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Reviewer's report:

The effort of these authors in undertaking this project is very impressive, however I found the English translation quite poor and very confusing. What resulted was that I tried to rewrite the sentences in order to understand the intent of the paper. I truly believe this paper should be in press, however I also do not think anyone would struggle through reading as it stands and get full comprehension of what the authors tried to do. I have not included my own rewrites in this, but suffice it to say, this paper took an incredible amount of time to understand.

I cut down all of the syntax and typographical errors from the remainder of my report (below), and just added the questions of concern. Comments on paper:

Introduction and Rationale (add e)

Line 2: overnutrition and undernutrition: define, and which half are illiterate. add Reference here not just speculation.

Line 3: What is the longitudinal measurement here from 1996 to 2006?

Line 4&5: Unclear; explain this- is it the traditional scientific thinking?

Line 15: You do not discuss or measure lower cognitive status, SES or education- "probably due" should be eliminated.

Page 2:

Aims are good, spelled out.

Name the local institutional ethics committee

Page 3:

Line 2: awkward phrase (underpinning philosophy hold)

Confusing description of the development of flipchart, booklet and placemats, especially beginning with "at this stage"

Page 4:

Evaluation of acceptance towards nutrition education package

Describe health staff (not staffs) what ages, education? You are analyzing their responses to the content as well.
Were the groups of elderly, caregivers and health staff separate from each other when doing the evaluations?

WRONG REFERENCE! Hawe et al (17) is used- this is sloppy and not checked at all. (the reference you are citing is actually mine).

Page 8:
Line 7: what does it mean, “need to be reduced?” (simplified/defined/explained?)
“with respect to illustrations” make this simple- they suggested more pictures.

Page 9, first para:
Language translation confusing,

Page 10: your font size got smaller in the pdf

Page 11: 2nd para: were the elderly subjects not exposed to the food pyramid, even though you claim it is the “present” pyramid?

Page 12: in your reference (17) there is no such Dietary Guideline for Older People, it is just an opinion reference (since I was one of the authors), and the references we use in that are from the National Academy Press DRI's.

Page 12: 5 lines from the bottom: What did you do to modify the package, did you retest it?
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