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Reviewer’s report:

As authors said, "… physical environment has an important impact on the dining experience of LTC residents,…." The study demonstrated well on key characteristics (homeliness and functionality) of physical environment of LTC dining rooms using the DEAP.

I would like to recommend minor things to add/revise in this manuscript.

Page 3, Line 72: DEAP - explain who and when it has been developed. Add References of DEAP original developments.

Page 5, Line 125; What is M3 study? Explain it briefly.

Page 7, Line 175; training of DEAP Staff - 3-day in-person training. Is this really necessary? It was also mentioned in Page 18. Explain why it is important and what are trained? (3 days!)

Page 8, Line 183-184; Explain the sentence. What is unit level?

Page 9, Line 223; food intake were estimated from weighing food intake? Not clear.

Page 16, Line 381; replace "caloric" to "energy"

Overall, it is a well written and useful paper for future research on LTC dining rooms.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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