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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper.
As I pilot study it has high lighted issues regarding recruitment.

There are no definite endpoints but this is expected in this type of study. The pilot should have outcomes that would be related to a more definitive study. I.e. what level of recruitment and retention needs to be reached for a full study to go ahead.

Why was the protein provided as a powder and not a tablet. This would have got over nay particular taste issues.

There are a few points to high light

1. The introduction should contain a comment regarding the inefficiency of converting protein ingested to muscle protein.

2. The term elderly should be changed to older people

3. The definition of older people needs to be stated as 60 is not old.

4. Why nursing home residents and not frail older people in the community. It may be better to recruit those that are pre frail or CFS 5 rather than 6-7 as it may be too late.

5. Functional outcomes should be included such as the Timed Up and Go. A increase in muscle strength without an increase in function may demonstrate limited benefit
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