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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
The question is new and very much in need of answering. As the authors clearly lay out, there is much mythology about HFCS that has never been adequately tested. The authors propose a question of great interest and value in addressing: did availability of fructose increase between 1970 and 2009 sufficiently to justify allegations that it is uniquely responsible for simultaneous increases in obesity rates?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
Yes, the methods are appropriate and well thought out, well described and provide sufficient details for replication. My only concern is that it doesn’t appear possible to verify the calculations in Tables 1 and 2, since they rely on AUC data that are not available in the paper.
I would consider this a discretionary revision.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
Yes, they are.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes, it does.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion and conclusions are well balanced, considering both supportive and unsupportive literature. I found the discussion and conclusions to employ more common sense and perspective than is commonly applied to this subject. Data adequately support the authors’ conclusions.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes, they do.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is refreshingly clear, concise, objective and authoritative.
Please make your report as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) – None
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) – None
- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore) – See point #2, above

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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