Review Report on Scoping review on the effectiveness of movement-friendly environments on health: greenspaces in Europe

Reviewer: Diogo Almeida
Submitted on: 14 Feb 2024
Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1606863

EVALUATION

Q 1   Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The main theme of the review focuses on evaluating the impact of greenspaces in Europe on health outcomes, behavior change, and environmental co-benefits. It emphasizes the positive associations between access to greenspaces and improved physical and mental health, reduced risk of all-cause mortality and certain non-communicable diseases, and increased physical activity. The review also highlights the importance of greenspace quality and the co-benefits it provides, such as ecosystem services, climate change mitigation, and enhanced biodiversity. Furthermore, it discusses the need for responsible governance and management of greenspaces to maximize health benefits and minimize public health risks and human disturbance of nature.

Q 2   Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

The main strength is the broadness of the review and its holistic approach to several implications of greenspaces.
The main limitations are: 1) the rationale. It is not clear as to why this approach is better than the sum of its parts; 2) the results are described but without a more detailed table, they are confusing for the reader; 3) the discussion lacks strength in the integration of the findings.

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

Abstract
-In the methods, there is no information regarding the date of data collection.
-In the results there is mention to numerous co-benefits but not one is presented. I would suggest presenting at least the most commonly found.

Introduction:
-My main concern with the introduction. The rationale for this scoping review is not clear. Why did it make sense to tackle health outcomes, behaviour changes, and co-benefits in the same review, and why a scoping review and not other type of review? What gaps in knowledge will be filled? This should be clear.
-The structure of the introduction can be improved. The second paragraph seems to present in its beginning the research question and afterwards some definitions. I would suggest that the last part of the introduction be the research question.
-The overall structure behind the introduction is confusing. It starts with benefits and co-benefits of green spaces, talks about urban planning, defines green and blue spaces, and then mentions co-benefits again.
-While no doubt urban planning is important for the actual implementation of the findings of this (and other investigations), there is no clear integration with the rest of the introduction (or manuscript except in the end of the discussion).

Methods
-The methods section is the one that needs to be reviewed the most and be much more thorough in the description. Even consulting the supplementary material, there is a lot of information that is not clear. What

are the criteria for inclusion and exclusion? How was data chartered and collected? How were disagreements about inclusion and exclusion decided? What data was deemed relevant to be collected? I would also recommend adding to the supplementary file the PRISMA checklist .

–The first paragraph seems more of a reason for the review than a methodological change. I suggest it is moved to the introduction section. Also, is there a mistake on "(see XXXX et al 2023 "Scoping review on the effectiveness of movement-friendly environments on health: mobility infrastructures in Europe")"?

Results
The results present the findings for the three main groups of outcomes of interest. They are mostly a consequence of the methods. A few things would improve the results (although some might be more of a consequence of the methods).
–Having information in the tables with more detail (characteristics of the population, how exposures were measured, what were the outcomes) would make the findings much clearer for the reader.
–Separate tables with the main findings for each group of outcomes.

Discussion
–The first part of the discussion often seems more of a rewriting of the results. There is no integration with the possible mechanisms that justify the findings. What justifies the results that were found? Why? Is there plausibility?
–The second part of the discussion (the implications of the findings, and the limitations of current investigation) is commendable, especially for the call to action for change. However, the authors have to support their statements regarding the plausibility of strategies

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes.

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 review has several aspects that imply it could have international or global implications. These implications arise from the universal nature of the themes discussed, such as the health benefits of greenspaces, the importance of urban planning for public health, and the role of greenspaces in mitigating climate change effects.