|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewers´ comments** | **Responses and changes made to the original manuscript** |
| *Reviewer 1* |  |
| ***1. Overview***  This was a very interesting and well written paper about one particular food policy council (Oldenburg FPC), one of the first FPCs in Germany. The authors use the five dimensions of food democracy (Hassanein, 2008) to analyze the extent to which the Oldenburg FPC is serving as a democratic institution within the community. Although the findings are rich and attempt to identify both strengths and weaknesses, it seemed, especially as reflected in the final conclusion, that the strengths won out as none of the weaknesses were mentioned again, nor whether they were important enough to compromise the long-term viability of the FPC. Having studied and participated as a member in FPCs in another country, there is far more nuance to be gained as to how, whether, and under what conditions FPCs, as institutions, function as alternative food initiatives that support food democracy. Unfortunately, a case study of one FPC does not allow much in-country comparison that would allow the authors to compare their findings with other FPCs and see how solidly their conclusions, both within each key dimension and across all dimensions really hold up to scrutiny. Adding analyses of 2-4 more FPCs might allow the authors to see FPCs in a very different light. Our experience in doing a number of FPC case studies recently, forced us to re-analyze our original thesis about how FPCs function. I am not convinced the authors can come to any generalizable conclusions about FPCs and food democracy by only studying one FPC. | Thank you for revising my paper and for your numerous suggestions for improvement. I made a number of changes to the original manuscript and I responded to all your concerns in great detail in my point-by-point responses below, especially as regards the focus on strengths and my methodological approach. |
| ***2. Originality and analytical framework***  The paper offers an innovative analytical framework by applying Hassanein’s 5 key dimensions of food democracy to studying this one FPC in detail. I appreciated the attempt to highlight both strengths and weaknesses, although in some cases, weaknesses were only partially described and then dropped. Sometimes, weaknesses were not identified at all. For example:  2a) • 4.1 Collective action. This section described the ways in which the FPC demonstrated collective action but left out the difficulties of doing so and when it might have fallen short. Here is a situation when one would like to know more about how the 4 committees were actually working. Were they always able to carry out the practical work they had set out for themselves?  2b) • 4.2 Education. The authors say it was initially difficult to find people willing to take on the responsibilities due to limited resources. Then what? Did this change? How? Why? Is it an ongoing challenge?  2c) • 4.3 Sharing ideas. The authors said it was increasingly difficult for members to monitor their activities and share with the larger group. This made it hard for newcomers? So, how was this resolved? Did the committee discuss this and come up with a solution? If not, why not?  2d) • 4.4 Efficacy. The FPC seemed to have uneven experience here with more difficulty in the beginning in seeing impact. This is a very common experience for many FPCs or nonprofit organizations for that matter. Small successes count and need to be celebrated. It would have been nice to share this insight, probably in the literature on community development processes. Community development and community organizing literature would likely enrich the analysis. So, what is happening now with the FPC that one success was recognized?  2e) • 4.5 Orientation toward community good. There was a definite weakness around members feeling overwhelmed at the end of this section, but we don’t find out what members did next? What happened as a result?  2f) • 4.6 Transparency and openness. The evidence for highlighting these two new elements is fairly sparse and could be much more developed. I would also want to see where the FPC fell short on these 2 dimensions and why. The theoretical argument for openness is suggested but not how or whether it emerges from this particular FPC in any concrete way. It is just asserted. | Yes, there is an emphasis on the strengths. I expanded on the challenges and weaknesses in the results as well as in the discussion section. Please see below my detailed responses to 2a)-e).  2a) I included difficulties the members had when agreeing on criteria to specify their vision and I also refer to these challenges in the discussion (5.1). Regarding the committees´ work please see my response to comment 2b).  2b) In this particular case, it was only initially difficult to find people willing to take over the responsibility. After the pre-formation event, a group of people met regularly and initiated a number of educational workshops. Starting in line 226, I refer to the issue of limited resources and how the initial committees were transferred into more manageable projects after the study period.  