Author’s response to reviews

Title: Leucine-enriched essential amino acid supplementation in mechanically ventilated trauma patients – a feasibility study

Authors:

Liesl Wandrag (l.wandrag@imperial.ac.uk)
Stephen Brett (stephen.brett@imperial.ac.uk)
Gary Frost (g.frost@imperial.ac.uk)
May To (may.to09@imperial.ac.uk)
Elaine Loubo (elaineloubo@gmail.com)
Nicola Jackson (n.jackson@surrey.ac.uk)
Margot Umpleby (m.umpleby@surrey.ac.uk)
Vassiliki Bountziouka (v.bountziouka@ucl.ac.uk)
Mary Hickson (mary.hickson@plymouth.ac.uk)

Version: 1 Date: 16 Jul 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

"Leucine-enriched essential amino acid supplementation in mechanically ventilated trauma patients – a feasibility study"

(TRLS-D-19-00390).

Response to Editor and Reviewers

The authors thank the Editor and Reviewers for their review and positive comments.

Reviewer #1: Congratulations for your work. Some comments:

1. Abstract: well described and structured
2. Title: very informative and clear

3. Key words: Mechanical ventilation and trauma are missing. Please add it.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: The authors agree: ‘Mechanical ventilation’ and ‘trauma’ have now been added as key words.

4. Background: Short, however with enough information.

5. Objectives: clear and consistent

6. Methods: Better description of the intervention is lacking. There is more information about this in the abstract than in the body of the study. Outcomes very well described. Statistical methods clear.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: The authors agree and have expanded the description of the intervention, which we acknowledge was lacking.

7. Results: text is concise, however with enough information which is clear in the tables.

8. Discussion: very well structured. No change needed

9. Conclusion: consistent with findings

Reviewer #2: The manuscript outlines the results of a pilot feasibility study looking at leucine enriched amino acid supplementation in mechanically ventilated trauma patients in an intensive care setting. The study demonstrated that it was rather unfeasible to recruit the required number of patients, and collect many of the planned outcome measures, which were planned. The manuscript is well written and clear. I have only minor comments, however I would learned more from the manuscript if the authors could have made more specific suggestions on ways they would change the protocol of a future study given what they learned from this one, as it is now the discussion tends to just highlight areas that need consideration without specific recommendations.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: The authors agree and have amended the discussion to include more specific suggestions to include in a future study.
Minor issues:

Abstract line 28, included "feasibility" after randomized.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: Agreed, the word “feasibility” has been inserted.

Line 29, there is a capital "A" than needs to be deleted from the word day.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: Thank you for pointing this out, the “A” has been deleted.

Methods, line 73, the dates in the methods section do not seem to correspond with the dates in the trial registry.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: We retrospectively registered the trial, hence why the trial registry reads 25/7/2012. It was assigned on 30/7/2012, yet recruitment took place between May to December 2012. Our ethics application for this study was valid from 2010-2013.