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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the second revision of our manuscript entitled, “Association between time perspective and organic food consumption in a large sample of adult” (Manuscript Number: NUTJ-D-17-00183), originally submitted on June 19th 2017.

We have taken into account the comments and include point-by-point responses. Changes in the final manuscript have been colored in red. We thank the reviewers for their comments.

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,
Marc Bénard

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

1) Line 117: I do not understand how the authors reached the lower and upper cutoff values for identifying under- and over-reporters of energy intake (EI) (i.e., 0.35 and 1.93, respectively). Are these values for the ratio of energy intake (EI) to basal metabolic rate (BMR)? Alternatively, are these for the ratio of EI to estimated energy requirement (EER)? For the former, the lower and upper cutoff values should be 1.10 and 2.19, respectively, as shown in the following table (see Table 8 in ref 26). For the latter, you should indicate that you used the EI:EER procedure (rather than Goldberg cutoff) with an appropriate reference. In any case, I strongly recommend that the authors should clearly indicate the equations for cutoff values as well as the values of CV used during the calculation, because the cutoff values used (0.35 and 1.93) seem strange for both cases.

2) Line 113: “using Schofield’s equations [25]” should be replaced by “using Goldberg cutoff [26]” or “against estimated energy requirement”.

3) Line 113-114: The authors should clearly indicate that BMR was calculated using Schofield’s equations.

4) Line 114-117: As mentioned above, I do not understand these sentences. What is energy requirement and how was this variable calculated?

5) Line 117: I do not think the citation 26 is correct in this context.

>> The methodology used to identify under- and over-reporters has been clarified. The ratio of energy intake to estimated energy requirement (1.55 x BMR) has been used. The cutoffs values (0.35 and 1.93) correspond to 1st and 99th percentiles of the EI:EER ratio of a previous food frequency questionnaire used in the Nutrinet-Santé cohort. The organic food frequency questionnaire (Org-FFQ) was developed based on this FFQ (Baudry J. et al, Contribution of Organic Food to the Diet in a Large Sample of French Adults (the NutriNet-Santé Cohort Study), 2015). For each food item, except those that do not exist in organic form (i.e., water and sweetener products) a 5-point ordinal scale ranging from “never” to “always” was used to determine the proportion of intake that was of organic origin. The reproducibility and relative validity of this FFQ were previously tested against 24-hour dietary records (DRs) and acceptable reproducibility and relative validity were observed (Kesse-Guyot E. et al., Relative validity and reproducibility of a food frequency questionnaire designed for French adults, 2010). Cutoffs values were chosen on this FFQ since the population that completed the questionnaire was larger and less selected than the one that completed the Org-FFQ.

In the text:

“Participants with unlikely estimates of energy intake were identified as under- and over-reporting participants against estimated energy requirement. Basal metabolic rate (BMR) was calculated according to age, gender, weight and height using Schofield’s equations. The ratio
between energy intake and estimated energy requirement (physical activity level x BMR, with
physical activity level set by default at 1.55) was calculated and individuals with ratios below the
1st percentile (0.35) or above the 99th percentile (1.93) were excluded. These cutoffs were
calculated on the validated FFQ for usual dietary intake used in the NutriNet-Santé cohort
(Kesse-Guyot E. et al, 2010).