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Reviewer's report:
Comments to the author:

This is well-written paper on breakfast skipping behaviours in children and it's associations with teacher and objectively reported academic performance longitudinally. It is a novel paper that fills a gap in the literature.

I have only minor comments for the authors:

Abstract:
- The conclusion at present is confusing, it doesn't match the conclusion of the main body of the paper and it brings in a new concept (poverty) which isn't mentioned earlier in the abstract. I suggest revising.

Background:
- Paragraph 1: requires references for the first and second sentences.
- Paragraph 2: please highlight that this systematic review was conducted in 2009.
- Paragraph 3: please highlight that this systematic review was conducted in 2013.
- Paragraph 2 & 3: Please add more details re: outcomes assessing in these reviews to clearly show/highlight the similarities and/or differences between the 2009 and 2013 review.

Methods:
- Paragraph 1, page 6, line 58: specify here that baseline was in 2004.
- Paragraph 1, page 7, line 32: please clarify why Wave 3 may have been skipped for the NAPLAN test.
- Page 8, line 12: please specify how many children skipped breakfast more than once
- Page 8, lines 41 - 46: the sentence beginning "Data for 4159 children…" appears incomplete/inaccurate and therefore is confusing. Please rephrase.
- Page 9, line 31: please clarify what you mean by "the outcomes were considered as covariates"
- Page 9, line 52: please list/summarise the 7 indicators of household hardship.

Results:
- The numbers in-text do not appear to match the numbers in Figure 1 (i.e. 2332 is mentioned in-text but doesn't appear in Figure 1)
- The section regarding ethnicity on page 11 at lines 53-60 would be better suited for the methods or discussion, not results.
- Page 12, line 35: the values for writing and numeracy in the final model for the difference between skippers and non-skippers do not match Table 4.
- Tables: please give an indication of the sample size in the heading of each table.

Discussion:
- Page 14, paragraph 3, lines 40 onwards: This could be revised and separated into two paragraphs (1, national standardised tests; 2, teacher-reported assessment) to assist with clarity of the argument
- Page 15, paragraph 3, lines 33 onwards: Provide information regarding the age of participants in these studies to assist with comparison to between studies and with your study.
- Page 15, line 60: In what population was this systematic review conducted? Please specify.

Conclusion:
- The last sentence is long and could be split into two. The idea about breakfast programs improve diet quality and nutrient intake also does not feature anywhere else in the discussion. If this is to remain in the conclusion than it should be discussed/raised earlier in the manuscript.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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