



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 80389

**Title:** Use of new technologies for the promotion of physical activity in patients with mental illness: A systematic review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05467628

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBBS

**Professional title:** Doctor, Research Fellow

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-09-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-09-28 02:39

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-09-28 03:17

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have submitted a systematic review pertaining to the use of new technologies for promoting in patients with mental illness. I am primarily concerned with the low number of included studies - I find it hard to believe authors arrived only at ten studies. This is a much lower number than past systematic reviews on the topic, many of which focus only on wearables and many only on MDD or BD alone. Here, the authors include studies related to any mental illness and studies that include apps as well, not just wearables. Thus, it is highly surprising and concerning as to how authors have arrived at so few studies despite such broad inclusion criteria. I am concerned about their methodologic process and hope that they shall share their study screening and data extraction files in the journal's supplementary material for review section. The manuscript also has several other issues and substantial changes are required. Given below are these comments in no particular order.

1. The abstract MUST be revised in line with PRISMA-abstract guidance. <http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/Abstracts>
2. Kindly state explicitly the standard quality assessment tool you used. Kindly provide a table that shows the subdomain score of each included study in quality assessment.
  - A. For randomized studies - use the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 (RoB2).
  - B. For non-randomized studies - use the Newcastle Ottawa Scale or the NIH NHLBI Quality assessment tool (recommended).
3. Kindly upload the list of excluded studies as supplementary material OR to a data-sharing website (such as figshare, Mendeley Data, etc) and reference it in the paper explicitly.
4. I recommend the authors use the exact PRISMA 2020 flow diagram. The exact diagram should be used as it is available online for editing - authors' own diagram



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

has incorrect/missing terminology. 5. Kindly mention the EXACT search strategy for EMBASE. 6. The heart of a systematic review is the methods section. The methods section needs significant improvement, especially further detail. A BMJ/NEJM/Cochrane Review should be consulted for guidance on how to describe the methods in greater detail. Some remarks have been pointed out in this review. Please attempt to improve reporting of the methodology. In particular, please use subheadings such as inclusion criteria, search strategy, Screening, study assessment, data extraction, data analysis, and so on. 7. Kindly run Grammarly, a free tool, prior to resubmission to remove the currently existing minor errors. 8. Discussion may be improved further. Please see Makar G, Foltz C, Lendner M, Vaccaro AR. How to Write Effective Discussion and Conclusion Sections. Clin Spine Surg. 2018 Oct;31(8):345-346. doi: 10.1097/BSD.0000000000000687. PMID: 29979216. I am not sure how useful it is to discuss the molecular biology here, rather focus on efficacy data. Highlight similarities and differences with prior reviews. 9. There are related systematic Cochrane reviews on the topic, I do not understand why they have not been cited or discussed. 10. Authors may wish to consider the use of the ROBVIS tool for better visualization of the risk of bias. <https://mcguinlu.shinyapps.io/robvis/>. 11.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 80389

**Title:** Use of new technologies for the promotion of physical activity in patients with mental illness: A systematic review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02640394

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-09-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-09-28 18:51

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-04 20:33

**Review time:** 6 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Here are some suggestions. I suggest adding Mental illness, or similar, to keywords “it is difficult to inculcate physical exercise habits in people with acute psychiatric symptoms”: the term acute may be deleted “The aim of this paper is to systematically review the available evidence on mobile apps for physical activity enhancement in patients with mental illness”. It is better to change mobile apps with e-health or new technologies. The study from Faurholt-Jepsen et al., (2014)[27] has no assessment as it is in process. Thus, it should be deleted from the review. Sentences on patient satisfaction should be deleted from table 1 to table 2. English language may be slightly ameliorated