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Author’s response to reviews:

The authors should in more detail explain how the INPAC pathway aligns with recent European guidelines on nutritional care and proposed care pathways: please see


Also, although the authors use the term "Evidence-based" several times in the manuscript, evidence about nutritional care is rather scarce. The authors should include an "outlook" or "limitation" section discussing how their pathway will be (or needs to be) studied in order to understand whether or not patient outcomes are really improved by the use of the pathway. Please also discuss more critical literature on the topic such as Bally, M. R., et al. (2016). "Nutritional Support and Outcomes in Malnourished Medical Inpatients: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis." JAMA Intern Med 176(1): 43-53.

Response: To address these comments, a discussion section has been added that compares INPAC to the ESPEN suggested pathway, discusses limitations regarding nutrition evidence, and provides direction for future work including closer examination of the long-term patient outcomes.