2c) This issue was not addressed by the coordinating group, but some members were aware of this and talked about their concerns in the interviews. In the discussion section (5.3), I extended the paragraph dealing with more open formats that facilitate sharing of ideas and integrating newcomers.  2d) Yes, small successes need to be celebrated, this was also a learning in the initiative and discussed during the first networking congress. I also added that joining forces would in turn increase motivation (line 390-391). Unfortunately, I cannot expand on the difficulties they had here due to the word limit but in this case I think, I already made their difficulties explicit (see paragraph starting in 279). As regards the community development literature, please see my response to your comment 4b.  2e) Yes, I did not specify what happened afterwards, I only mentioned that the need for a coordinator became obvious. I added the following sentence at the end of the section “This situation changed for the better when they received funding to hire a part-time coordinator after the official formation of the council”. The issue of volunteers feeling overwhelmed is also discussed in 5.4.  2f) Starting in line 328, I am now explaining why these two criteria turned out to be important in this particular case, also by providing examples. I am not arguing that the criterion of openness could not have emerged from studying other FPCs. Instead, while analysing the case in terms of the five dimensions, these two aspects seemed very important for the topic of food democracy and citizenship in general, but not yet covered by Hassanein´s framework.  (Please see also my response to comment 6 by Reviewer 2.) |
| ***3. Interest to the readers***  This paper is very interesting to other scholars and non-scholars but it isn’t enough to draw conclusions from. It is a good first step. | I think the strength of a single case study design is the opportunity to gain a deep understanding of a single setting. Of course, you have to be careful with generalizing specific findings. While putting them into context you can gain interesting insights from specific cases, you might not get when using other approaches. The different methods used in the case study (participant observation, interviews, document analysis) are also a means of triangulating findings. I am convinced that an in-depth understanding of single cases is a prerequisite for comparative studies that might generate more generalizable findings and test those suggested by research on single cases (please see also my responses to your comment number 4a and 4e). |
| ***4. Scientific soundness*** (methodology, lit review, conclusions supported)  4a) The methodology was good as far as it went. However, to be able to offer useful conclusions, the authors really need more cases for comparative purposes. If there are really 40 FPCs in Germany, there should be more to choose from. Deliberately selecting case studies with differing variables (eg years in existence, rural/urban/, size/membership, funding) would help the authors uncover which conditions influence the 5 key analytical aspects. This would make a much stronger paper.  4b) In addition to the FPC literature, it might be useful to briefly explore the community development and/or community organizing literature to help explain what stages these FPCs are at.  4c) The Discussion section was interesting but limited severely by lack of comparisons. There was one useful comparison with some other FPC initiative in Germany around the idea of including an educational event at the beginning of regular meetings vs simply doing the administrative tasks. There were several ideas suggested about what the FPC initiative might do to mitigate particular challenges. If there had been other cases explored, the authors might have actually seen how other FPCs handled these challenges. These comparisons lend much richness and nuance to one’s understanding of how these FPCs actually function. Without other cases, it almost seems as if the authors are guessing or hoping the FPC fulfills its roles in particular ways. For example, in lines 384+, the argument is made that FPCs can negotiate with the city’s catering service from a more comprehensive (objective?) standpoint than organic farmers may not be the case, depending on how the FPC is constituted. Further, depending on what information the FPC provides to policymakers, they may not be less biased than advocacy groups. In fact, FPCs are often thought of as advocacy groups. Citizen engagement is important; yet it also comes with its own challenges and is usually not completely unbiased.  4d) The authors assert that FPCs need to be publicly supported (financially?) if they are to become recognized spaces of deliberation. Possibly; however, the literature also suggests that public support also comes with strings attached and sometimes these political strings can hamper the freedom of FPCs to make their own decisions.  