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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor:

We appreciate the reviewer’s comments about our manuscript entitled: "Smoking and prostate cancer: a life course analysis ", as well as, the opportunity to improve it. Please find attached a point-by-point response to this new comment. In the new manuscript version the changes are indicated in red.

Sincerely

Dr. Luisa Torres-Sánchez
Corresponding author

Shama Virani, PhD (Reviewer 2):

1.- Although I understand the purpose of Table 2, the descriptive findings from Table 2 are not discussed in the context of "population exposure from which the cases arose". It's still unclear how these descriptive contributed to your understanding of smoking and prostate cancer in a way that Table 3 did not. Perhaps a few sentences in the discussion of the importance of the findings from Table 2 can clarify this.
R: Thank you for pointing this out. In the discussion section (page 20, lines 368-375), we included the following statement “There is no information available about the distribution of smoking patterns A and B in the general population. Nevertheless, available data suggest that most of ever-smoking Mexican males (76.4%) in urban areas have a low smoking intensity habit (<11 cigarettes/day) [32]. This figure is consistent with our results, where most of the smoking controls (88.9%) experienced a life-course Pattern A, characterized by a median of 4 cigarettes/day and 17 years old at smoking onset; only a small fraction of smoking controls (11.1%) were characterized as smoking pattern B, with a median of 17.9 cigarettes/day.”

Additional corrections:

In abstract section there was duplicated information. We eliminated (12.2%) in line 36.