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Q1- I asked for the correlation of DDE levels with estimated PUFAs intake and this was not provided.

The authors provide distributions graphs of DDE but still no correlation between DDE concentration and PUFA intake.

Q2- I suggested to look at associations between PUFAs intake and child neurodevelopment scores (association that is the focus of the manuscript) according to levels of DDE: they propose a table presenting the association between DDE and child neurodevelopment scores, stratified for PUFAs levels; this is not the right one.

As an answer, the authors propose the same results as already proposed after the last review - that is associations between DDE and neurodevelopmental scores stratified for PUFAs estimated intake - stating that « our main interest from the beginning was to explore whether neurodevelopment and DDE serum levels associations may be modified by PUFA intake »! I understand their interest, however the title of the present manuscript is: «PUFA and child neurodevelopment among a population exposed to DDT: a cohort study», implying that the focus in on PUFA and that they would study a possible modification of PUFA-Child neurodevelopment by DDT levels, not the reverse…

Q3- I asked for more details on the validity of the food frequency questionnaire to estimate PUFAs intake and questioned the fact that measures of FFQ validity for estimating polyunsaturated fat were not reassuring.

I thank the authors for providing the original manuscript of this validation study. I notice on page 139 of this publication, the following statement: « Nutrients like polyunsaturated fat,…..were not well estimated by the FFQ, although the reproducibility data for these nutrients was not bad. ». No discussion if provided on this problem, the authors keep presenting data on reproducibility, not mentioning the weakness of validity data that, in turn, weaken their conclusions.
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