4e) The conclusions, unfortunately, were limited to mentioning only how the Oldenburg FPC demonstrated the positive aspects of the 5 key dimensions and not the challenges they faced. This simplified the reality that was more deeply explained in the body of the paper and we lose the richness embedded in it, which was the purpose of the case study in the first place. The conclusions do not seem to be supported by the evidence described. | 4a) This comment is closely related to your critique in your overarching comments on the paper in the beginning of your review. Maybe some more clarification is needed here. Today, we have around 40 emerging FPC initiatives in Germany, though many of them are still in the very early stages and have not yet turned into institutions (to clarify I added this information in the introduction when mentioning the initiatives, see lines 69-72).  Please take into account that when the study was designed, there was no German FPC at all and the study was from its nature exploratory. This study followed a case study approach, which is particularly suitable for new research fields: A case study is “a research strategy which focuses on understanding the dynamics present within single settings” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 534). This approach not only allows for a rich description of specific cases, it can also inform the development of theories grounded in the data: “Theory developed from case study research is likely to have important strengths like novelty, testability, and empirical validity, which arise from the intimate linkage with empirical evidence” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 548).  During the study period (April 2016-April 2018), five more FPCs were formed and I included some more insights from these cases in the discussion section. The problem here is also that there are no scientific publications because it is still such a recent topic. A comparative approach with larger N is definitely needed now as I mention in the conclusions. Such an approach would just not have been possible when this study on the emergence of one of the first German FPCs was conducted.  4b) Unfortunately I did not fully understand this point. Maybe you can specify how the community development literature would help explain what stages these FPCs are at and also where this should be placed in the paper. I think I clearly stated that the institutional phenomenon of FPCs in Germany is still in its early stages.  4c) I added more examples from the other FPCs that formed during the study period in the discussion section (e.g. starting in line 356 and in line 387) for viewing the case study´s results in the broader context of the emerging movement. Under the given circumstances at the point the study was designed, I cannot provide a comprehensive comparison of the studied German FPC with other FPCs (see my response to your comment 4a).  In lines 384+, I did not want to give the impression that FPCs are neutral or objective. Of course, their member composition strongly influences the information they provide to policymakers. But I still think that they are possibly less biased than classical advocacy groups striving for a specific concern, because FPCs usually have a more comprehensive approach because of their broad membership. For clarification, I specified my understanding of advocacy here (line 433).  4d) Public support may include financial resources but also recognition as outlined in the same paragraph. Of course, public support can also possibly also hamper the freedom of FPCs as suggested for example by Harper et al. In this paragraph, however, I want to stress the need for resources for deliberative processes and give a justification why FPCs should benefit from public support.  4e) Yes, the conclusions simplified the results of the case study. I added a sentence mentioning the challenges they faced and clarified at some point that the results draw on this single case study in order to avoid giving the impression of drawing on more comparative cases (see also my response to your comment number 3). |
| ***5.Suggestions/Revisions Required:***  To make this a viable article, I think 2-4 more cases in Germany are required for comparison. Perhaps these are already written up by other colleagues? It is almost impossible to draw useful conclusions from a case of one FPC.  Other suggestions are made in the General Comments | Unfortunately, given the novelty of the topic, there is no scientific literature by colleagues on the emergence of FPCs in Germany yet (please see also my more detailed responses to your comments 1 and 4a).  I hope this paper – still focused on one of the first FPCs in Germany, but more put into the broader context with examples from other emerging initiatives in the discussion section – provides interesting findings that can be used for comparing different cases in a next step.  Thanks a lot for your numerous comments that helped improving the paper. |
|  |  |
| *Reviewer 2* |  |
