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Reviewer's report:

Excellent literature review indicating the need and justification for this research. Important research, effective design and encouraging results given it was a pilot test.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. How were your tools pilot tested?
2. What is the reliability or validity information regarding these tools?
3. Line 24 Page 4 What does NPA stand for? It is first defined on Page 5 line 8.
4. Page 15 People do not go out to “eat healthy” (consider in discussion)
5. Given table 4 how do you explain the changes in the control group… perception of F/V choices and low-calorie choices? See note below regarding additional limitation.
6. There is another potential limitation given how close these communities are. Might there be some contamination between intervention and control sites? Which community was the smaller 6000 resident community? They would likely travel to the larger 26,000 resident community for meals and shopping occasionally.
7. Another potential limitation that should be addressed in future studies: Did the intervention change what the participants would have ordered? Or, are you really just getting participants who would've ordered healthy anyway? How should this be assessed? Tracking restaurant sales or food sales when this method can be refined will be another effective method.
8. Table 2- one column should be added for both restaurants and stores for pre-assessment indicating how many of these strategies were selected to commence the intervention. It was indicated in the methods that they only had to pick three. The text does indicate none of these strategies were in place pre-assessment, but which strategies did they select for their intervention?
9. Table 3-it’s not completely clear what all of your variables mean. What is..this percent community resident? Percent lunchtime? Percent weekday? Percent celebrating? Even when I go back and read the methods these still aren’t clear. Why only show the post-data?
10. Figures on page 26 - A footnote should also be added regarding scale scoring. The text indicates 1 month prior to 10 month post—so a similar foot note
should be added.
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