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Update on the Integrated Nutrition Pathway for Acute Care (INPAC): Post implementation tailoring and toolkit to support practice improvements.

This short reports focuses on an update of a previously published "integrated Nutrition Pathway for Acute Care" (INPAC) in Canada. The report does not include much clinical data but rather outlines changes made in response to physician experience. It is thus rather a "protocol-type" paper and not a scientific report. It has, however, still merit because background information about the changes in pathway are nicely lined out and explained.

Still, 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.
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