| **1. General Comment for Authors:**  This is a very nice paper, well-written and well-organized. As I noted in other review, I am not big on case studies and this is just one case study. For me, this means that causal inferences are difficult at best. The author in this case seems to recognize that, especially at the end of the paper, the value of this work is to generate hypotheses and to point the direction toward further research along certain lines. I find it very close to a finished product and don’t have a lot to critique or suggest.  This seems to be original research tied to a set of manuscripts on similar topics. Hence, ‘the readers’ who pick up this volume should have interest in the paper. As a case study, it is solid. The author seems to have followed this method appropriately and usefully. The author seems to recognize what a single case study can offer as well as its limits.  • Originality of the paper: is the research or approach of the manuscript innovative?  • Interest to the readers: is the manuscript appealing to other scholars and non-experts interested in the topic?  • Scientific soundness: are the methodology and literature review well performed? Are the conclusions supported by the results?  • Clarity of presentation: are the ideas and structure of the manuscript clear and logical?  • English language level: is the English language comprehensive and flawless? | Thanks a lot for your positive feedback on my manuscript! |
| 2. Could we have just a bit of background on Oldenburg? Just the basics, a bit more than Lower Saxony. | I added the approximate number of inhabitants (167,000), so readers have a better idea of the context (line 94). |
| 3. I realize that the paper follows on Hassanein with a sort of assumption that her work (which I greatly admire) is without question. However, with respect to 4.1 Collective action toward sustainability. It is important to not conflate democracy and sustainable initiatives. Democratic forms and processes do not necessarily lead us to sustainable outcomes. Democracy could well lead us toward disaster. This section has a tendency to blur the two variables: democratic collective action and sustainable objectives.  Having said that, just a comment: the analysis recognized 3 primary agents: civil society, business, and the state. My first thought is that only civil society has some implicit interest in democracy and will likely have to push the others toward more democratic processes. | Yes, you are right. Democratic forms and processes – and processes of direct democracy in particular – do not necessarily lead to more sustainable outcomes. I think Hassanein´s core argument is that food democracy needs collective action, not only individual decisions and actions (Hassanein, 2008, p. 290). From her perspective, sustainability seems to be the normative concept that should lead this collective action. As sustainability seems to be in line with an alternative vision of the current system of food production and consumption, I still think collective action for sustainability can be seen as an adequate operationalization of food democracy. It would have been better, however, to separate the two aspects. For example splitting this dimension into two variables: collective action and orientation towards sustainability. I inserted a short comment on this contested relationship starting in line 99 of the revised manuscript.  Please see also my response to comment number 4 by the Editors. |
| 4. the author notes that at the FIRST workshop a presentation was given by a speaker from S. Africa! It seems to me that this fact deserves a bit more comment. It suggests something (I am not sure what) about the group, level of organization prior to the first meeting, external ties, global interests…Even if the speaker is talking about the importance of the local everywhere, it still seems noteworthy that one of the speakers at this ‘local’ event came from S. Africa. | I agree. Involving a guest from South Africa in the Oldenburg case can partly be explained by the professional background of the initiator (a development NGO). Still, your comment made me think about the fact that international experts were also invited to the first networking congress. I commented on this in the discussion section 5.2 starting in line 354. |
| 5. Other discussion in this passage also suggest that the pre-formation phase had already begun to ‘harden’ the organization (subverting the ‘grassroots-ness’?), e.g., “the members informed the public about the initiative’s goals”. Were goals already set? Does this preclude the ‘next’ set of participants from input to the goals? | I think in this particular case (talking about external events members of the initiative attended), they really “informed” the public about the initiative´s goals referring to the vision the group members in the emerging phase agreed upon. Internally, it took them a while to agree on these goals. These goals were kind of set, as it took the coordinating group more than a year since the initial event to agree on a mutually shared vision for the future council. It is a very interesting question to what extent newcomers influenced the goals. The commonly agreed vision “Together for a sustainable nutrition in the region” seemed binding as a baseline. The ways in which new participants gave input to the goals at a later stage was different. For those working in the committees, these written codes did not seem that important because they were more concerned about their practical work. There were many discussions, however, on what the vision means in terms of specific criteria prior but also after the official formation of the council. When the representative body started working, all members were invited to comment on the statute that was approved with a few changes to the original version afterwards.  I included some more details on this process in the manuscript (starting in line 188) and – in line with Reviewer 1´s and the Editors´ comments that I neglected a bit the weaknesses of the initiative in the original manuscript – I generally give more details on the challenges the initiative faced in the revised version of the manuscript. |
