Review of Grant Proposal D. Rosenberg:

**Center and Periphery—The ‘in-site’ Story: Tracking Intra-Site Culinary Variability at Tel Tsaf (ca. 5,200–4,700 cal BC)**

Six documents have been submitted and will be reviewed here.

General comments: the spelling was changed to American but can be adjusted to British if the author wishes. In the project description, a header includes the name of the primary investigator with his affiliation and email address. In the other documents, the header consists of just the PI's name and the project's title.

1. *Abstract*

The abstract includes all significant aspects of the scientific background and explains the importance of the project. It mentions the procedures which will be used and which finally should achieve the results. The abstract accurately reflects the content without going too deeply into the subject. No major changes are requested in the abstract.

1. *Project Description*

The project description is well-structured, beginning with the scientific background (I), which is divided into a general introduction (I.A) and a site-specific description (I.B). The middle part describes the expectations of the project (II). This is also divided into two parts (II.A and II.B); IIA deals with the research objectives, explaining their necessity and importance in studying the food culture during the Chalcolithic period and mainly focusing on Tel Tsaf. Part IIB dwells on the expected significance of the project. The last and most important part (III) starts with the working hypothesis (II.A) and outlines and explains the research's methods. This part is very detailed, including the methods and the researchers who will participate in the endeavor.

Several points need to be addressed in this part: the text has been edited to make it flow easier by eliminating or substituting heavy wording and/or unclear or complicated words. The subject is, per se, intricate, so the text should not be convoluted but easy and straightforward for a better understanding.

The many references are appropriate and updated to the most recent ones and show that the author has a firm knowledge of the subject.

The bibliography was checked and edited. It needs another round of editing and probably formatting.

1. *Schedule*

The graph is unclear; I suggest a revision as follows: dividing the project into years with the various tasks that will be undertaken in that year. This division would also increase the font, making reading easier. A graph can be used but needs to be more precise than the present one.

1. *Title and Keywords*

In my opinion, the word 'Mediterranean Diet' should be included in the title. The keywords are adequate, but two have been added.

1. *Budget Justification*

This part is written clearly. I have added bullets to clarify the various points. In addition, I think the budget could be shown in a table. As in the text, it should be divided by years and categories. The budget is written in very general terms. Are precise sums not necessary?

1. *Bibliography*

The edited and corrected bibliography was imported from the project description. Another round of fine-tuning is advisable.