

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Instruments and indicators for assessing organizational food environments: a scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Azevedo, Ana Beatriz; Curioni, Cintia; Bandoni, Daniel; Canella, Daniela

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Galvez, Patricia Universidad de Chile Facultad de Medicina, Nutrition
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Aug-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thanks for the opportunity to review the article “Instruments for assessing organizational food environments: a scoping review protocol.” The article shows a protocol proposal of a scoping review about a topic that could interest the journal readers. However, some aspects of the manuscript do not allow me to approve it in its current form.</p> <p>Please, clarify the need for this scoping review. Clarify why a scoping review is better than a systematic review. The scoping review will review studies with instruments and indicators for evaluating the organizational food environment. However, the title and the study question include just instruments. I suggest rewriting both of them.</p> <p>Line 5. Please, review the use of this second “malnutrition.”</p> <p>Line 25. Why are schools not considered setting for the scoping review? According to the Glanz et al. model that the authors describe in line 18, it also includes schools on it.</p> <p>In the search term. Why are psychometrics and those word related to this analysis included? Are the authors looking just for validated instruments? Please, clarify this in the text.</p> <p>The Castro and Canella model seems essential for the article data extraction. However, this model is mentioned in lines 52 to 57. I suggest moving this paragraph before the text.</p> <p>The authors should review in-text citations.</p>
-------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER	Lee, Kirsten University of Waterloo
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Oct-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This study protocol is a scoping review of assessments for organizational food environments. The authors use the Arksey and O'Malley guidance to inform the methods for their scoping review. Overall, the manuscript provided a meaningful rationale for the purpose of the review and described a systematic approach to the</p>
-------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>scoping review. Below are some suggestions to strengthen the protocol.</p> <p>Overarching comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract and introduction briefly mention managers, however, the relevance of this review to managers is unclear. Is the intention of this scoping review to inform managers of organizations/institutions? If so, consider describing their role and potential interest in food environment assessment. As well, if intended for managers, consider describing opportunities for engagement with organization managers in the dissemination section. 2. The introduction provides a good rationale for why it is important to target food environment, particularly organizational settings. The authors also provide examples of organizational environments based on the definition used (i.e., "It includes schools, universities, companies, public services, hospitals, prisons and civil society associations and their respective food centers"). However, the methods and search strategy, seem to focus primarily on workplaces, post-secondary campuses, and hospitals. If focusing on specific organizational environments, it would be helpful to describe why only focusing on these types of settings. E.g., why aren't schools or recreational sports facilities/public services considered? 3. If the review is focusing on workplaces, postsecondary campuses, and hospitals, it is a bit unclear why only the specific Brazilian study on hospital assessments was described to rationalize the study, but other assessments for workplaces/campuses were not. Is the intention to identify organizational food assessments that could be used to inform the Brazilian context? If so, it would be helpful to describe this context more. 4. A broad over-arching research question is provided, focused on what food environment assessments are available to evaluate food and eating settings in organizations. However, the data extraction and synthesis components seem to go beyond the research question and includes data extraction items, such as "results" and "validity and reliability". To help structure this protocol, consider describing a series of research questions/sub research questions that align more closely with the data that will be extracted and synthesized from the included articles. 5. The authors suggest that no language restrictions will be applied to the search. What is the plan for screening and data extraction of articles that are not in the authors' preferred language of choice? E.g., will only titles/abstracts be translated in the first instance for screening, with only included articles receiving full translation or will full texts be translated? 6. For data extraction, "results" is included in the standardized form. Does this refer to the results of the included studies (e.g., food environment scores for different organizations)? Since the review is focused on understanding the assessment tools, it is unclear why extracting the results of studies will be relevant to the review. Consider also including a data extraction item for gaps in the literature on food environment assessments for organizations (e.g., might find that organizational food environment assessments
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>are missing key components, limited testing for validity and reliability in a variety of settings).</p> <p>7. The data synthesis section could be further clarified, particularly with language around “evaluation” of assessments. How will the assessments be evaluated? Consider synthesizing the assessments by organization type (e.g., narratively summarizing for all campuses, worksites, and hospitals), providing opportunity to compare with and across types.</p> <p>8. Strengths and limitations section provided, but limitations not clearly described.</p> <p>Minor comments:</p> <p>1. Overall, the paper should be reviewed for grammar. E.g., first sentence of the search strategy section says, “The search will be conducted in using databases”.</p> <p>2. First sentence of abstract is awkwardly structured. Consider revising for clarity.</p> <p>3. Include in search strategy, “post secondary” as its own term without institutions. It may be helpful to do a search of relevant articles to see if there are other terms that are often used, such as colleges, dining halls, cafeterias.</p> <p>4. Authors described that the screening process will be recorded in a diagram. Assuming this is referring to a PRISMA diagram, but would like to confirm. Typically this may also be described in the screening section of the methods as well.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1
Patricia Galvez Espinoza

