[Line # 158] The manuscript states, “Qualitative variables are expressed as frequencies and percentages”; however, the term “categorical” is more appropriate than “qualitative.”

Throughout the manuscript, the term “qualitative” is used; however, since a chi-square test or Fisher’s exact test was performed, it would be more appropriate to refer to these variables as “categorical.”

[Line #162] “**usedFisher’s** exact test” → “used **Fisher’s** exact test”

[Line # 174 & Table 1] In the "Working status" category, the percentages do not sum to 100%. Please verify the numbers. Additionally, in Table 1, "Retired" is listed as 284 (60.5%), while in line 174 of the main text it is reported as 60.6%. One of these appears to be an error.

[Line # 177] The value is reported as "2.86 (1.81)," whereas in Table 1 it is listed as "2.9 (1.8)." This discrepancy may confuse readers. It would be better to ensure that the numerical values in the table and the main text are consistent. It appears that Table 1 rounds to one decimal place.
Similarly, please report "Barthel index was 97.03 (9.36)" consistently with Table 1.

[Line #182] In line 182 and Table 1, the "MUST score was 0.72 (1.09)." is reported with two decimal places. Why was this the only value presented to the second decimal place? Unless there is a specific reason, it would be better to standardize the number of decimal places throughout the document.

[Line # 214 & Figure 1] The percentages—Grade I: 20.6%, Grade II: 49.3%, Grade III: 28.1%, Grade IVa: 2.1%—sum to 100.1%.

[Line #222] In line 222, "with a 30-day complication rate of **9%"** should be "with a 30-day complication rate of **9.4%**."

[Line #228 & Figure 1] The percentages—Grade I: 34.1%, Grade II: 36.4%, Grade III: 25%, Grade IVa: 4.6%—sum to 100.1%.

[Line # 239-241] In lines 239–241, it is stated that "In the 146 patients with complications during hospitalization, the mean (SD) MUST score at hospital discharge was 0.90 (1.19), although it was significantly higher among those who received nutritional treatment (n = 105) as compared to those without nutritional support (n = 41) (1.06 [1.25] vs. 0.51 [0.90], P = 0.012)." However, this information cannot be directly found in Table 4. According to Table 4, among the 225 patients who received nutritional support during hospitalization, 105 (46.7%) developed complications, whereas among the 237 patients who did not receive nutritional support, 41 (17.3%) developed complications, with a significant difference (P = 0.0001). This suggests that a lower complication rate was observed in patients who did not receive nutritional support. In the table, the data are presented as the incidence of complications, whereas in the main text they are reported as MUST scores, resulting in inconsistent reporting. In the table, the data are presented as the incidence of complications, while in the text, it is described using MUST scores, which is inconsistent. Since the MUST score is as important as the complication rate, it is recommended to include the MUST score in the table according to whether patients received nutritional treatment.

[Line #250-251] In lines 250–251, it is stated that "In patients with severe risk at discharge (**MUST score ≥ 2**), the percentage of patients with complications was 24.7% as compared to **9.2%** in patients without complications ($P < 0.0001$)." However, this information cannot be found in Table 4. In the table, MUST scores at discharge are only categorized as 0 or ≥1 according to the presence of complications. In particular, it is unclear where the "9.2%" value comes from.

[Line # 253] There were no analyses of complications in relation to the GLIM score in the main text.

[Line #254~263] The results are described for 179 patients with available data among the 183 patients who had a MUST score ≥ 1 at the time of hospital admission. It would be preferable to present these results in a supplementary document.

[Line # 264-270] A key table presenting the results of the logistic regression analyses, which represent one of the most important findings of this study, is missing. These results should be included either in the main manuscript or provided as a supplementary table.

[Line # 264] "**Multivariate** logistic regression" should be changed to "**multivariable** logistic regression." The term multivariate implies the inclusion of two or more dependent variables, whereas in this analysis a single dependent variable was modeled with multiple independent variables. These terms are often mistakenly used interchangeably, but multivariate logistic regression is incorrect in this context.

