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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
I think the aim of the study is “to verify the psychometric and econometric properties of two scales about problems in neighborhood” and no “to verify the psychometric and econometric properties of perception of the problems in neighborhood”

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The authors can be write with more details econometric statistics. The results of variance components (Table 3) not are describe and explain in this section. To explain the process about models (for example, what is the process input and maintenance variables? All the variables the first level were used in other levels?)

3. Are the data sound?
Yes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes, but is need a review.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation):
  a) No.

- Minor Essential Revisions (The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes):
  a) References 1 and 5 are the same.
  b) References 12 and 19 are the same.
  c) References 20 and 28 are the same.
  d) References 4 and 35 are the same.
  e) Table 1: The variable “Number of years of educational attainment” has not stratification by gender.
  f) Table 4: At the end of the title, the better phrase is: “...by individual and census tract level variables”.
  g) How the response options to the scale items were transformed in number values? Each option is equivalent to the value (e.g., 0, 1, 2)?
  h) I suggest modify the aim and improving description about statistical analysis.

- Discretionary Revisions (These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential):
  a) Page 13, second line: What is “the true neighborhood scores”?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.