Comments to the Author:

Thanks for the opportunity to review the article “Instruments for assessing organizational food environments: a scoping review protocol.” The article shows a protocol proposal of a scoping review about a topic that could interest the journal readers. However, some aspects of the manuscript do not allow me to approve it in its current form.

Thank you for the very important comments.

Please, clarify the need for this scoping review. Clarify why a scoping review is better than a systematic review.

The scoping review aims to identify the nature and extent of evidence on a given theme to obtain a mapping of the literature. Considering that no review evaluated instruments for assessing the organizational food environment, we believe that a scoping review with a systematic search would be more appropriate than a systematic review, for providing a mapping of the literature on the topic (MUNN et al., 2018).

We have made changes to the text considering the suggestions:

This is the protocol of a scoping review, that aims to identify the existing instruments and indicators for assessing organizational food environments as well as the different components, dimensions, and items assessed by them, taking into account the elements presented in the conceptual model

proposed by Castro and Canella (2022) (8). Using a systematic search of the literature, the scoping review aims to identify the nature and extent of evidence on a given theme to obtain a mapping of the literature. One of the purposes of conducting a scoping review is to identify the types of evidence available in a given field (9,10).

The scoping review will review studies with instruments and indicators for evaluating the organizational food environment. However, the title and the study question include just instruments. I suggest rewriting both of them.

Thanks for the comment. We made the changes accordingly.

Line 5. Please, review the use of this second "malnutrition."

Thanks for the comment. We have made changes to the text considering the suggestions: Malnutrition is one of the major health problems worldwide, including obesity, undernutrition, and dietary risks for non-communicable diseases (NCDs).

Line 25. Why are schools not considered setting for the scoping review? According to the Glanz et al. model that the authors describe in line 18, it also includes schools on it.

We chose to focus on workplaces, universities and hospitals because despite the differences between these settings, they have many similarities. On the other hand, the option by not to include studies that measured the food environment in schools, prisons and recreational facilities, since each of these organizations and their public have many specificities, such as young age and low autonomy of individuals (in the case of schools and prison) and length of permanency in the place (very short in the case of recreational facilities and very long in prisons), which probably influence a lot characteristics of the environment.

In the search term. Why are psychometrics and those word related to this analysis included? Are the authors looking just for validated instruments? Please, clarify this in the text.

We considered all related terms on the topic of instruments (combined by the Boolean operator "or" to broaden the results). Thus, making it possible to locate articles that focused on instrument validation, as well as articles that applied non-validated models.

The Castro and Canella model seems essential for the article data extraction. However, this model is mentioned in lines 52 to 57. I suggest moving this paragraph before the text.

The authors should review in-text citations.

Thanks for the comment. We made the changes accordingly, including a mention about the model in the beginning of the Methods, as you can see below:

This is the protocol of a scoping review, that expects to identify the existing instruments and indicators for assessing organizational food environments as well as the different components, dimensions, and items assessed by them, taking into account the elements presented in the conceptual model proposed by Castro and Canella (2022).

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Kirsten Lee, University of Waterloo

Comments to the Author:

This study protocol is a scoping review of assessments for organizational food environments. The authors use the Arksey and O'Malley guidance to inform the methods for their scoping review.

Overall, the manuscript provided a meaningful rationale for the purpose of the review and described a systematic approach to the scoping review. Below are some suggestions to strengthen the protocol.

Thank you for the very significant comments.

Overarching comments:

1. The abstract and introduction briefly mention managers, however, the relevance of this review to managers is unclear. Is the intention of this scoping review to inform managers of organizations/institutions? If so, consider describing their role and potential interest in food environment assessment. As well, if intended for managers, consider describing opportunities for engagement with organization managers in the dissemination section.

Thanks for the thoughtful comment. We have the interesting in verifying if any instrument was developed for being used by managers, but this is not the main focus of the scoping review so we opted by excluding it information.