[Table 1] The percentages within each category should sum to 100%, but Table 1 does not always reflect this. For example, the total of Men (62%) and Women (37.9%) is 99.9%. If there are other gender categories, such as "Other," they should be included.

Please check the sums and percentages for the following variables:

- Gender
- Living conditions
- Working status
- Place of residence (inhabitants)
- Smoking habit
- Comorbidity
- Barthel index score
- MUST score

[Table 2] In Table 2, the percentages for "Primary tumor localization" sum to 98.2%. Should an "Other" category be added, or was there an error in the reported numbers?

[Table 2] In Table 2, the percentages for "Surgical procedure" sum to 101.8%. If patients could have multiple procedures, this should be clearly indicated; otherwise, please verify whether the numbers are correct.

[Table 1] Table 1 needs to be improved for better readability. Please see the example below.

Variable	Total patients (n = 469) N (%)
Gender	
Men	291 (62.0)
Women	178 (37.9)
Age, years, mean (SD)	68.2 (11.7)
Civil status	
Single	45 (9.6)
Married/partner	333 (71.0)
Widower	69 (14.7)
Separated/divorced	22 (4.7)
Living conditions	
Alone	63 (13.4)
Partner or family	403 (85.9)
Nursing home	3 (0.6)
Educational level	
Primary education	264 (56.3)
Secondary education	153 (32.6)
University level	52 (11.1)
Working status	
Active/student/housewife	123 (26.2)
Retired	284 (60.5)
Sick leave/unemployed	62 (13.2)
Place of residence (inhabitants)	
500,000 to >1 million	131 (27.9)
200,001–500,000	101 (21.5)
50,000–200,000	94 (20.0)
<50,000	143 (30.5)
Smoking habit	
Smoker	70 (14.9)
Ex-smoker	177 (37.7)
Never smoker	222 (47.3)
Body mass index (BMI), kg/m², mean (SD)	26.7 (4.3)
Comorbidity	
Cardiovascular disease	271 (57.8)
Diabetes mellitus	110 (23.4)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)	51 (10.9)
Charlson comorbidity index, mean (SD)	2.9 (1.8)
Barthel index score, mean (SD)	97.0 (9.4)
<20 (total dependency)	2 (0.4)
21–60 (severe dependency)	4 (0.8)
61–90 (moderate dependency)	48 (10.2)

Variable	Total patients (n = 469) N (%)
91–99 (slight dependency)	28 (6.0)
100 (independent)	387 (82.5)
Nutritional risk	
MUST score, mean (SD)	0.72 (1.09)
MUST score 0 (no risk)	286 (61.0)
MUST score 1 (moderate risk)	84 (17.9)
MUST score 2 (severe risk)	99 (21.1)
GLIM criteria of moderate malnutrition	35 (35.3)
GLIM criteria of severe malnutrition	64 (64.6)

[Table 2] Table 2 needs to be improved for better readability. Please see the example below.

Variables	N (%)
Primary tumor localization	
Colon	253 (53.9)
Rectum	111 (23.7)
Stomach	38 (8.1)
Pancreas	25 (5.3)
Esophagus	17 (3.6)
Small bowel	8 (1.7)
Liver	5 (1.1)
Biliary tree	4 (0.8)
Surgical procedure	
Right hemicolectomy	128 (27.3)
Left hemicolectomy / Sigmoidectomy	122 (26.0)
Low anterior rectal resection	87 (18.5)
Gastrectomy	40 (8.5)
Abdominoperineal resection	30 (6.4)
Pancreatectomy	28 (6.0)
Esophagectomy	15 (3.2)
Hepatectomy	19 (4.0)
Total colectomy	9 (1.9)

In summary,

- Several inconsistencies are evident in the content.
- The most important analytical results are not clearly or adequately presented.
- The results do not appear to support the stated objectives.