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Reviewer's report:

In general:
The theme is very actual, because the practice is deviating from theory (guidelines) in majority of hospitals, indeed. However the usual reason is not based on lack of knowledge but on overloading of staff and on the undue flexibility accepted by the local management. The structure of the publication is clear, the strategy behing is acceptable. The innovation in Delphy method the authors presented is unique, however the article will initiate discussion about the benefit, I gess. The workload behind the INPAC seems to be huge, congratulation for it.

In general I take this article as acceptable for publication without compulsory or minor essential modifications.

In details (discreetinary revisions):
- The article describes the development process of nutrition pathway step-by-step. The title is, however, not reflecting that the article is mainly a methodologic attempt to make more precise the former pathways.
- the description of working method is too detailed, for me. This is very good for „newcommers“ because they can learn this method in one hand but is boring and straining for others seeking to learn the details of final recommendation.
- I miss the short summaries of statements of each circles and panel discussions (now they are included as big tables with statistics).
- unfortunately the result (= INPAC) is not included and several readers will miss the exact description. ( Full algorithm can be found elsewhere, on internet.)
- about the language: native english reviewer should give advise rather than me.

Extra opinion (comment):
1. I take group of experts to be too large. According to my experience some 12 active practitioners (nurses, nutritionists and MDs) and aditional 2-3 scientists for organize and manage the task force could be come to the similar initial result.
Of course, this is a research planning question, now, post festam it can not be taken into consideration.

2. Due to lack of detailed information I can not summ up the level of experience of the participants but as mentioned in the article, there was a relatively big difference in the delegates. Maybe the selection of participant could be more accurate.