2. The introduction provides a good rationale for why it is important to target food environment, particularly organizational settings. The authors also provide examples of organizational environments based on the definition used (i.e., "It includes schools, universities, companies, public services, hospitals, prisons and civil society associations and their respective food centers"). However, the methods and search strategy, seem to focus primarily on workplaces, post-secondary campuses, and hospitals. If focusing on specific organizational environments, it would be helpful to describe why only focusing on these types of settings. E.g., why aren't schools or recreational sports facilities/public services considered?

We chose to focus on workplaces, universities and hospitals because despite the differences between these settings, they have many similarities. On the other hand, the option by not to include studies that measured the food environment in schools, prisons and recreational facilities, since each of these organizations and their public have many specificities, such as young age and low autonomy of individuals (in the case of schools and prison) and length of permanency in the place (very short in the case of recreational facilities and very long in prisons), which probably influence a lot characteristics of the environment.

3. If the review is focusing on workplaces, postsecondary campuses, and hospitals, it is a bit unclear why only the specific Brazilian study on hospital assessments was described to rationalize the study, but other assessments for workplaces/campuses were not. Is the intention to identify organizational food assessments that could be used to inform the Brazilian context? If so, it would be helpful to describe this context more.

Our intention in citing the Brazilian study was giving an example of a more complete assessment. But we agree that it was not clear and we opted by excluding this information.

4. A broad over-arching research question is provided, focused on what food environment assessments are available to evaluate food and eating settings in organizations. However, the data extraction and synthesis components seem to go beyond the research question and includes data extraction items, such as "results" and "validity and reliability". To help structure this protocol, consider describing a series of research questions/sub research questions that align more closely with the data that will be extracted and synthesized from the included articles.

Thanks for the very important comment. We included more research questions and now the text is: The main research question of this review is "What instruments and indicators are available for assessing organizational food environments?". Additional research questions are "What settings were studied?"; "What elements of organizational food environments have been studied?"; and "Have the psychometric properties of the instruments and indicators been evaluated?".

5. The authors suggest that no language restrictions will be applied to the search. What is the plan for screening and data extraction of articles that are not in the authors' preferred language of choice? E.g., will only titles/abstracts be translated in the first instance for screening, with only included articles receiving full translation or will full texts be translated?

Thanks for the comment. For screening, titles and abstracts will be translated and only included articles will receive a full translation. We have made changes to the text considering the suggestions:

The summaries of selected titles will be analyzed to identify those that meet the inclusion criteria. The full texts of selected articles will undergo an assessment for inclusion in this review. If abstracts or articles were founded in languages other than English, Portuguese, and Spanish, they will be translated using software programs. Any disagreement during the process will be resolved by consensus among the reviewers or by consulting a third reviewer.

6. For data extraction, “results” is included in the standardized form. Does this refer to the results of the included studies (e.g., food environment scores for different organizations)? Since the review is focused on understanding the assessment tools, it is unclear why extracting the results of studies will be relevant to the review. Consider also including a data extraction item for gaps in the literature on food environment assessments for organizations (e.g., might find that organizational food environment assessments are missing key components, limited testing for validity and reliability in a variety of settings).

Thanks for the comment. We excluded the results and included “Limitations and gaps pointed out by the authors”, now the text is:

Two reviewers will extract data independently, using the standardized form, considering: 1) reference, including the year of publication; 2) country; 3) sample; 4) study objectives; 5) study design; 6) setting (evaluated the organizational food environment in universities, hospitals or workplaces); 7) components of the food environment and eating spaces assessed; 8) instruments, number of items, and methodologies employed to measure the food environment; 9) measured dimensions of eating spaces (availability, accessibility, affordability, quality, food and nutrition information, and promotion of foods, beverages, and culinary preparations and the availability, acceptability, convenience, ambience, and infrastructure of the eating space); 10) limitations and gaps pointed out by the authors; 11) reported validity and reliability of measures; and 12) the existence of summary measures or healthiness indicators. Disagreements arising from the literature review will also be resolved by consensus.

7. The data synthesis section could be further clarified, particularly with language around “evaluation” of assessments. How will the assessments be evaluated? Consider synthesizing the assessments by organization type (e.g., narratively summarizing for all campuses, worksites, and hospitals), providing opportunity to compare with and across types.

