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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The paper is well-written and makes a significant contribution to the community garden literature. I enjoyed reading the paper and particularly like the fact that six gardens were considered. I have the following recommendations to improve the paper:

Major issues
More information about the sample should be provided. The readers should know when people joined the program. This is important because their perspectives become biased over time. This should be mentioned in the limitations.
At times, the citations from participants don't fully match with the categories. A definition of the coded categories would help better align this. For example, under the category "politics of community gardening", there are examples of access to low socio-economic status groups (Louise) and environmental benefits such as composting (Catalina) beside inclusion (several participants). These perspectives do not need to be related to politics. The same arguments apply to "building identity", particularly the first paragraph.

A note on differences between the six community gardens in the results section would be good. It may lead to future research (e.g., comparative case study).

Minor issues
Page 5, line 56: add an "s" to "et al." so that it reads "et al's"

Page 6, lines 1-5: Guitart's statement can be taken out (note that the paper is from 2012 and that you had already mentioned non-US-based studies before)

Page 7, line 145: write "where" instead of "were"

Table 1: write "participants" instead of "participant"

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
There are only minor revisions to do.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.

Yes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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