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Reviewer's report:

This is an article of importance in its field. It is in general well written and the findings are of clinical importance.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. In abstract, first paragraph, clarify that the aim was to make separate comparisons for men and women (aim).

2. It is confusing to read that the weight loss was smaller in the intervention group compared with the controls (p=0.013)(in abstract) and then in background one read that the intervention reduced clinically relevant weight loss in the intervention group compared with the controls although ns (p=0.055). Please clarify.

3. Material and methods, inclusion process, describe the reasons for why some patients were not reassessed.

4. Material and methods, inclusion process, "showed that 124 patients were required" - in total or per group?

5. Material and methods, intervention. The patients were discharged with nutritional advice to prevent undernutrition. By whom was this information provided, dietician?

6. Statistical analysis. Also non-parametric tests must have been used (analysis for table 1).

7. Discussion, second paragraph, last sentence, at what time - 3 months?

8. Discussion. There is a need for a paragraph discussing/speculating in why the intervention worked in women but not in men. What are the recommendations from the findings?

9. Tables and figures. Legends are missing (Fig 1, 2 and 3).

10. Table 1. Results should be given for men and women separately. The results can then possibly give some explanation to comment 8 above.

Discretionary Revisions
Minor revision not for publication

11. Material and methods, inclusion process, divide into two or more paragraphs.

12. Material and methods, inclusion process, missing parenthesis: "(not able to weigh (n=1) and withdrawn (n=1) after randomization."

Finally, congratulations to an interesting and well written paper!
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