Thank you for the very important comments. We have made changes to the text considering the suggestions:

Initially, the summary of the studies will be synthesized narratively by organization type (universities, worksites, and hospitals), in order to provide the comparison within and across types, through summary tables with the characteristics of the settings. The synthesis will provide an overview of the studies, with specific sub-analyses of relevant features such as components of the food environment and measured dimensions of eating spaces. The key differences and similarities of the instruments and indicators will be explored through a more detailed analysis. The instruments and indicators will be also described for a reliability and validity of the measures.

8. Strengths and limitations section provided, but limitations not clearly described.

Thank you for the very important comments.

We have made changes to the text considering the suggestions:

- The proposed scoping review is the first to provide an overview of the instruments and indicator for assessing organizational food environments.
- Data extraction and analysis will be guided by the conceptual model proposed by Castro and Canella (2022), which is a more comprehensive framework that considers the different components and dimensions of the organizational environment.
- By focusing on studies that evaluated universities, hospitals, and workplaces, organizational contexts with adults as subjects, the study will not capture all the literature on instruments and indicators of the organizational food environment.

Minor comments:

1. Overall, the paper should be reviewed for grammar. E.g., first sentence of the search strategy section says, "The search will be conducted in using databases".

Thanks for the comment. We made the changes accordingly.

2. First sentence of abstract is awkwardly structured. Consider revising for clarity.

Thanks for the comment. We have made changes to the text considering the suggestions:

Many studies have explored the food environment to characterize it and understand its role in food practices, in order to contribute to the creation of healthy food environments and the prevention of obesity and non-communicable diseases.

3. Include in search strategy, "post secondary" as its own term without institutions. It may be helpful to do a search of relevant articles to see if there are other terms that are often used, such as colleges, dining halls, cafeterias.

Thanks for the comment. We made the changes accordingly.

4. Authors described that the screening process will be recorded in a diagram. Assuming this is referring to a PRISMA diagram, but would like to confirm. Typically this may also be described in the screening section of the methods as well.

Thanks for the comment. We included that it is the PRISMA diagram and changed this sentence to the topic "Study selection":

The selection process will be presented in the PRISMA-ScR flow diagram.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Galvez, Patricia Universidad de Chile Facultad de Medicina, Nutrition
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Dec-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	All my comments have been addressed.
-------------------------	--------------------------------------

REVIEWER	Lee, Kirsten University of Waterloo
REVIEW RETURNED	06-Dec-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the revisions of this article. Thank you to the authors for responding to my comments in the previous round of revisions. The comments in the attached file are for specific sections to help clarify the article.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the revisions of this article. Thank you to the authors for responding to my comments in the previous round of revisions. The comments below are for specific sections to help clarify the article.</p> <p>Article throughout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest reviewing for grammar throughout – e.g., line 25 in introduction should be "however, there is still little explored." <p>Abstract</p>
-------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 10: Describes “few instruments and indicators have been developed and validated for this type of setting” – if there are only a few, readers may question the need for a review. Suggest changing the framing to help rationalize why we need to synthesize evidence on the range of instruments available. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 18: Flip the structure of the sentence so that the definition is first, followed by “generally available to defined groups rather than the general population”. Line 25-26: Still unclear about the rationale for focusing on organizational environments. Suggest the authors go beyond saying that “little has been explored” on organizational environments here. For example, the authors could reference scoping/systematic review articles that synthesized instruments for community/consumer nutrition environments, and then point toward the lack of reviews focused on organizational settings. <p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 50, page 14: Suggest describing more about the Castro and Canella model here since it helps to describe what the authors are looking for in organizational food environment assessments. For example, consider taking the paragraph in lines 28-33 of the introduction – it currently disrupts the flow of the rationale for the study. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of the Castro and Canella model is a bit vague – what is meant by “institutional level” or “different dimensions”? Is there a figure that can be provided here to help clarify? Line 9-10, page 15: Unclear why settings is a research question if the authors are limiting to universities, hospitals, and workplaces. Perhaps this research question should be how do instruments/indicators compare and contrast when assessing different types of settings? Line 40-42, page 15: Rationale for the focus on universities, hospitals, and workplace is provided but vague. Suggest using some of the language provided in response to the reviewers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More broadly, building on comments from the previous rounds, still a bit unclear why schools are removed if the definition suggests that it is a place where food is sold or supplied to workers/students. Based on the reasoning focused on autonomy, including hospitals is also confusing as patients are likely receiving food at the bedside (unless referring to hospital cafeterias for workers/visitors?). An argument can also be made for including recreational sports facilities – although food outlets in sports facilities tend to be less permanent, the focus of the review is on assessments of the food environment (i.e., the permanency of food outlets in recreational facilities is less important because the authors will be focusing on understanding what characteristics of the recreational food environment is being looked at it assessments and indicators). Could see a rationale for potentially excluding prisons since it is a unique environment, particularly where there is less autonomy, but probably would lean toward being inclusive here. Overall, consider not restricting the review by setting – this would make for an interesting comparison of different types of assessments for the range of organizational settings which seems to be more of the focus of the review. Difficult to see a rationale for
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>only focusing on universities, hospitals, and workplaces (i.e., not entirely clear if these settings are all that similar anyway?).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there interest in reviewing grey literature? Organizations, particularly universities, may have their own versions of assessments of food environments that could be conducted. Provide rationale for why grey literature is not searched. E.g., Maynard M, Lahey D, Abraham A. (2018). Campus food report card: The state of food on Ontario university campuses. Toronto, ON: Meal Exchange. Retrieved from https://www.mealexchange.com/reportcard/ <p>Strengths and limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest clarifying the second bullet point – “more comprehensive framework” is used but without a comparator. Could say something along the lines of “The study uses a comprehensive definition and framework of organizational food environments by Castro and Canella (2022) that considers characteristics beyond the availability of food and beverages. The definition and framework considers components such as the institutional level, internal level of eating spaces, decisional level surroundings, and different dimensions.” Authors should consider commenting on publication bias that is inherent to systematic/scoping reviews.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Kirsten Lee, University of Waterloo

