

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Investigation of physical activity levels in the population of Switzerland: Association with lifestyle and sociodemographic factors

Original Article, Int. J. Public Health

Reviewer: Reviewer 1

Submitted on: 04 Dec 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2025.1608010

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The majority of the Swiss population met the WHO recommendations on PA

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Cross-sectional design and the use of questionnaires

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Dear authors, thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I have made some comments to improve it.

The Introduction section presents many populational data provided by previous surveys, but these data seem not entirely connected each other. Moreover, the gap in the literature is not clearly (or consistently) presented. The Methods section is well-written, and the survey carried out seems representative of the Swiss population. However, some questions remain unclear: 1) is there any reproducibility data? That is relevant because the use of long questionnaires is surrounded by bias; 2) the outcome itself is not properly identified by the authors (which categories were combined to characterize the outcome?); 3) the binary logistic regression is poorly presented. First, chi-square test should be used before logistic regression (the existence of significant association [or trend, $p\text{-value} \leq 0.200$] is an assumption to calculate OR, which is an expression of the magnitude of the association); 3.1 Hosmer-Lemeshow test should be considered in the final model as a measure of goodness-of-fit; 3.2 the general explanation of the model should be presented; 4. The models should be split into sexes (men and women present different patterns of physical activity, as well as the determinants are not always the same).

The Results section should be expanded, especially in the steps to create multivariate models.

The Discussion section is not that bad, but I believe that men and women are potentially different and hence deserve their determinants discussed separately.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.