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Reviewer’s report:

1. Abstract. The conclusion should be rewritten according to main study results.

2. The use of one 24 hour recall to explore associations in nutritional studies is mistaken as the one day diet may not represent usual intake (or expenditure). It may be true that day-to-day diet in this population be stable as authors mention in Discussion. However, some comment on the potential bias and its influence on study results should be mention as well (eg non-differential biasing the HR toward the null).

3. It is suggested a review of the manuscript (eg, line 124 “in relationship to each…”, should be changed “in relation to …”

4. Figure 1 should be removed as it does not add new information with respect to table 3.

5. Sentence in line 143-144 is wrong. Information for Grain is presented in table 3. Despite non-significant, information for animal-derived foods should be included in that table.

6. Table 2 present a lot of data and it is somehow confusing with no clear purposes. Thus, table 2 could be removed: Information on characteristics could be placed in the text or using a more succinct table.

7. It is not clear why to focus on food expenditure instead of food intake also collected in 24 hour recalls. Since not all purchased foods are eaten and information on food and nutrient intake are available, why information on food expenditure was preferred? Was fruit and vegetable intake also related to better survival?

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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