| 6. At the end of the Results section, the author adds 2 new variables (transparency and openness) to Hassanein’s 4 variables that have informed the analysis. This is helpful but would it be possible to mix in some discussion of those two new variables in the subsequent Discussion section? The Discussion section nicely reviews the findings but would benefit from a more explicit drawing out of why and how transparency and openness were revealed in their analysis of the 4 Hassanein variables. | Yes, I agree. I inserted a couple of sentences arguing how transparency and openness revealed in the case of the FPC in the results (4.6) and the discussion section (5.6). Please see also my response to comment 2f) by Reviewer 1. |
| **7. Suggestions/Revisions Required:**  I would not insist on anything that I have noted. Of course, I think the paper might benefit from a couple of my suggestions and I would encourage the author(s) to do so. Actually, none of the suggestions would seem to involve much work. | Thanks a lot for your thoughtful comments which helped improving the original manuscript. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Editors´ comments** | **Responses and changes made to the original manuscript** |
| Comments for authors Thanks again for your article which we read with great interest. The study of citizen participation and food citizenship is a key element of food democracy, and we would be pleased to include your contribution in the special issue.  To this end, the article needs major revisions, however. The two reviewers make numerous comments and suggestions which should be carefully taken in to consideration. In addition, we think that the following comments from our side should also be taken into account when revising the paper: | Thank you.  I hope my changes to the original manuscript have adequately addressed the reviewers’ and your concerns. Due to the numerous issues to address, the word count increased when revising the manuscript, but is still beneath the limit of 8000 words. Nevertheless, I can think of shortening the paper if necessary (e.g. skipping the introduction to the pre-formation event (line 129-138). |
| 1) This paper needs to be improved in terms of structure and style. The line of argumentation seems to be interrupted numerous times, particularly in the introduction, the paragraphs are of very differing lengths, etc. See more concrete examples and suggestions below. | I reorganized different parts of the manuscript, especially the introduction and discussion section also taking into account your more detailed suggestions below. |
| 2) The introduction seems to be a ‘mixed bag’ of topics revolving around food policy councils, but without a compelling structure. Please, reorganize (see suggestions below). In particular, the research question: whether Food Policy Councils make a contribution to food democracy, should the developed in a more accessible way right from the start. | I reorganized the introduction trying to follow a clearer structure and a better flow between the paragraphs, also taking into account your more detailed suggestions below. |
| 3) ‘Food citizenship’ is a key notion, around which much of the article revolves. This notion is however not defined. Is it synonymous with citizen participation for example, as suggested in the first paragraph of the introduction?  In addition, there seems to be contradiction around the developments associated with food citizenship: On the one hand, you argue that food citizenship is diminishing (which implies that food citizenship used to be stronger); on the other hand, you argue that food used to be seen as a commodity, and due to the resulting dysfunctionalities of this view, food citizenship (i.e. the political nature of food that goes beyond the market) provides a solution. Thus, the question is what is developing in which direction? | Reorganizing the first part of the discussion, I also tried to resolve this issue here. I gave a definition of food citizenship and I tried to clarify the contradictions in my line of argumentation. Overall, I argue that the four major trends diminishing the possibilities of citizens to exercise influence on food seem to also have led to new forms of citizen participation. |
