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**Reviewer’s report:**

This paper concerns an interesting topic, and is generally well-written.

My comments are:

Page 3, lines 10-24: Please specify whether these numbers on obesity prevalence are in American children, or global estimates?

Page 3, line 20: When and where is the "overall obesity prevalence" on 17%?

Page 3, line 35: Is the decline in SSB consumption observed in the US, or in other countries as well?

Page 4, line 9: When was this prior review conducted/published?

Background section: I think the authors need to make it more clear why this review is important, and what it adds to the current knowledge. In addition, it should be more clear what the aims of this review are.

Page 4, line 58: What do the authors mean with "new" data?

Page 5, lines 6-20: This information is indeed relevant, but I don't think it belongs in the results section, unless this is something that has been extracted from the review?

Page 5, lines 13-14: Something seems missing in the sentence

Page 6, lines 22-24: Are the listed possible reasons for differences in results based on observations from the reviewed literature (e.g. observed differences in instruments used to assess SSB consumption or weight gain)? If so, please specify what these differences include.

Page 7, line 40: Many fewer than what?

Page 8, lines 33-51: This section provides some of the information that I think is missing in the introduction. I think the manuscript would improve with more consistency on what is written under each "outcome-headline" - for example, on page 5 lines 6-20, the authors provide
information on the mechanisms behind the investigated association (and no information on previous literature), whereas on page 8 lines 33-51 information on previous literature is provided (and no information on mechanisms).

Page 12, line 33: I think there is a typo ("with and attention....")

Page 13, lines 8 and 40: What results from the review suggest that additional research on taste preferences is needed?

Conclusion: Based on the results of this review, do the authors think there is evidence or indications suggesting that intake of SSB is harmful in particular population subsets?
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