

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_99726 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Decreased Mood Correlated with Decreased Exercise Adherence and Increased Pain |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | 1. Yes. 2. No. This title sounds as result or conclusion. 3. Abstract- need to state an aim. Explain NPRS. No need to write small details in result section- only main results. More concrete/synthesized conclusion (some information could be moved to results). Future directions- for the discussion field. Keyword- could be "pain", exercise/physical activity, but why "orthopedics" 4. Introduction should end with the aim of study statement. a more consistent and detailed description of the methodology with where, with whom, how the study was conducted, what permission to conduct research and informed consent were obtained, etc. would be necessary. The information in the tables could be condensed into a smaller table or a more informative picture. More description of the results obtained. Correlation between mood and pain is obvious- need for novelty in explanation, comparison with other researchers works, suggestions on what to do with it in discussion field. Some information from the conclusion part could be moved to discussion to make clear conclusion as answer to study aim. More conclusive impact statement. 5. Not sure. 6. yes | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | More scientific writing style could be used | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Name: | Lolita Rapoliene |
| Department, University & Country | Klaipeda University, Lithuania |