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Reviewer’s report:

Good evening

Thanks for the opportunity to review the manuscript, it is appreciated. Overall, the quality of the manuscript was not acceptable as it stands and it is need of major revisions. The manuscript would have to address some of the problems that I have highlighted before it would meet the standard for publishing. See the manuscript for specific comments.

The author are examining the relationship of fruit and vegetable intake of elementary students with SES and social factors. Please note that I have indicated specific comments on the manuscript with sticky notes on the PDF of the manuscript. The problem is that my surname appears as the author of the sticky notes on the PDF. Since the author did not number the lines of the manuscript, I was not able to refer to specific line numbers in my comments.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   No - I have highlighted the problems with the questions. The authors could have made better use of the data. In fact, I believe that the manuscript the authors may consider splitting the paper. For example, parental perceptions and health beliefs would make a nice paper on its own.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   At first glance, it would seem that the methods are appropriate, but the methods are not well described - lacking detail and description. The formative work that was done (and in some instances appears to have not been done) is not explicitly addressed. The tools/instruments are identified but it is not clear whether the authors had permission to use these tools. Also, it is not clear that any validation work was done on the tools prior to launching it with participants (e.g., criterion validation, Web-based survey validated for use by elementary students since it was developed for adolescents, etc.). This is an important piece that is missing in the methods. If this evaluative work has not been done, it would weaken the credibility of the findings.

3. Are the data sound?
   A more detailed description of the data analysis would strengthen this section. It is difficult to assess this section.
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?

The discussion and conclusion needs to be flushed out - the authors need to talk more about the nuances of their data rather than simply backing up their findings what others have found.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Yes - the authors clearly stated the limitations of the study.

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?

No

9. Is the writing acceptable?

The writing of the manuscript needs to be improved. There were several grammatical and syntax errors, and in addition to that, there were many sentences that were not clearly written. Also, I would suggest replacing colloquial terms and informal style of writing with one that is more technical and formal. As well, I would suggest having the manuscript reviewed by a copy editor to assist with some of the problems that I have identified.

I apologise for the delay in responding.

Thanks again.

Sincerely,

Anna