

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Grammatical Errors contained therein (if any) are negligible. However, the strength and limitation section must be shifted and placed at the end of the discussion section. It must be noted again that it is overly long. A single paragraph suffices. The authors must make every attempt to comment on how they managed to address or mitigate or attempt to overcome such. You do not have to leave us in suspense. I expect improvements on this one

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

This section requires reconstruction. You do not need to introduce new issues that we have not heard in the entire document. You do not need further citations in your conclusion just as you do not need them in your abstract.

Comment on key points based on the findings and implications for research, policy and practice. Summarize in your own words using simple and very clear language

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

This is the only chapter that has been mentioned in your entire document. Was it necessary in the first place??

Many references appearing here have not been used at all or are not found in your entire document. They must be relieved.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors are investigating an important domain of public health domain. And therefore once all necessary revisions have been made, it can be a necessary source of important information regarding covid 19.
