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Author's response to reviews:

19.06.2017

Dr. Alison Yaxley,
The Editor
BMC Nutrition

Dear Dr. Yaxley,

RE: NUTN-D-17-00046-NUTRITIONAL STATUS OF CANCER OUTPATIENTS USING SCORED PATIENT GENERATED SUBJECTIVE GLOBAL ASSESSMENT IN TWO CANCER TREATMENT CENTERS, NAIROBI, KENYA

I appreciate the comments raised by the reviewers. Below are my responses;
1. Background – 2nd sentence – change ‘prevents’ mortality to ‘reduces’ mortality. Comment accepted; ‘prevents mortality’ has been changed to ‘reduces mortality’ in the abstract, background section, page 2 line 30

2. Methods – 1st sentence – change ‘survey’ to ‘study’ Comment accepted; the word ‘Survey’ has been changed to ‘study’ in the abstract, methods section, page 2 line 38

3. Were the participants all over 18 or were they 18 and over? Comment accepted; the statement has been changed to ‘aged18 years and above’ in the abstract, methods section, page 2 line 39

4. Results – Sixty-nine percent of participants.. add. And this difference was statistically significant.. add. Comment accepted; the phrase ‘of participants’ and ‘this difference was statistically significant’ in the abstract, results section, page 2 line 45 and 46 respectively.

5. Line 104 - were the participants all over 18 or were they 18 and over? Comment accepted; the statement has been changed to ‘aged18 years and above’ in the, methods section, study population subsection page 4 line 99 and 100

6. Line 109 – do not use footnotes (this comment applies to subsequent use of footnotes also). This should be cited by the same method as all the other in-text citations. There is no need to include the calculation as your text describes the information you need to include. Add a sentence indicating that the required n=385 and assuming 10% non-response rate you aimed to recruit a minimal sample size of 424.Comment accepted; footnotes have been removed and a sentence indicating how the sample size was determined included in the methods section, sample size estimation and allocation subsection, page 4 line 104-107

7. Line 129 – systematic random sampling method? What does this mean? Did you use random numbers table? Did you select every 5th patient? You need to give some detail. Comment accepted and addressed to include that every third patient was recruited in the included in the methods section, sample size estimation and allocation subsection, page 4 line 112

8. Line 129 – sentence beginning ‘Since…” – this is results and does not belong in the methods. Comment accepted and this section has been deleted and moved to results section, paragraph 1 page 7 line 154-155

9. Line 141 – change ‘impacting’ to ‘impact’ Comment accepted; impacting changed to impact addressed in the methodology section, page 5 line 129

10. Line 149 – sentence beginning ‘the scores..’ – this is a repetition of the information in the background. Suggest keeping the information here and removing the detail from the background but instead indicating that the resulting score guides the intervention plan. Alternatively remove from methods and replace with a comment on the scores while referring to the PGSGA guiding materials. Comment accepted repeated information removed from the background
11. Page 7 – Table 1 – you must refer to the table in text before the table appears. You should indicate what table 1 contains. Comment accepted and addressed to include a sentence referring to the table before table appears in the methodology section, page 5 line 133-134

12. Line 160 – change ‘derived’ to ‘extracted’ Comment accepted; derived changed to extracted in methodology section, page 6 line 140

13. Line 183 – check tense – should be required – check throughout and change appropriately. Comment accepted; tense changed in the results section, page 8 line 164-169

14. Table 3 – remove ‘anabolic’ from SGA-A or include it at all points in which you describe SGA-A as well nourished. Similarly, you should be consistent with your description of SGA-B. Do not justify the text in table 3. Comment accepted; anabolic removed, consistency maintained in describing SGA-A in results section, table 3, page 8

15. Line 193 – change ‘statistical’ to ‘statistically’ Comment accepted; statistical changed to statistically addressed in results section, page 8 line 173

16. Throughout you use a variety of formats to describe categories eg SGAA; SGA A; SGA-A. You should be consistent throughout with your choice of format. Suggest SGA-A. Comment accepted; the format has been corrected throughout the entire document

17. Your first paragraph should highlight and summarize your key findings before moving on to discuss them. Comment accepted; first paragraph includes summary of key findings in discussion section, paragraph 1, page 10, line 191-201

18. Line 209 – remove this sentence. You have not mentioned cachexia at all prior to this and I do not believe that the PGSGA diagnoses cachexia. Alternatively, if you have references to support this statement please include. Comment accepted; for consistency, statement on cachexia has been removed.

19. Line 224 – PGSGA is an assessment tool, not a screening tool. Comment accepted; revised to PGSGA is an assessment tool page 11 line 213

20. You have not included any limitations. All research has limitations and you should declare yours in the discussion. Comment accepted; limitations included page 14, line 280-289

21. You indicate that screening should be conducted, which I do not disagree with, but you did not do a screening study. The PGSGA is an assessment tool. Moderate your conclusion to reflect the study that you conducted. Comment accepted; conclusion revised page14, line 292