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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks for improving the manuscript. It looks very nice and clear now.
Just a few minor comments:

Abstract:

Line 29: Methods section: change cost effective analysis into cost-effectiveness analysis

Line 50: Results: please change the word participant into patient

Introduction:

Line 31/page 6: What do you mean with this sentence? .."This is especially so as the majority of these studies have been conducted in Europe."?

Line 9/page 7: "…. and the anticipated clinical benefit (nutrition status) was small [12],....." A nutrition status is not a clinical benefit but a nutritional benefit!! An optimal nutrition status (nutritional benefit) can result in a clinical benefit - but is not the same. Please adapt

Methods:

Line 20/page 9: The reference [14] used to estimate the protein and energy requirement for the studied patient population in this manuscript (malnourished general medical patients ≥60 years) is very strange as this ref 14 is about critical ill patients - not comparable at all with the patient population in this manuscript. Please adapt using the literature for malnourished older patients as suggested before.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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