

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Associations between the built environment and physical activity in community-dwelling older adults 60 years and older: A best- and most-up-to-date-evidence umbrella review of systematic reviews of quantitative studies

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Diogo Almeida

Submitted on: 02 Nov 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2023.1605474

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The main theme of the review is to perform an umbrella review concerning the association between physical activity and built environment, and synthesize the evidence.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The main limitations of the paper are:

- The lack of novelty. A recent umbrella review covered a similar topic, and besides other ages, also covered old age. They used a quality score to evaluate papers. Exactly what is the main advantage of this paper at this point? This is the point I have the most trouble with.
- The lack of grey literature search. Although it is acknowledge, for a review conducted with the help of a librarian, it is strange to this limitation exist or at least to not be better discussed or somehow minimized.

The main strenghts of the paper are:

- The clear description of the methodology, and the rigor in the search in the different databases.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

No answer given.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

There is lack of grey literature in the review, which is acknowledge by the authors.

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

The findings of the review probably won't have impact globally since although the findings are applicable all around, there was a recent review of reviews with similar findings.

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Overall very informative. The type of study, exposure, outcome are all well defined. I would say that best-evidence is redundant. I also believe that specifying the cut-off to consider older age would make the study more transparent.

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes.

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes. No faults and the text is homogeneous.

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Quality of generalization and summary



Q 14 Significance to the field



Q 15 Interest to a general audience



Q 16 Quality of the writing



REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.