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Dear Professor Engler-Stringer,

Thank you very much for your letter of June 19, 2019, regarding our manuscript (NUTJ-D-19-00075R1) and including the comments of the reviewer. I am sending herewith two copies of our revised manuscript (highlighted and not highlighted). This manuscript has been revised as a Research article.

Before revision, our manuscript has been carefully reviewed by an experienced editor whose first language is English, and who specializes in editing papers written by physicians and scientists whose native language is not English. We are submitting the certificate in the supplemental material.

Our incorporation of the suggested changes is described below.

Reviewer #1: Hello, Interesting paper. it needs more improvement based on the comments I provide. Good luck.

We appreciate and thank you for your encouraging evaluation. Your suggestions are appropriate and important and helped us to improve our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript in accordance with your recommendations. Our responses to your suggestions are shown below.
Title

# Why you study the association between the prevalence of restaurant and stroke instead of the type of food and stroke?

We appreciate your important suggestion. As you suggest, we would prefer to directly clarify the relationship between the type of food consumed and stroke. However, accurate analysis of individual foods consumed was not possible because no nationwide database of individual food consumption is available. Thus, we analyzed restaurant prevalence as a proxy for food preferences.

Background

# It is better to add any stats about the rate of stoke in Japan generally and specifically in the area where you collect the data!

We appreciate your important suggestion. In response, we added the following sentences in paragraph 1 of the Background section.

(page 4, lines 1–3 in the highlighted manuscript)

Methods

# According to describing “A correlation coefficient (r) >0.7 was considered to denote highly correlated, between 0.5 and 0.7 to denote moderately correlated, between 0.3 and 0.5 to denote poorly correlated, and <0.3 to denote no correlation.”, why you are classified the correlation into three or four groups? you should explain this why because it is un-usal to read like this!

We appreciate your important suggestion. We initially classified correlations according to r value to make the results easier to understand. However, as you suggest, this approach may be confusing. We have removed the classification according to r value and now evaluate correlations with pure r values. In response to your suggestion, we changed the following sentences.

(page 6, lines 13–16 in the highlighted manuscript)

(page 7, line 12 in the highlighted manuscript)

Discussion

# Why accurate analysis of individuals’ diet is impossible?
We appreciate this important question. We agree that we need to add an explanation of the reason accurate analysis of diet was not possible. We have added the following sentences to the text.

(page 8, lines 8–9 in the highlighted manuscript)

# According to French or Italian ··· the Mediterranean diet, which is generally considered a model of a healthy diet, although there is some controversy concerning this. How?

Thank you for this important question. We acknowledge that this was a confusing sentence and have deleted it.

# It is better to discuss these in more details like write them by percentage according to “That study also suggested that wealthy older individuals eat less fast food than poor younger individuals.

We appreciate your relevant suggestion. Reference 18 study was widely reported in the popular press in the US because the results were in opposition to the general opinion and expectations. Because it is not clear how the relationship between socioeconomic status and fast food consumption in the US relates to the present study, we have deleted the sentences including Reference 18.

We believe the manuscript has been adequately improved and hope it will now be accepted for publication in Nutrition Journal.

Best regards,

Sincerely yours,

Kosuke Matsuzono, MD, PhD

Division of Neurology, Department of Internal Medicine, Jichi Medical University School of Medicine, Yakushiji 3311-1, Shimotsuke, Tochigi, 329-0498, Japan
E-mail: kmatsuzono51@jichi.ac.jp