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Cover letter

Natalie Pafitis
Editor Executive of the BMC Public Health Journal

We would like to thank you and the reviewer for having considered and analyzed our paper entitled “Perceived neighborhood problems: multilevel analysis with psychometric and ecometric properties in a Southern adult Brazilian population”. Their suggestions were very helpful in improving the quality of the manuscript. Please, find below a point-by-point reply to all reviewers’ comments. In order to improve the readability, we used italic for the editorial comments and bold for our responses.

Sincerely,

José Leopoldo Ferreira Antunes

on behalf of all authors
Editor's comment:

I have a few suggestions for improvement of the presentation

- Title:
  - consider removing "and ecometric" - which seems to complicate the title unnecessarily
  - consider adding the word "evaluation" or "to evaluate" - to indicate what is done in this paper
  **We did those modifications.**

- Abstract
  - add one more sentence to the Background, on the importance of measuring residents' perceptions - to clarify the relevance of the paper.
  - add more details in the Methods section on the data sources used for this study
  **Information were added.**

- Page 5
  - the text on this page lacks a clear line of reasoning. Consider shortening this part and making a stronger link between end page 4 and beginning page 6
  - "transformed land people occupation" - an error?
  **We did some modifications in those paragraphs, for instance, we have moved the paragraph about ecometric to the Method section. Thank you for realizing that, we have changed this sentence.**

- Page 10, row 3
  - introduce to the concept of 'reliability' as used in this paper. What is the purpose and value of this extra measure? How could it be interpreted? This may not be clear to most lay readers
  **Explanations about reliability were included in the paragraph.**

- Page 15, row 9-10
  - this sentence ending with reference 38 seems poorly connected with the rest of the paragraph - consider removing it.
  **This sentence was excluded.**

**Referee 2:**

http://www.biomedcentral.com/imedia/9685759091066928_comment.pdf

**Additional Editorial Request:**

a) Background section of abstract needs aims of study.
**We have clarified the aim of the study in the last paragraph.**