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The authors would like to thank you for the new assessment of the manuscript. We are submitting the reformulated version of the article in accordance with the suggestions. Reviewer comments and our responses are written in black and in blue for easy viewing, respectively. In the manuscript, we made a clean version and not included track changes or highlighting.
Editor Comments

Thank you for responding the editorial and reviewer requests. We have a few points for clarification in light of this.

ANSWER: The authors would like to thank you for the comments. The new questions have been answered.

1. In your response to including the questionnaire, you indicate this has been recently published, citing reference 19. This is fine, but in your response to the editor could you provide a little extra background to this please? How does the current study relate to or build on reference 19? If the studies are related we ask that you cite and briefly discuss this early in the manuscript (towards where you state the objective of your current study; please keep in the reference in the methods also).

ANSWER: The referenced manuscript (Costa et al., 2018) is a recent publication on the methodology of the ecological study on the food environment carried out in the context of the Health Academy Program (HAP), to which this manuscript belongs.

In this article (Costa et al., 2018) we present information regarding the validation of secondary data used in the investigation of food environment. We also describe the assessment tool used to assess the characteristics of the community and consumer environment in health promotion service territories. This information about the article was included in the manuscript, methodology section.

Because it is an article referring to the methodology of the work, we believe that it is more appropriate to refer only to the methodology of the work. (Methods section, line 119 to 122, page 4 and 5).

2. To strengthen your paper please add the study design and setting to the title.

ANSWER: The authors would like to thank you for the comments. We did it. (Title, line 1 to 2, page 1)

3. The manuscript would benefit from a further minor proofread to ensure clarity, in particular the new parts of the text.

ANSWER: Thank you for your understanding. We asked American Manuscript Editors to review the manuscript. We forwarded the statement of the revision.
4. Thank you for clarifying that the map in Figure 1 has been drawn by yourselves. Could you confirm it has not been published elsewhere please? Please add a figure legend after the references (including the source, e.g. authors own). The figure file should only contain keys and scale bars.

ANSWER: Figure 1 was developed exclusively for this article. Therefore, it was not published elsewhere. We made the changes on the map. (After the references, page 19).