| 4) The article is based on the five dimensions of Hassanein to define food democracy and uses them as assessment criteria in the empirical study. Looking at these criteria, they do not appear compelling, and it remains unclear however why these should be the ones that define food democracy. A more elaborate and critical discussion of the Hassanein criteria would be desirable. For example, do other criteria or views on what food democracy means exist? In which ways are Hassanein’s criteria preferable? From our perspective, in particular the link Hassanein makes of food democracy with sustainability needs some justification. In which ways are both – necessarily – related? | As far as I know, Hassanein´s work is unique in the sense of suggesting concrete dimensions to operationalize the food democracy. I would be happy to learn more about other operationalisations of the concept and I am wondering if other contributions to the special issue might be considered here.  I doubt I can expand on the complex relationship between sustainability and democracy here. I think Hassanein´s main argument is that we need collective action (and not only individual action) to achieve food democracy. An orientation towards sustainability seems to be the normative concept that speaks to those criticising the current predominant way of food production and consumption. I think her argument is rather than presuming democracy leads to sustainability that we need democracy for achieving sustainability because sustainability involves conflicts over values, as outlined in line 108 onwards.  (Please see also my response to comment number 3 by Reviewer 2.) |
| 5) Methodology: You are studying one case of an FPC in Germany. What does the case stand for? Which conclusions can be drawn from this single case? Are there insights with regard to similar/different developments or findings in other FPCs in Germany? In case there exists literature or studies on other FPCs, this should be taken into account at least in the discussion of the findings of this study. See also comments of reviewer 1 on the topic. | Please see my very detailed responses to Reviewer 1´s comments number 3, 4a and 4e.  Unfortunately, there is no scientific literature on FPCs in Germany yet as it is such a recent topic, but I included more insights from other initiatives that formed during the study period in the discussion section. |
| 6) Most of the evidence presented in section 4 is purely illustrative. While this is interesting in itself, it could still be shorter (for example 4.1: the events leading to the creation of the FPC could possibly be skipped. Moreover, the details presented are all supporting Hassanein’s criteria – but were there also instances or developments that did not adhere to these? | This very striking argument is also in line with Reviewer 1´s comments concerning my neglecting of the weaknesses as regards the dimensions. I included several additional examples where the initiative was struggling with or not adhering to the criteria. I think this more nuanced presentation and discussion makes the paper much stronger.  Please see also my response to comment 2 by Reviewer 1. |
| One option for reorganizing the text might also be to merge the descriptive bits of section 4 with the respective discussion of the respective criteria of section 5, and then to use 5 for a more overarching discussion. This might involve the location of the Oldenburg example in the broader German FPC landscape; it might also provide space to elaborate the more general reflections on the role of citizen participation in representative democracies (lines 391-415), which are currently rather sketchy and appear more as an add-on. In the current form, they seem to be more suitable for an outlook, maybe to be included in the conclusions.  In the following, we provide some more specific comments: | I reorganized the text as follows:  I kept the structure of presenting the specific results of the case study in chapter 4 and discussing the findings in chapter 5, but I added subchapters in the discussion section: First, I discuss the results of the case study dimension by dimension putting them more into context by considering more examples from other emerging initiatives in Germany. Second, I elaborate a more general discussion in a subchapter called “FPCs as loci for practicing food democracy: challenges and opportunities”. |
| 15: “While FPCs have been established in the US and Canada for several decades, the formation of FPCs in Europe is a rather new development.”  This sentence marks a break in the text. Consider rephrasing, or begin a new paragraph. | I agree – I decided to begin a new paragraph (beginning in line 16). This gives the whole abstract a more compelling structure with a more general paragraph introducing the phenomenon and the research interest in the beginning and a second paragraph explaining how the research interest is pursued in this particular study. |
| 32: “While this limited involvement used to be considered the sufficient level of citizen participation, the involvement of professional organizations and interest groups were considered necessary and appropriate.”  Explain from which perspective you are talking here – who considers citizen participation ‘sufficient’ and the involvement of other groups ‘necessary’? | I reformulated this part of the introduction (see first paragraph in the revised manuscript). |
