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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an impressive study in terms of the sample size, longitudinal design and data collection.

In the background section please include a rationale for testing every 12 to 18 months. Please add in more executive function studies to the background section.

Perhaps re-order background section so the second paragraph introducing the CogBIAS study is towards the end.

I like it how a biopsychosocial framework is considered.

Include background research to support your hypothesis of increasing impulsivity. This could relate to the Shulman et al dual system model or Crone &amp; Dahl (2016) Understanding adolescence as a period of social-affective engagement and goal flexibility. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 13, 636-650.

It is good that data demographics of participants who remained in the study were compared with participants who dropped out.

Include more rationale including food / eating measures in the study.

There is some evidence that pubertal development may influence brain development and executive functions. This should be briefly mentioned in the discussion.
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.
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Quality of written English
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