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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study on health behaviors among a cross-sectional sample of youth in the US. The introduction and methods are thoroughly explained; however, some points may need to be expanded upon. For the discussion section, suggest avoiding making inferences as this is a cross-sectional study.

Methods:

Line 139 and 141: written as Q69 the as Q 89

Line 163: stated missing data was not imputed. Suggest adding reason why such as data not missing at random/completely at random

1. Used BMI percentile and not BMI z-score what was the rationale?

2. Consider justifying which questions on the survey were targeted to measure healthy versus unhealthy food intake.

Results:

Lines 192-197: This section was confusing having results of lower and high odds for many covariates in one sentence. Consider separating to sex and BMI then ethnicity and race as a separate sentence.

Discussion section:

1. The strengths of the study are not addressed.
2. In the sentence for limitations "before results can be generalized" is not appropriate since this is a cross-sectional study measuring specific population at one point in time, however, may be important to follow-up with a longitudinal study.

3. Suggest avoiding use of "directly associated" terminology and consider for this sample to be more or less likely compared to the referent group.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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