



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Moderating Role of Daily Walking Between Productivity and Generalized Anxiety Among Millennial Employees of San Pablo City
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript is relevant because it connects mental health, productivity, and daily walking among millennial employees. However, the paper still needs stronger methodological and statistical explanation before the findings can be fully trusted, especially because the moderation result is central to the study.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The measurement of daily walking needs clarification. The manuscript reports an average of only 4.58 minutes of daily walking, which seems very low and may affect the interpretation of walking as a moderator. The authors should explain how this value was computed from IPAQ-SF and whether it refers to minutes per day, MET-minutes, or another derived score.
The moderation analysis is not sufficiently reported. Since the main claim is that daily walking moderates the relationship between mental health and productivity, the manuscript should



present the interaction term, confidence intervals, effect size, and simple slope interpretation. Without these, it is hard to assess whether the moderation effect is meaningful.

The results and discussion sometimes make strong causal-sounding statements, although the design is correlational. Phrases suggesting that walking “protects” or “shields” productivity should be softened unless supported by longitudinal or experimental data.

The introduction should better justify why millennial employees in San Pablo City are a distinct and important population. The paper mentions inactivity and stress, but more local or empirical support is needed to show why this group and setting deserve specific study.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The topic is very timely and relevant, especially since millennial workers make up a large portion of the Philippine workforce and face high stress from digital exhaustion.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
In your Introduction, you grounded the study using the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory and the Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory. But when you reached the Discussion section, you suddenly introduced Eysenck's Processing Efficiency Theory and the Attention Restoration Theory to explain your findings. Please align your theories. The theories you use to build your argument in the introduction should be the same ones you use to interpret your results.
The abstract explicitly states that the participants walked at a "daily average of 4.58 minutes". You need to double-check your IPAQ-SF computation. An average of less than 5 minutes of walking a day is extremely low and highly questionable. Furthermore, it is difficult to theoretically justify how merely 4.58 minutes of walking can act as a vital protective force or significantly moderate the effects of generalized anxiety on productivity.
In Table 1, the r-values for Generalized Anxiety and your productivity metrics are 0.147 (Absenteeism), 0.212 (Presenteeism), and 0.184 (Activity Impairment). While the p-values are significant, these r-values actually indicate a very weak correlation. However, in your results interpretation, you claimed that Generalized Anxiety showed a "strong connection" to all productivity losses. Please correct this overstatement. You must acknowledge that while the relationship is significant, the effect size is weak.
The title and your primary objectives emphasize the broad variable of Mental Health. However, your results explicitly state that perceived stress did not show a significant relationship with productivity. Since only Generalized Anxiety showed significant interaction, you should



consider revising your title and your main arguments to focus specifically on anxiety, rather than the broader umbrella of mental health, so as not to mislead the readers.

The methodology mentions that 210 millennial employees were selected through proportional stratified random sampling. For advanced regression and moderation analysis like Hayes' PROCESS Macro, you need to justify if this sample size has adequate statistical power. Please indicate if you used tools like G*Power to determine this sample size, as this is a standard requirement for quality assurance in publications.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> <u>1</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> <u>2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			