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Author’s response to reviews:

We thank the Editor and Reviewers for their helpful and scholarly comments. We have responded to each with gratefulness as follows:

Protocol Editor:

Thank you for this revised version of your manuscript.
Before formal acceptance, please consider the following comments:

Abstract

Page 2. Background. Line 31. Please, include the objective of the review (after context). For example: “The objective of this study will be to evaluate oral nutritional supplements on preventing SSIs in adult surgical patients”.

We have inserted as suggested

Page 2. Methods. Lines 32-34. Please, provide a summary of planned methods including: data sources, study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; outcomes (including prioritization), study appraisal and synthesis methods.
For example: “Randomised controlled trials conducted in adult surgical patients who receive oral nutritional support will be included. The primary outcome will be the incidence of SSIs (within 30 days of surgery or within 90 days for joint replacement surgery). Secondary outcomes will be changes in nutritional status, mortality, health-related quality of life and costs. Literature searches will be conducted in several electronic databases (from inception onwards): MEDLINE, Embase, CINAHL and The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL). Grey literature will be identified through searching clinical trials registers and dissertation databases. Two reviewers will independently screen all citations, full-text articles, and abstract data. The study methodological quality (or bias) will be appraised using the Cochrane risk of bias tool. If feasible, we will conduct random effects meta-analysis where appropriate”.

We have inserted as suggested

Page 2. Discussion. Lines 35-36. Please, provide a brief summary and potential implications.

We have inserted as suggested

Thank you for your kind comments and we do apologize for the delay in responding. The lead author undertook personal leave over the holiday season and needed extra time to complete these tasks.

In response to your review, we thank you again and reply as follows:

Protocol Editor:
Thank you for this revised version of your manuscript. Before formal acceptance, please consider the following comments:

Abstract

Page 2. Background. Line 31. Please, include the objective of the review (after context). For example: “The objective of this study will be to evaluate oral nutritional supplements on preventing SSIs in adult surgical patients”.

We have inserted as suggested.

Page 2. Methods. Lines 32-34. Please, provide a summary of planned methods including: data sources, study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; outcomes (including prioritization), study appraisal and synthesis methods.

For example: “Randomised controlled trials conducted in adult surgical patients who receive oral nutritional support will be included. The primary outcome will be the incidence of SSIs (within 30 days of surgery or within 90 days for joint replacement surgery). Secondary outcomes will be changes in nutritional status, mortality, health-related quality of life and costs. Literature searches will be conducted in several electronic databases (from inception onwards): MEDLINE, Embase, CINAHL and The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL). Grey literature will be identified through searching clinical trials registers and dissertation databases. Two reviewers will independently screen all citations, full-text articles, and abstract data. The study methodological quality (or bias) will
be appraised using the Cochrane risk of bias tool. If feasible, we will conduct random effects meta-analysis where appropriate”.

We have inserted as suggested.

Page 2. Discussion. Lines 35-36. Please, provide a brief summary and potential implications.

We have inserted as suggested.

Systematic Reviews requires prospective registration of systematic reviews in PROSPERO. Please, include PROSPERO registration number (e.g. CRD42xxxxxxxx, with an URL for verification by the Editorial team).

We have inserted as suggested however we are awaiting ongoing delays to URL provision from PROSPERO and will continue to follow up.

We are experiencing delays in PROSPERO providing us with a URL and will continue to follow up.