

Review Commentary

Zachary Zenko

Summary of Peer-Review Process

Budzynski-Seymour et al. (2021) submitted their manuscript for consideration in *Communications in Kinesiology* on September 8th, 2021. Of six expert reviewers invited, two accepted the invitation and both recommended revisions. Some of the original, representative concerns with the manuscript included (a) clarification of the role of the COVID-19 lockdown in the study (i.e., whether the study was planned as a lockdown study, or happened to take place during lockdown), (b) removal of a secondary aim that did not include pre-registration, and (c) addition of details regarding the measures and measurements. One of these issues focused on the measurement of affective responses after physical activity, rather than during physical activity. A systematic review performed by Rhodes and Kates (2015) concluded that affective responses during exercise predict future exercise, whereas postexercise affective responses do not seem to predict future exercise behavior. Relatedly, concerns were raised about the lack of assessment of pre-activity affective valence and arousal. In addition, suggestions were made about the presentation of results, consistent terminology, limitations regarding generalizability (e.g., the use of the specific videos in the study, and the confidence of the conclusions).

The authors submitted major revisions on November 18th, 2020. The original reviewers were again invited and suggested that revisions were required. The authors responded to these more minor suggestions in their final revision, submitted on February 6th, 2021. The authors clarified limitations regarding the measurement of affective responses and the achievement of saturation in the themes, given the sample size.

The manuscript was accepted after these revisions. Overall, the thoughtful comments of the reviewers are highly appreciated, and the manuscript improved as a result of the peer-review process. While the assessment of affective responses before, during, and after the activity would be ideal and allow for a more complete understanding of the affective experience, I recognize that the data cannot be recollected. Further, the authors were transparent about the process and justified their measurement decisions (e.g., “it was considered difficult to capture measures during activities without disrupting the activities as intended”). Given the transparency in reporting, efforts made to address reviewer concerns, completeness of revisions, and the additional discussion around potential study limitations, I made the decision to accept the manuscript.

Reference

Rhodes, R. E., & Kates, A. (2015). Can the affective response to exercise predict future motives and physical activity behavior? A systematic review of published evidence. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 49(5), 715–731. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-015-9704-5>