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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors

Thank you again for letting me read your interesting paper, which has improved due to your changes and elaborations.

However, I still have some comments:

Settings: You have explained upazillas twice; in line 18 and 19.

Results: I am still not fully convinced about the statement of results:

The paragraph: 'individual and group level mechanisms' mainly discuss group level mechanism. I do not think it is clear where the individual level is discussed under this paragraph?

To understand this heading, I think it would help the reader, if you make it more clear, or distinguish more clear between 'individual' and 'group' level mechanism.

I do not think that the headline 'agency, resilience & changed social norms' covers the paragraph written below.

Further, should the paragraph 'community' and 'diet' not be joined. As I see it, the theme they have in common is: 'healthier eating habits.'

And will it not bee too wide to call the paragraph 'community,' when the description only covers 'some local shops' who changed their assortment?

Discussion: I think that L 11-23 is more of a conclusion than a discussion. I would suggest you put the short presentation of your main findings at the very beginning of the discussion.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.