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**Reviewer's report:**

Minor revisions
The revised text is much clearer than earlier versions. I would suggest that the authors consider the following suggestions:

Page 7, line 9: "beverage consumption", rather than "beverages consumption".

Page 7, lines 10-12: I am still unsure about the reference group of children: non-consumers with BMI and/or WC within the normal range. I could understand that the odds ratio of other consumer groups be assessed in reference to the group of non-consumers, including overweight or obese non-consumers. It does not seem to make sense using a reference group (non-consumers) including only non-overweight or nonobese children (unless there truly were no overweight or obese children in that group). The odds ratio of other groups should be computed in reference to the frequency of overweight or obesity in the non consumer group. If overweight or obese non consumers are excluded as the text suggests, then we are not really dealing with a comparison of consumers versus non-consumers. This is an important point that could cast doubt on the validity of the results. Perhaps the text is not describing what was actually done. What should have been done is a comparison of consumers (including overweight and obese) versus other consumption groups.

Page 7, line 18: Delete "two".

Page 7, line 21: "the highest category of sugar-added beverage intake", rather than "the highest category of sugar-added beverages".

Page 8, lines 9-10: same problem as above regarding the reference group.

Page 9, first sentence: A reference should be provided.

Table 1: I still don't understand why bottom of page notes 1 and 2 mention "Chi-square test (X²)" and "Analysis of variance", since there are no statistical results given in the table.

Table 1 gives Mean and SD whereas table 2 gives Mean and SE. This inconsistency should be amended.

Table 2: n should be given for all groups.
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