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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the second revision of our manuscript entitled, “Dilemma between health and environmental motives when purchasing animal food products: sociodemographic and nutritional characteristics of consumers” (PUBH-D-16-02580R1), originally submitted on August 24th 2016 and February 10th 2016 for a first review.

We have examined and taken into account all comments and include point-by-point responses to all comments and issues raised. Changes in the final manuscript appear highlighted yellow. We thank the reviewers for their comments.

The material used in this study is original and has not been either published or submitted for publication elsewhere. We confirm that the paper has been read and approved by all authors. There is no conflict of interest. No honoraria, grant awards or other forms of payment had been received by anyone in order to produce the manuscript.

We thank you for your continued consideration of this manuscript and will be happy to provide any additional information that might be needed.
Sincerely yours,

Sandrine Péneau

Reviewer #1: Reviewer report:

The authors addressed all reviewer comments in an appropriate and relevant way. There are only a few minor points to improve clarity.

In general authors added 5 recent papers, I was wondering if with this addition the comment of reviewer 2 to add hypothesis to the paper could have been addressed? do the new papers already give indication for hypothesis. If not, introduction is appropriate but please evaluate.

>>> We confirm that papers that have been added do not focus on this specific topic and therefore do not allow us to add hypothesis.

Food choice motives were assessed in 2013 but socio demographics were used from the latest available data. But is it not better to choose the data closest to food choice motives? Please clarify what was the date of demographic data and why was this chosen?

>>> We have used sociodemographic data that were the closest from the food choice questionnaire (September 2013). There was indeed a mistake in the text. Thank you for pointing it out. (line 163)

Line 201: it is still not clear what is the difference between mPNNS-GS and the PNNS-GS. I guess it excludes only the activity component but that is difficult to find out from the paragraph. This can be improved.

>>> It is correct that it excludes the physical activity component only. We have now added this information in the sentence (line 200)

Table 2 educational level: a p-value is missing for meat?

>>> Thank you for pointing out this omission. Missing p value has been added.(table 2)
Related to the answer about confounding factors (reviewer 1), it could be informative to add a figure to show how much variance was explained with the models in Table 4 (Nagelkercke)

>>> Explained variance ($R^2$) is indeed an interesting information. We added these values at the bottom of the table. (Table 4)