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Dear Editor,

I am pleased to submit revised version of manuscript 1888363717107339 (BMC Cancer: 2794758971158552) to *BMC Cancer*.

We have worked through the details in the comments of the *Reviewer #1*, and revised the paper accordingly, and addressed the each point made by *Reviewer #1* below:

*Reviewer #1:*

**Question 1:** There is however exception in page 10 (line12) where it is written: "Fatty acid profile in serum only reflects acute dietary intake over the past few days". This is wrong. Thus this part of the sentence should be deleted.

 **Response:** As suggested, we have deleted the part of sentence “Fatty acid profile in serum only reflects acute dietary intake over the past few days”(line 16-17 in page 10)

**Question 2:** They could just say that: "Fatty acid profile in serum phospholipids may be an untypical representative of ...". The rest of the sentence is OK. This is a critical issue which must be corrected.

 **Response:** Done (line 18-19, page 10).

**Question 3:** Also corrections in page 13 (line 17) ["Ratio of n-3/n-6 PUFA in vivo influenced by dietary ration might be an independent predictive factor used for clinical diagnosis of BC"] are quite naive. Obviously such a weak association cannot be used for any clinical diagnosis. This should be deleted.

 **Response:** As suggested, we have deleted the sentence (line 18-19 in page 13).

Yours sincerely,

Duo Li