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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revision

1) In the Methods, please provide more information about the initial rate of enteral nutrition, the rate at which the enteral nutrition was advanced to goal, and the use of prokinetic medications. How as the presence and absence of VAP determined?

Minor Essential Revisions

1) There are numerous minor spelling, grammar, and style mistakes throughout the manuscript. Although it was still easy to follow and understand, these mistakes detract from the overall quality of the manuscript and should be fixed.

2) Please include a reference for the fourth sentence of the Introduction ("In critically ill patients...")

3) In the Methods, first paragraph, third sentence, please provide examples of contraindications to enteral nutrition.

4) Regarding the time to initiate nutrition: was the data normally distributed? If not, a median is more appropriate to report.

5) In the Results section, I am confused by the sentence: "Only one patient was not started on any enteral feeding over the stay in the ICU." Wasn't your inclusion criteria "received enteral nutrition"?

6) Please define the 32 procedures that were the cause of interruptions.

7) In the fourth paragraph of the Discussion, please provide a reference for the first sentence ("The time taken to achieve full feeds....")

8) In Table 1, please include additional information on demographics. Were these patients medical? Surgical? What was the ICU length of stay? Ventilator days? Also, for skewed distribution, it is more appropriate to report median and interquartile range. For normal distribution, mean and standard deviation (not range).

Discretionary Revisions

1) Did you calculate APACHE 2 scores?
2) In the Discussion, the authors may consider including recommendations for A.S.P.E.N. and the Canadian guidelines, as multiple professional societies have different recommendations.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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