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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, there have been nice improvements to the paper since the last submission. However, there are additional revisions required regarding grammar, scientific verbiage, and sentence structure that are required before the paper should be accepted. I have attempted to outline a few main areas to revise.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Cardiometabolic should be one word or hyphenated.
2. In the results section of the abstract, please insert “There were significant correlations between...”
3. Abstract conclusions: split the last sentence into 2 or more sentences for clarity and to avoid a run on sentence.
4. Introduction: the first sentence seems very short and does not seem to belong. Either elaborate on that point with additional text to round out the paragraph or remove the sentence and insert in a more appropriate place in the introduction.
5. Introduction: Please add citation for the second sentence in the introduction.
6. Introduction: The use of a colon is not appropriate here. Please remove the colon and revise the sentence.
7. Introduction: Do not capitalize “indicators” in the sentence that includes reference 3.
8. Please revise the final sentence in the introduction to read “compare the WHtR to the 2007...”
9. Methods: Remove the commas after November and April
10. Please be consistent with the use of either gender or sex throughout document.
11. Third sentence in Methods: Please remove the term “Afro American” and use “African American”
12. Fourth sentence in methods: please revise “All the patients were classified according to Tanner staging as non-pubertal (B1P1 in girls and G1P1 in boys).”
13. Fifth sentence: remove “the” before “puberty”.
14. Please note (n=XX) how many children were excluded from study based on exclusion criteria listed.
15. Results: is “non-obese” an acceptable clinical term? Would “normal weight” be appropriate?

16. Results: if a correlation coefficient (r) is presented, there is no need for a r-squared value as well.

17. Discussion: the first paragraph seems a bit out of place and hangs there with no connection to the next section. Please revise to tie the first 2 paragraphs together.

18. Discussion: the concept of nutritional state was introduced here but was not mentioned previously in the manuscript. This may be a bit confusing for the reader to switch focus here so late in the paper. Please either introduce it in the introduction or remove it from the discussion.

19. Page 8, last paragraph: since this study is cross-sectional, please do not use language that infers prospective analyses. Please use the term “elevated LDL” instead of “LDL increase”.

20. Please use a term alternative to “mixed racial subjects”.

21. Page 9 second paragraph: this sentence needs to be revised. It uses language that is too casual for a scientific manuscript.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.