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Reviewer's report:

Authors provide a good review of the process and the outcomes of developing nutrition education materials for older adults in Malaysia.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. A limitation is that this project has not yet reached the stage where the impact on the target population is assessed. Inclusion of such data would greatly strengthen the manuscript.

2. However, all information is provided in a helpful and informative way. Documentation of these efforts through a publication will help show the seriousness and soundness of the approach to developing these materials.

3. Throughout, change “elderly” to older adults.

4. Avoid term “whilst” and edit throughout.

5. Avoid term “subjects” and use “participants” throughout.

6. Edit “staffs” to “staff” throughout.

7. Edit to i.e.,

8. Page 1 – mid section, change elderly subjects to older adults with diabetes.

9. Page 2 change to “needS assessment”

10. Page 2 approved BY the local

11. Page 2 change it’s to its

12. Page 2 bottom change document to documentS

13. There are too many other edits – authors need a professional editor

14. Page 4 Hawe et al ref 17 is not correct, because 17 is not Hawe, so fix this

15. Page 7 define “medical officer” – is it a physician or administrator or ??

16. Table 4 correct typos in title
17. Table 2 don't capitalize strength or any of the diseases, foods or nutrients; check all tables for this problem

18. Table 3 “actractive” fix spelling

19. Whole manuscript needs a detailed review to correct grammar and spelling

Other information requested from BMC:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes.
3. Are the data sound? Data per se are not provided as numbers, but descriptive information is provided.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.
9. Is the writing acceptable? No, because of the numerous typos as noted above.

**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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