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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting piece of research that examines drive-thru banning as a policy tool. My main concern is that the study is based on the assumption that such measures are effective in terms of indicators of eating. I think that the rationale - that it is in fact effective - needs to be argued better for. A few suggestions:

The background might benefit from being turned into an introduction where the authors "make their case" - why this study is timely and relevant. Please also consider to make the intro shorter and make sure that the AIM of the study stands out clear at the end of the intro.

The choice of diffusion theory seems relevant but the authors could consider doing a "conceptual foundation" section where the authors develop a "heuristic" for their use of this theoretical approach.

The authors do a qualified walk through of the land use literature but the weakest pont of the manuscript is still to argue for the fact that among the land use policy options, in particular the drive thru instrument could be speculated to be effective and as a result is worth studying.

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.

Unable to assess

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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