

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	MULTICENTRIC, OBSERVATIONAL, LONGITUDINAL STUDY FOR THE EVALUATION OF NUTRITIONAL MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS IN NEWLY DIAGNOSED ITALIAN CANCER PATIENTS: THE ITALIAN REGISTRY OF MALNUTRITION IN ONCOLOGY (IRMO)
AUTHORS	Bosetti, Cristina; Casirati, Amanda; Da Prat, Valentina; Masi, Sara; Crotti, Silvia; Ferrari, Alessandra; Perrone, Lorenzo; Serra, Francesco; Santucci, Claudia; Cereda, Emanuele; Iannelli, Elisabetta; De Lorenzo, Francesco; Pedrazzoli, Paolo; Caccialanza, R; IRMO Collaborators, IRMO Collaborators

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Knapp, Guido Technische Universität Dortmund
REVIEW RETURNED	07-Mar-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The study protocol is clearly written. I have just one question. At the end of the section on Statistical methods and sample size, the author discuss power and sample size. I think I understand the assumptions of 75% survival rate and the ratio 2.3 between all patients and malnourished patients. What does then the hazard ratio 1.36 mean? I think the increase of surviving in the group of non-malnourished patients. Correct? But I do not understand the 0.66% explanation in the following sentence given in brackets.</p> <p>Small typo: Page 8, first line: I guess the second "are" must be deleted.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Salama, Amany Pharos University, Nutrition and food safety
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Apr-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	The dates of the study should be included in the manuscript.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Bowrey, David University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust, Surgery
REVIEW RETURNED	04-May-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a well written study protocol for a longitudinal study looking at nutrition in Oncology patients. This will be a valuable contribution to the understanding of this process
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Guido Knapp, Technische Universität Dortmund

Comments to the Author:

The study protocol is clearly written. I have just one question. At the end of the section on Statistical methods and sample size, the author discuss power and sample size. I think I understand the assumptions of 75% survival rate and the ratio 2.3 between all patients and malnourished patients. What does then the hazard ratio 1.36 mean? I think the increase of surviving in the group of non-malnourished patients. Correct? But I do not understand the 0.66% explanation in the following sentence given in brackets.

>>In the Methods, we modified the sentence on the sample size in order to make it clearer.

Small typo:

Page 8, first line: I guess the second "are" must be deleted.

>>We corrected the typo.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Amany Salama, Pharos University

Comments to the Author:

The dates of the study should be included in the manuscript.

>>As suggested also by the Editor, in the Methods we indicated the planned dates for the study.

Reviewer: 3

Dr. David Bowrey, University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust

Comments to the Author:

This is a well written study protocol for a longitudinal study looking at nutrition in Oncology patients.

This will be a valuable contribution to the understanding of this process

>>Thank you for your positive comment.