Comments to the Author:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the revisions of this article. Thank you to the authors for responding to my comments in the previous round of revisions. The comments in the attached file are for specific sections to help clarify the article.

Thanks for the careful revision and all suggestions.

Article throughout

Suggest reviewing for grammar throughout – e.g., line 25 in introduction should be “however, there is still little explored.”

Thanks for the suggestions. We reviewed all the text.

Abstract

Line 10: Describes “few instruments and indicators have been developed and validated for this type of setting” – if there are only a few, readers may question the need for a review. Suggest changing the framing to help rationalize why we need to synthesize evidence on the range of instruments available.

Thanks for the suggestion. We kept the previous text but included more elements. Now the text is:

However, few instruments and indicators have been developed and validated for assessing this type of setting. The systematization of those can be useful to support the planning of future assessments and the development of wide-ranging instruments.

Introduction

Line 18: Flip the structure of the sentence so that the definition is first, followed by “generally available to defined groups rather than the general population”.

We made the change as suggested.

Line 25-26: Still unclear about the rationale for focusing on organizational environments. Suggest the authors go beyond saying that “little has been explored” on organizational environments here. For example, the authors could reference scoping/systematic review articles that synthesized instruments for community/consumer nutrition environments, and then point toward the lack of reviews focused on organizational settings.

We understand the point and believe that a more comprehensive assessment of the organizational food environment demands specific instruments, and not the usage of instruments developed for assessing consumer environment but studies that used these instruments probably will be identified in our search. We included a statement about it, as you can see below:

Research on food environments continues to grow, but the conceptual model published in 2022 argues that more research is needed specifically to assess the organizational food environment and that should go beyond the availability of food and beverages in spaces (8), which is the most frequently assessed element using instruments developed for the consumer food environment (6,7).

Methods

Line 50, page 14: Suggest describing more about the Castro and Canella model here since it helps to describe what the authors are looking for in organizational food environment assessments. For example, consider taking the paragraph in lines 28-33 of the introduction – it currently disrupts the flow of the rationale for the study.

- The description of the Castro and Canella model is a bit vague – what is meant by “institutional level” or “different dimensions”? Is there a figure that can be provided here to help clarify?

Thanks for the suggestion. We changed the introduction, that now is:

This environment can play a strategic role in health promotion. However, the organizational food environment is still little explored and in a limited manner (5–7). In this context, a conceptual model published in 2022 points out that the assessment of the organizational food environment should go beyond the availability of food and beverages in spaces (8), which is the most frequently assessed element using instruments developed for the consumer food environment (6,7).

And included all levels and dimensions of Castro and Canella model in the Methods, as you can see below:

Although other models include the organizational food environment in their scope, this model is more comprehensive, including components (institutional level, internal level of eating spaces, decisional level and surroundings) and dimensions (availability, accessibility, affordability, quality, food and nutrition information, and promotion of foods, beverages, and culinary preparations and the availability, acceptability, convenience, ambiance, and infrastructure of the eating space) that go beyond the assessment of food and beverage availability in commercial and non-commercial establishments (8).

