



Inserm



INRA  
SCIENCE & IMPACT

le cnam



Editor, Pr Daoxin Yin,  
The British Medical Journal  
January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2018

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed **the revised version** of our manuscript **BMJ.2017.040538.R2** titled **'Consumption of ultra-processed foods and cancer risk: results from the NutriNet-Santé prospective cohort'**.

We would like to sincerely thank you and the Editorial team for provisionally accepting our article, and we would like to thank the Editors and Reviewers again for their valuable comments which helped us improve the scientific quality of this paper, and made it suitable for publication in the BMJ. The remaining comments from the Editors have been taken into account, as detailed below in our point-by-point responses.

We hope that these final modifications adequately address the Editor's comments and that our paper is now suitable for publication. We thank you again for your consideration of our work.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Bernard Srour, PharmD  
(Corresponding author)

Sorbonne Paris Cité, Epidemiology and Statistics Research Center, Nutritional Epidemiology Research Team (EREN), Inserm U1153; Inra U1125; Cnam; Paris 13, 7 and 5 Universities,  
SMBH Paris 13, 74, rue Marcel Cachin, 93017 Bobigny Cedex, France  
Tel: +33.148.388.968 ; Fax: +33.148.388.931 ; e-mail: [b.srou@eren.smbh.univ-paris13.fr](mailto:b.srou@eren.smbh.univ-paris13.fr)

**Point-by-point responses:**

Comments :

1. Please double check the page numbers in your response letter, there are many miss-matches between the letter and the text of the manuscript.

→We apologize for this inconvenience. In fact, these miss-matches occurred after we revised the manuscript upon the Editor's request on December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017 (the later were only formatting modifications, but they led to a shift in page numbers). The page numbers in our response letter of the second review became mismatching with the new revised manuscript. We have carefully updated page numbers in the revised version of the response letter (enclosed). Updated page numbers are now marked in red.

2. Please double check the denoting numbers of model 2 and 3 in the response letter and compare them with the footnote of table 2 and the text.

→We apologize for this mistake. This has been modified and marked in red in the revised version of the response letter, which is now in line with the footnote to table 2 and the text of the manuscript.

Please note that we have added in the contributorship statement paragraph (page 27) of the manuscript that Fiolet T. and Srour B. have equally contributed to this work (this was previously mentioned in the Title page only). This is the only modification made in the Manuscript file.

\*\*\*\*\*END\*\*\*\*\*