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Author's response to reviews: see over
“Reducing our environmental footprint and improving our health: greenhouse gas emission and land use of usual diet and mortality in the EPIC-NL cohort.”

We thank the reviewer for his valuable additional comments on our paper. We are glad that all other adaptations to the text based on his previous suggestions were considered ‘a very good job’. See below our answer (A) to the comment of the reviewer (Q). In the revised manuscript, the changes are highlighted in red (directly in the text using a red font).

**Reviewer #1:**

*Discretionary revisions*

Q1: Nevertheless, to improve the information content of the Abstract, suggest changing the following part:

Conclusions: Within this Dutch cohort, the environmental impact of usual diet was not associated with mortality risk. This indicates that an environmental friendlier diet is not necessarily a healthier diet, and the other way around.....

To similar wording to what is in the final Conclusions in the main manuscript eg,: Conclusions: Within the dietary range of this population-based Dutch cohort, there were no significant associations between overall daily dietary-derived GHGE and land use and mortality. However, a modelled reduction of 35 grams/day of meat and replacement with other foods resulted in lower GHGE and land use as well as decreased all-cause mortality risk. Replacing meat by vegetables, fruit-nuts-seeds, pasta-rice-couscous was particularly beneficial for protecting health and the environment.

I suspect that this change is important in that the conclusions as they stand currently can be easily mis-interpreted – since the general pattern is that healthier diets are more environmentally friendly. Indeed, within the dietary range of this cohort – the finding of no statistically significant relationship is not that surprising. It is somewhat trivial to do the “not necessarily” bit – as it is obvious that this is a complex issue with many caveats (eg, air freighted fruit is good for health but is problematic for the environment). What matters for the conclusion is the general pattern and not the exceptions.

A1: We agree with the reviewer that the conclusion section of the abstract did not reflect the more elaborate version from the final conclusion section at the end of the manuscript. We have changed the final phrasing of the conclusion section to reflect this.