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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper about the development and relative validation of an interviewed-administered FFQ for a specific population (i.e., French Canadian adolescent and young adult survivors of acute lymphoblastic leukemia). On overall, the paper is clear and well written and the reviewer has the following comments:

Table 1: Please could you clarify the units for white bread, rice and whole-grain bread?

Lines 110-111: The reviewer is confused as to what n=80 refers to. Did the 80 participants for the validity testing completed FFQ and 3-DFR at phase I or II; or the phase did not matter as long as at least one FFQ and at least 3-DFR were completed?

Lines 208-210: The reviewer understands that ICCs were calculated with crude data, instead of energy-adjusted data, due to the small sample size (n=29) in the reproducibility testing. However, for the usual reader, this rationale may not be obvious. Please could you add a sentence explaining this rationale for clarity?

Line 228: Does recall rate mean response rate?

Lines 260-261: Minor typo, it should be CHO instead of glucose.

Table 3 (Footnote 1): This is either a typo or a misunderstanding of how the difference % should be calculated. It should be calculated as follows (at the individual level first): (Daily intake as per FFQ - Daily intake as per 3-FDR) / (Daily intake as per 3-DFR) * 100. Then from that result, the authors can calculate medians and IQRs for each nutrient. Please make changes accordingly on Tables 3, 5 and in the supplementary materials.

Figure 1: Minor typo in the box for "Reproducibility of FFQ", it should be n=29 instead of n=58.

Supplementary tables 1-8: Minor typo in footnotes, it should be median (IQR) instead of means ± SD.
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