

## Author's response to reviews

**Title:**NutOrMed-Optimising nutrition, oral health and medication for older home care clients-study protocol

### Authors:

Miia Tiihonen ([miia.tiihonen@uef.fi](mailto:miia.tiihonen@uef.fi))  
Kirsi Autonen-Honkonen ([kirsiau@student.uef.fi](mailto:kirsiau@student.uef.fi))  
Riitta Ahonen ([riitta.ahonen@uef.fi](mailto:riitta.ahonen@uef.fi))  
Kaija Komulainen ([kaija.komulainen@uef.fi](mailto:kaija.komulainen@uef.fi))  
Liisa Suominen ([liisa.suominen@uef.fi](mailto:liisa.suominen@uef.fi))  
Sirpa Hartikainen ([sirpa.hartikainen@uef.fi](mailto:sirpa.hartikainen@uef.fi))  
Irma Nykänen ([irma.nykanen@uef.fi](mailto:irma.nykanen@uef.fi))

**Version:**4**Date:**30 January 2015

### Author's response to reviews:

Dear Mr Ian Dominique Trinidad on behalf of Dr Catia Cornacchia

We wish to thank you for your comments on our manuscript: MS:  
2000903579138644 - NutOrMed: Optimising nutrition, oral health and medication  
for older home care clients – study protocol

We revised the manuscript in the light of the comments. Our replies to all  
comments are listed in detail below. Beside this cover letter, we uploaded two  
files; the marked version showing the changes made on the manuscript and the  
actual revised version.

On behalf of the author team

Yours sincerely,

Miia Tiihonen

Reviewer 2.

Methods

There should be a better description of the study design than “trial”. It appears to  
be a non randomized prospective intervention study of three groups of people.  
The study design would be stronger if a cluster randomized design was used.  
How are each group to be chosen to receive intervention or no intervention and  
what strategies are to be used to minimize bias.

-This has been improved but would be better as a prospective non-randomised  
population-based multidisciplinary intervention study.

Study design is defined as a prospective non-randomised population-based multidisciplinary intervention study

3. The first two groups are described as 'a random sample' . How was the random sample achieved. The method should be described. The third group is described as a 'total' sample. What does this mean? Was this also a random sample and if so how were they chosen?

-This is explained in the letter but should also be in the manuscript.

Now explained also in the manuscript.

4. The purpose of the third group is unclear. Are both groups 2 and 3 control groups and if so why two control groups. This should be justified.

-This is explained in the letter but should also be in the manuscript.

Now explained also in the manuscript.

13. I would like to see change in weight and BMI as outcomes as these will allow comparison with other similar studies within systematic reviews. At present it would be impossible to compare the nutritional outcomes of this study with others that are similar.

-This has been addressed but I hope that the results for weight and BMI will be reported separately.

Weight and BMI added as outcomes.