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Reviewer's report:

Overall:

The authors should be commended on a very good manuscript that addresses the validation of a self-administered FFQ in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada. The question posed by the authors is relevant and well defined, the methods are appropriate and well described, and sufficient details are provided to replicate the work. The data appear sound and the discussion and conclusions balanced and supported by the data. The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found and the writing is excellent.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

None

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Objective 3 under Background has been done by other investigators in the past.
2. Footnotes are not provided in numerical order in the text
3. Can the authors provide examples of the “1,000 additional sources of data” used by ESHA?
4. Why did the authors only use two 24-hr recalls? The authors should discuss how their findings may have been different had they used more 24-hr recalls.
5. What is the population size of NL? Do the study participants reflect members of the population in terms of measured characteristics?
6. In the statistical analysis section, how often were foods not exactly matched? The authors should provide examples of such items and/or provide this information in a Supplement.
7. There were nearly 4 times as many women as men in the study. How does this affect interpretation of the results? Also, the authors should comment on potential reasons for gender differences in their results.
8. The Bland-Altman plot should be provided if not in the manuscript, then in Supplemental Material, if possible.
9. How does the ‘moderate relative validity’ of their FFQ impact interpretation of
future diet-disease studies that use the FFQ?

Discretionary Revisions:

None

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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