We opted not to describe deeply the model since it is used as a strategy for the analysis but is not the subject of the scoping review.

Line 9-10, page 15: Unclear why settings is a research question if the authors are limiting to universities, hospitals, and workplaces. Perhaps this research question should be how do instruments/indicators compare and contrast when assessing different types of settings?

This research question is connected with Data synthesis. As mentioned, we intend to synthesize the studies by organization type (universities, worksites, and hospitals), to provide a comparison within and across types. We changed one of the questions to make it clearer:

What elements of organizational food environments have been studied in different types of settings?

Line 40-42, page 15: Rationale for the focus on universities, hospitals, and workplace is provided but vague. Suggest using some of the language provided in response to the reviewers.

- More broadly, building on comments from the previous rounds, still a bit unclear why schools are removed if the definition suggests that it is a place where food is sold or supplied to workers/students. Based on the reasoning focused on autonomy, including hospitals is also confusing as patients are likely receiving food at the bedside (unless referring to hospital cafeterias for workers/visitors?). An argument can also be made for including recreational sports facilities – although food outlets in sports facilities tend to be less permanent, the focus of the review is on assessments of the food environment (i.e., the permanency of food outlets in recreational facilities is less important because the authors will be focusing on understanding what characteristics of the recreational food environment is being looked at it assessments and indicators). Could see a rationale for potentially excluding prisons since it is a unique environment, particularly where there is less autonomy, but probably would lean toward being inclusive here.

- Overall, consider not restricting the review by setting – this would make for an interesting comparison of different types of assessments for the range of organizational settings which seems to be more of the focus of the review. Difficult to see a rationale for only focusing on universities, hospitals, and workplaces (i.e., not entirely clear if these settings are all that similar anyway?).

Thanks for the thoughtful comment. We tried to better explain the rationale related to our decision, as you can see below:

We chose to focus on workplaces, universities and hospitals/healthcare units because, despite the potential differences between these settings, they have many similarities, being one of them the public of adults/workers. Hospitals/healthcare units can be considered from the perspective of the patients, but also from the workers who normally spend long hours in these settings. The option not to include studies that measured the food environment in schools, prisons and recreational facilities is related mainly to the public and their specificities, such as young age, low autonomy of individuals (in the case of schools and prison), and length of permanency in the place (very short in the case of

recreational facilities and very long in prisons), which probably influence the characteristics of the environment. Additionally, schools have so many specificities that specific models have been developed for them (15,16).

Is there interest in reviewing grey literature? Organizations, particularly universities, may have their own versions of assessments of food environments that could be conducted. Provide rationale for why grey literature is not searched.

- E.g., Maynard M, Lahey D, Abraham A. (2018). Campus food report card: The state of food on Ontario university campuses. Toronto, ON: Meal Exchange. Retrieved from <https://www.mealexchange.com/reportcard/>

It is an interesting point. Google Scholar, a comprehensive academic search engine, will be included in our literature review process. We believe that Google Scholar has extensive coverage, ensuring a thorough exploration of assessments of food environments, even those present in grey literature. We made the following inclusion:

The search on Google Scholar can be considered as a strategy to assess grey literature, since this is a comprehensive academic search engine, allowing the identification of different documents of assessments of food environments.

Strengths and limitations

Suggest clarifying the second bullet point – “more comprehensive framework” is used but without a comparator. Could say something along the lines of “The study uses a comprehensive definition and framework of organizational food environments by Castro and Canella (2022) that considers characteristics beyond the availability of food and beverages. The definition and framework considers components such as the institutional level, internal level of eating spaces, decisional level surroundings, and different dimensions.”

Thanks for the suggestion. Now the text is:

Data extraction and analysis will use a comprehensive definition and framework of organizational food environments by Castro and Canella (2022) that considers characteristics beyond the availability of food and beverages. The definition and framework include components such as the institutional level, internal level of eating spaces, decisional level surroundings, and different dimensions.

Authors should consider commenting on publication bias that is inherent to systematic/scoping reviews.

Thanks for the suggestion. We included the following:

As a potential limitation it is important to consider that despite our comprehensive approach, it is essential to acknowledge the persistent challenge of publication bias in scoping reviews.

VERSION 3 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Lee, Kirsten
----------	--------------

	University of Waterloo
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Dec-2023
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thanks for the opportunity to review this protocol. Best of luck with the searches, screening, and analysis!