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Dear Editor,

Thank you for your e-mail of 8 February 2014 informing us about the reassessment of our manuscript “High coffee consumption and different brewing methods in relation to postmenopausal endometrial cancer risk in the Norwegian Women and Cancer Study: a population-based prospective study” by Gavrilyuk et al. We are including our point-by-point replies (in italics) to the editorial comments (in bold) here below:

1. Please remove supplementary files for the main manuscript file, and upload them as additional files.

We apologize for the confusion regarding the supplementary tables. We have uploaded them separately as additional files as requested, and we further confirm that our revised manuscript conforms to the author instructions of BMC Women’s Health.

2. Please note that all authors must fulfill the ICMJE criteria for authorship (http://www.icmje.org/roles_a.html). Currently, author GS is listed as contributing solely to the revision of the manuscript, which does not meet these criteria. Please clarify the role of this author, and if necessary, remove from the list of authors and mention in the Acknowledgements section.

We apologize for the incomplete information about the contribution of author Guri Skeie. Dr Skeie is one of the leading nutritionists in our research group and has helped with the planning of statistical analysis and revised the manuscript. The contribution of this author has been amended in the revised version of the manuscript (page 21, highlighted in yellow).

As an additional note, we have included alternative version of Table 2 (with diabetes) and uploaded it as additional file. Please let us know which of the versions of this table is preferred. Unfortunately, we could not get clear answer before this resubmission (please see email correspondence below).

We look forward to receiving your final decision and thank you again for considering this revised version.

On behalf of the authors,

Yours sincerely,

Oxana Gavrilyuk, MD, PhD candidate
Department of Community Medicine
The Faculty of Health Science
The Arctic University of Norway
Email correspondence regarding the Table 2:

From: Professional Standards Editing [pse@professionalstandardsediting.com]  
Sent: 3 March 2014, 21:54  
To: BMCSeriesEditorial  
Copy: Gavrilyuk Oxana A.  
Subject: Re: FW: MS: 1490216512111449

Dear Ruth,

Thank you very much for your e-mail below in response to our questions regarding the manuscript number 1490216512111449: High coffee consumption and different brewing methods in relation to postmenopausal endometrial cancer risk in the Norwegian Women and Cancer Study: a population-based prospective study by Oxana Gavrilyuk, Tonje Braaten, Guri Skeie, Elisabete Weiderpass, Vanessa Dumeaux and Eiliv Lund (submitted for publication in BMC Women's Health).

I am afraid that perhaps we did not make our question very clear. Indeed, our question was regarding the Table 2 (not the Supplementary Table 2), as we had uploaded two different versions of this table with the revision submitted on 1 February 2014. One of the reviewers had brought up the question of diabetes, and suggested showing results stratified by diabetes status. In response to this we created an alternate version of Table 2 for the reviewers which included stratification by diabetes status.

Therefore TWO versions of Table 2 were submitted for the reviewers' consideration, and we asked them to choose which they preferred for publication: 1) the original version of the Table 2, which was included in the revised manuscript file, and 2) an alternate version of Table 2 that INCLUDED information on diabetes (please see that version attached).

This remains the issue that is unclear to us: which of the two versions did the reviewers feel was the most appropriate. Might you have the answer to this question? As soon as we know this we will proceed immediately with the resubmission.

We thank you very much for your time an attention to this matter, and look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Trudy Perdrix-Thoma and Oxana Gavrilyuk

From: BMCSeriesEditorial  
Sent: 27 February 2014 17:50  
To: 'pse@professionalstandardsediting.com'  
Cc: 'oxana.gavrilyuk@uit.no'  
Subject: MS: 1490216512111449

MS: 1490216512111449  
Research article  
High coffee consumption and different brewing methods in relation to postmenopausal endometrial cancer risk in the Norwegian Women and Cancer Study: a population-based
prospective study
Oxana Gavrilyuk, Tonje Braaten, Guri Skeie, Elisabete Weiderpass, Vanessa Dumeaux and Eiliv Lund
BMC Women's Health (Section: Gynecology, gynecological disease, and reproductive health)

Dear Trudy and Dr Gavrilyuk,

Thank you for your call, please do accept my apologies for my delayed response to your query.

The editor has asked that Supplementary tables 1 and 2 be re-uploaded as additional files. Tables 1-4 should remain in the main manuscript document. The manuscript which has been assessed and to which these editorial comments refer is the revised submission which was uploaded on the 1st Feb 2014.

I hope this fully answers your questions, however if you do have any further concerns or need any assistance please do contact us again and we will be happy to help.

Kind regards,
Ruth Baker
Senior Editorial Operations Coordinator

BioMed Central
Floor 6, 236 Gray's Inn Road
London, WC1X 8HB