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Reviewer's report:

1 - What are the exclusion criteria for PAHs?

2 - What is the criterion for the selection of 2 PAHs?

3 - Why did the sample only include people aged 20 years or older? What is the criterion for eliminating, for example, those between the ages of 18 and 20?

4 - What is the reliability of the instruments used in the study (original and current)?

5 - How reliable is HFSI? What is the number of constructs of the instrument?

6 - In pg 6 lines 7 - 11 add summary description of the criteria of Duran et al., 2013;

6 - Replace comma by point in line 13 of pg 07;

7 - The results chapter should begin by describing the quality of the instruments used (reliability) so that the power and strength of the other results are better understood;

8 - The authors report that in the city of the study there is a specific public policy for the installation of health food stores. Does the information proceed? What is the structure of such a program? When was it implanted? Has the program been evaluated yet? Was the variable adequately treated so as not to confuse the study?

9 - The authors bring in the affirmative discussion and results of other studies that anchor their discussions. The study designs, sample and main results of such studies are essential for readers to evaluate the quality of the studies presented and whether they actually serve as a measure of comparison or analysis of their own results.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

No

**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:

Acceptable
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