| 36: “Four dimensions have been identified as major factors for the ongoing process of diminishing food citizenship.”  Specify that you are referring to the scientific discussion here. Is this the general discourse there? | I reformulated this part of the introduction (see first paragraph in the revised manuscript). I´m referring to the scientific discourse here, demonstrated by the reference. |
| 39: “In contrast to other systems, however, the food system touches people´s daily life in a very intimate way.”  We would argue that it is also (or rather) the ubiquity of food that makes the topic important. Also unclear, which ‘other systems’ you have in mind here. For example, the health system is also affecting people´s daily life in a very intimate way (but, arguably, this system has not been colonized in the same way by corporate interest). | Yes, indeed, the ubiquity makes the topic also important. My intention was to stress the physical component of food. I skipped the first part of the sentence. |
| 53-57: These sentences belong rather to the previous paragraph. Afterwards you start a new paragraph/topic. Consider reorganizing the paragraphs. | I agree. I reorganized this part of the introduction completely. |
| 67-69: The information that Food Policy Councils are new in Europe and Germany comes very abrupt. This should be better connected to the rest of the introduction text. | I agree. I reorganized this part of the introduction completely. This information is now embedded into the fourth paragraph. |
| 70-81: It is unclear why so much emphasis is put on the Toronto Food Policy Council – other than to argue that the Council refers to the notion of food democracy. Consider skipping or shortening this paragraph. | I agree, the details about the Toronto FPC are not so relevant for my paper. Though I think it is interesting that there is a reference to food democracy. I also integrated this information into another paragraph (number four). |
| 82-84: It is unclear what the message behind the quote in the context of the article should be. Integrate this better into the introduction. | These references demonstrate that FPCs have already been discussed in terms of food citizenship. In the revised version of the manuscript, this is now integrated into paragraph number three, which generally refers to the scientific literature on FPCs. |
| 85: “This paper seeks to disentangle the several aspects that potentially make FPCs loci for practicing food democracy.” ‘The’ several aspects refers to specific aspects, but it is unclear which aspects you mean. | I reformulated this part into “a variety of aspects” because I am not referring to specific aspects here. |
| 86: “Following the demand of not only conceptualizing food as more than a commodity and people as 86 more than consumers, but to study expressions of food citizenship (Welsh & MacRae, 1998, p. 240), this study aims …”  Consider simplifying this sentence by splitting it into two (e.g. start the second part with: Along these lines, this study aims…). | I simplified the sentence by rephrasing the first part and by splitting the sentence into two sentences as you suggested. |
| 90: “As mentioned above, FPC have been acclaimed for their potential with regard to food democracy.”  This is a break in the text. Consider moving this sentence to the beginning of the paragraph, line 85. | I deleted this sentence and also the following one because this argument is already covered in the previous paragraph. |
| 92: “As the phenomenon of FPCs emerged in Germany only recently, one of the first German FPCs (FPC Oldenburg, Lower Saxony) provides an exemplary case…”  Consider distinguishing more explicitly between the research question and it implementation, i.e. the case study when you present these things. | I reformulated this sentence. |
| 197-217, 224-248 etc.: The text comes in large chunks, which is not necessarily reader-friendly. Consider improving the structure, e.g. by inserting some breaks/more paragraphs | I inserted a number of paragraphs not only in the two subsections you are pointing to but also in all other subsections of the results section to make the text more reader-friendly. Each last paragraph now contains also challenges the initiative faced as regards the specific dimension (see also my response to your comment number 6) |
| 228: “Interview 2”; 243: “internal meeting 23” etc.: Without any additional explanation, the coding of interviews, meetings and other data is not understandable. Suggestion to skip the numbers for the sake of the article (e.g. with formulations such as ‘as one interviewees said’). | I would prefer keeping the numbers for the sake of transparency. In the methods sections, I introduce the data set so it should be clear that I refer to the interviews and protocols collected in this study.  If it is important for you to delete the numbers in the manuscript, however, I would agree with your suggestion. |
| 210: CO2 emissions – number not as exponent | Changed into “CO2 emissions”. |
| References: Some titles are incomplete, e.g. Carlson et al., Sussman/Bassarab. | I added additional information to the references. |