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Dear Reviewer:

With regard to your comments we would like to clarify:

1- Methodology - Height was measured using a scale which is not appropriated. For further studies use a standard laboratory stadiometer. (Lohman TG, Roche AF, Martorell R. Anthropometric Standardization Reference Manual. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics; 1988.)

Height was not measured using a stadiometer because many patients were unable to stand. Chumlea method was used instead, as it is now in the text.

2- Methodology – The methodology used on the Educational Group (EG) is poorly described. The authors described: “…consisted of 10 weekly classes developed based on the main nutrition deficits in AD patients as observed by family members.”

A more detailed explanation on the content of the educational sessions, how it was chooser is now included in the text.

3- Methodology – How often the Supplementation Group (SG) was monitored? Elucidate it in 8th paragraph of Methodology.

There was a monthly monitoring, as it is now in the text.

4- Results – In the first paragraph, the authors point that “… 8.89% (8) of the patients did not meet the inclusion criteria…” If they did not meet the inclusion criteria, they never were enrolled in the study. So, the number of subjects enrolled in this study was 82 and they lost only 4 patients who died. Or, these 8 patients did meet the exclusion (not the inclusion criteria) criteria. Please, clarify
this question.

These 8 patients were included, but did not completed the study – 4 died; there were 3 drop out (difficulty in being transported to the hospital); 1 subject needed tube feeding. All these points are now in the text.

5- Discussion – in the 4th paragraph the authors write: “... oral nutritional supplementation provided to dementia patients, which has already been studied by other authors, significantly improves nutritional status patients.” But these authors were not cited. Please, provide some references.

References are provided now.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Dear Reviewer report 1: Mr. Lorenzo M M Donini

With regard to your comments we would like to clarify:

In particular it is not clear if cognitive status influenced the efficacy of education intervention and how food intake was modified during the study due to the different intervention protocols.

It was not our objective to investigate this issue (which is interesting and should be addressed in another study). Most of our sample was CDR 2 and the statistical analysis would be poor.

Moreover: was does it means “CG ... did not receive any form of intervention” ? I suppose that, at least, usual diet was adapted to patient needs.

Both groups revival an orientation the healthy diet at the time of subject inclusion. This information is now included in the text.

Results are not clear (see table 3): units are not described and it is difficult to understand the improvement/decline in particular of TLC, total protein and albumin. It is also difficult to understand the variation of BMI (e.g.: if there is a decline of 2.2 kg, the decline of BMI cannot be 2.21 kg/m² for subjects whose stature is 1.57 m)

This table shows the variation between initial and final values for those variables. This is now better explained in the text.