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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Abstract: The second sentence of the background section should state what the intervention is for; i.e. "a carry-out intervention [to promote healthy food choices]..."

2. There are multiple grammatical errors. The authors need to be more careful in their editing and proofing. This is a partial list of errors found: Page 4, 3rd paragraph - missing period at end of first sentence; Page 6, last sentence of Formative Research - unnecessary "that"; Page 7, first sentence at top of page - and extra "(n=50)"; 3rd sentence under Methods/Process Evaluation - should read "customers served", and there is an extra "e" after "baseline"; last sentence of Discussion - unnecessary "is"; 2nd sentence of Conclusions - unnecessary "to"s...

3. Multiple referencing issues (page 5, first paragraph under Methods; last paragraph under Development subheading; first paragraph under Methods/Process Evaluation)

4. Table 1: Following the format of the other rows, Sales Data is not the Intervention Component. My understanding is that Customers Served is the component being measured in order to estimate Reach. Also, the notation for Table 1 is off (top of page 12), but this will probably be fixed when the preceding reference is fixed, or is there supposed to be an Instruments sub-heading?

5. There is a big gap after the Statistical Analysis section. Is there something missing here? It doesn't look like you did more than descriptive stats so I don't think there's more to say - so probably a formatting error.

6. Results: Table 2 shows that 100% saw menu boards, but text says 98.0% (pg 14).

Discretionary Revisions

1. Under Sampling Strategy, I think readers of this article will be interested to know owners' reasons for not participating.

2. Discussion: There was no mention of why Reach was an important indicator to measure. It seems like looking at receipts to count number of entrees is a high burden task (although, I assume you were also collecting other info not presented here) but the significance of total number of customers served or what the increase in reach seen means is not clear.
3. Discussion: The last paragraph of the Discussion seems too abbreviated. There is one short sentence about the effectiveness results which seems out of the blue and too little. It makes the reader wonder why this is the first they are hearing this - a note of "results not shown" or "published elsewhere" seems appropriate. Or..."Additional analyses on outcomes (published elsewhere) showed an increase in purchases of healthy items and total revenue among intervention carry-outs [23]."

4. A timeline of some sort seems important here. Could be a paragraph but a diagram would probably be more effective. There is a specific audience for the article and they will want a clear picture of implementation. Timeline should include timing of phases and there should also be some indication of when intervention visits occurred. There was mention in the results that interventionist visits occurred with high fidelity but there was no mention of what was required. Timeline may be different for each store depending on different variables so could just show progression and mention typical timeframes.
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