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Abstract

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Line 3: Delete ‘are’.
2. Results: Include the p-values from the multivariate analysis where appropriate.

Discretionary Revisions

3. Methods: Suggest replacing ‘Raw and adjusted odds ratios…’ with a sentence about the statistics used for comparison of supplement use etc. e.g. Using univariate and multivariate analysis we examined…….’
4. Results: Suggest deleting ‘but the results were attenuated……’
5. Conclusion: Suggest replacing ‘friends and family’ with ‘public’.

Minor Essential Revisions

Tables 3 and 4 suggest putting in the comparison group (on which OR is based) in a footnote and in the methods section.

One final comment, in the methods section it states that the participants were matched on age and sex in the initial studies at Tufts and UC Davis. However, in this analysis 60 participants have missing data for sex (n for supplement use=637, n for sex=577). Please include the explanation for this in the methods section.
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