

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Point 1 (lines 90 to 92): The word “descriptive” is not necessary in that sentence. The authors are describing the design and setting in that section not the analysis. It seems using a verb would be more appropriate. Perhaps rephrase as: “An observational cross-sectional study of the psychometric properties of the Entornos de Vida (EdV) tool was undertaken in Denia (Spain) between 2019 and 2020.”

Response 1: Thank you for your comment. According to your suggestion, we have reworded the paragraph in a more appropriate way.

Point 2 (lines 93/94): I am not sure what this sentence means. Would it be: “The study was part of the XarxaSalut strategy [13] in to analyse the health situation analysis stage in Denia.”

Response 2: Thank you for your observation. We have rewritten the paragraph following your suggestion.

Point 3 (lines 99 to 100): Please delete as per below.

“The main activity sector is the one of services, tourism being the main economic activity.”

Response 3: Thank you for your recommendation. Following your advice, we have deleted the indicated paragraph. It is effectively redundant with the paragraph that follows.

Point 4 (line 107): The word “design” doesn’t seem appropriate in that sentence. Perhaps rephrase as: “The design definition of the participation was based on three assumptions: ...”

Response 4: Thank you. We have modified the sentence in order to clarify the information.

Point 5 (line 112): Please replace “conversation” by “discussion”.

Response 5: Thank you for detecting an inappropriate group name. We have included the suggested change.

Point 6 (line 114): Please rephrase as: “The equity approach was applied to form the discussion groups by using convenience sampling, ...”

Response 6: Thank you for your suggestion. We have reworded the paragraph following your indications.

Point 7 (lines 144 to 146): In Table 1, there are 19 themes but in Figure there are 14 themes. Why? Also, In Figure 1, the definitions are in Spanish. Could the authors translate to English?

Response 7: Thank you for your observation. Apparently, in the process of inserting the Table 1 in the manuscript, the format of the title of each group of the evaluation items was lost. We have modified the format to clarify that the 14 items are grouped into 5 themes: Movement, Space, Resources, Civic and Stewardship.

On the other hand, the Figure 1 has been modified, including the name of each item in English.

Point 8 (lines 148/149): Please rephrase as: “As for the sampling, according to Iacobucci and Duhachek [17], the sample size must be related to the length of the scale.”

Response 8: Thank you. We have changed the sentence in order to clarify the information.

Point 9 (line 149): Please replace “to” by “for”.

Response 9: Thank you for the review. We did correct the text.

Point 10 (line 152): Please use the word “assess” instead of “study”.

“The Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) test was used to study assess the relationship between variables”

Response 10: Thank you for your appreciations. We agree with your considerations, and have modified the word.

Point 11 (line 156): Please add “and percentages” after “frequencies”

Response 11: Thank you for your recommendation. We have reworded the paragraph following your indications.

Point 12 (lines 157 to 159): This sentence is confusing. It contains too much information. Please simplify. I assume the authors were attempting to say something along those lines?

“For each item, quantitative variables were calculated by summing the scores obtained for each question and taking their arithmetic mean”.

Response 12: Thank you for your appreciations. We agree with your considerations, and have modified the paragraph following your suggestion.

Point 13 (line 177): It is confusing to have “,” to indicate decimal places. Please use “62.81” instead of “62,81” throughout. Please be consistent in reporting the number of decimal places; in this case 2 decimal places throughout. Typo in “Secondary school uncomplete”. Some of the variables total don’t add up to 242 (e.g. Age, Nationality, Neighbourhood), please add missing (if any) under each variable as a separate row in Table 2.

Response 13: Thank you for identifying this inconsistency. We have changed both the decimal separator, (dots instead of commas), and the number of decimal places in all the tables.

On the other hand, in order to facilitate the understanding of the table, we have included the sample value (n=) in each variable analyzed (e.g. Age, Nationality, Neighborhood).

Point 14 (line 180): Same remark as above regarding using “,” for decimal places. Please change throughout.

Response 14: Thank you again for detecting this. We have modified decimal separator (dot instead of comma).

Point 15 (lines 181 to 186): Is there a cut off score in the literature to support that score of say 5 and below can be classified as worst? If so, please provide a reference.

Response 15: Thank you, we really appreciate your comment. The original tool, the Place Standard had a scoring system from 1 to 7. In the process of translating and adapting the Place Standard Tool to the Spanish context, the scoring system was changed to facilitate the evaluation of each dimension due to its similarity with the current school rating system in Spain.

In this scoring system, the passing note is five out of ten. Thus, values less than five are considered non-acceptable. The items with the lowest score have more room for improvement.

Point 16 (line 189): The word “studied” in “The degree of relationship between studied variables...” doesn’t seem appropriate. Perhaps “derived quantitative”.

Response 16: Thank you for your appreciations. We agree with your considerations, and have modified the word.

Point 17 (line 191): The word “studied” in “the percentage of explained variance was studied” doesn’t seem appropriate. Perhaps “assessed”.

Response 17: Thank you for your appreciations. We agree with your considerations, and have modified the word.

Point 18 (lines 192/193): This sentence is rather difficult to comprehend. Could the authors please rephrase? Perhaps start with “With a percentage explained variance of 81.50%, the tool can be considered as a single factor”. It’s also rather strange that the authors went about doing the EFA but then stating “it was not considered appropriate to perform an exploratory or confirmatory factorial analysis.” Please clarify.

Response 18: Thank you for your observations. Since the variance explained and the reliability rate were not the ones obtained, we would have carried out the EFA. Thus, given the results obtained (81.50% and 0.849 respectively), we have not considered necessary to perform it.

However, we agree that it is needless that the paragraph include that explanation. Therefore, we have modified it according to your indications.

Point 19 (line 215): Please rephrase “and that finally there were 242 of them” as “and we had a final sample of 242”.

Response 19: Thank you for your recommendation. We have reworded the paragraph following your indications.