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Reviewer's report:

This paper assesses the validity of two sources of secondary food environment data available in England against street audits in England, as well as appraises the utility of these data.

Congratulations! This is a substantial piece of work. Overall, this paper is well written and will make a contribution to the evidence base. Below I provide minor comments for each section of the paper.

Background

p. 4 line 26 - Is it possible to provide a sentence summarizing the results of the research examining the validity of secondary food environment data in the US?

p. 5 lines 1-16 - How often are the LA and FSA datasets updated? Annually?

Statistical Analyses

p. 13 line 3 - Is significant set at p <0.05 or p < or = to 0.05? This differs throughout the paper.

Discussion

p. 22 lines 1-2 - This is an awkward sentence. Please consider rewording.

p. 23 lines 5-9 - Interesting point. Given the potential proportion of businesses selling food that are not primarily engaged with food retail, please make a suggestion for how to improve coverage of these FOs in secondary data.
Conclusion

Abbreviations used throughout the paper are no longer applied in this section only.

Figure 1

In the top right box under "After data matching", is this supposed to be "FO entries screened"?

General Comments:

Several uncommon abbreviations are used throughout the paper. I found myself often flipping the pages to crosscheck the meanings of the abbreviations. Is it possible to cut down on the number of abbreviations used?

Please consistently use 1 decimal point for %s reported throughout the paper.

Level of interest

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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