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Author’s response to reviews:

To whom it may concern,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their time and thoughtful review of our study. Below we have detailed, point by point, all of the changes we made to the study.

Reviewer 1: we accepted the suggestion to further discuss the implications of the small differences between occupational and environmental exposures, as exhibited by the study on Thai mothers. We expanded our discussion by adding a paragraph on this. We also expanded on the fact that regulatory agencies have not addressed these high exposure levels.

Minor comments: we spelled out GBH as suggested, expanded on the differences between the IARC and EFSA/EPA assessments in the introduction, made sure to convert any measurements of ppb or ppm to µg/L, and added units where suggested.
Reviewer 2: in the 5th paragraph of the conclusion we expanded our discussion of the merits of ELISA compared to different types of mass spectrometry and discussed the limitations of comparing measurements taken with different methods. We cited the poster that reviewer 2 suggested in this discussion.

We went through each study and noted the studies that specify that their average glyphosate level was adjusted for creatinine. We discussed this lack of consistent adjustment in the discussion, explaining how this might add to variability in the data.

We included the year of measurement for all studies that reported them and included a suggestion to monitor levels of inert ingredients in GBHs as well.

As mentioned above, we expended on our discussion of the small difference between occupational and general population glyphosate levels.

We did not include the suggested study on bioaccumulation of glyphosate in rodents because we were unable to find the poster to which the reviewer refers. If you have the correct link to the poster, we will be happy to add it to the references and comment on it in the discussion.

Reviewer 3: we made sure that the sample size was included for all studies and included drinks as a potential source of glyphosate exposure, per reviewer’s suggestions.

We would again like to thank the reviewers for their suggestions and attention to our work.

Very Respectfully,

Gillezeau et al.