

Paper: “Learning Engagement of Adult Females in Remote Physical Fitness Program Through Mobile App Intervention”

Submitted: 21 September 2022

Accepted: 14 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: N. K. Rathee

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n31p65](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n31p65)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Layal Temsah
USJ/Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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. Layal Temsah	
University/Country: USJ/Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received: 5 December 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 16 December 2022
Manuscript Title: Learning Engagement of Adult Females in Remote Physical Fitness Program through Mobile App Intervention	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	4

The title is clear although it does not include the concept of participants from marginalized societies and their engagement in this program	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
Needs rephrasing to clearly depict the sample size, sampling method, research design, research problem to be addressed and summary of findings	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Correct	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Correct	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
A better synthesis of the triangulated results is needed in terms of clarifying the similarities and differences between results of questionnaires, interviews and observations	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Generally good	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Needs to include the missing references	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Create further relevance of the results to participants from marginalized societies as per their accessibility to the program, the reasons behind their economic stress and their need for such a program, and how the program leveraged their accessibility, and in what ways the program had impacted females who were economically stressed.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: