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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. The authors need to assess whether there are any contributions that employ the stochastic actor-based model (SIENA) for the co-evolution of social selection and peer influence, and if there are none, highlight this lack.

2. Related to (1), more explication of the identification problem (i.e., confounding of selection, influence, and capital) would have been helpful.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Note that Bahr (2009) is cited twice (#5 and #11).

Reviewer question list:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, the authors are providing a “scoping review” of social networks and obesity. They explain what this review is, then describe three mechanisms by which networks may affect obesity specifically in adults.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   This review followed transparent methods.

3. Are the data sound?
   The articles selected for the review represent a good scope of the literature. However, the manuscript omits a large segment of the literature on social networks and obesity that attempts to model the processes of social selection and social contagion on obesity using an actor-oriented stochastic model (SIENA). While I recognize many of these papers model adolescent social networks (are thus beyond the scope of the current review), there may be others that do the same for adults.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes, there is just one figure showing the search strategy.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   This is not applicable.
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, except more explication of the identification problem (i.e., confounding of selection, influence, and capital) would have been helpful.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes, these are clear.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Since this is a review, they are explicit in acknowledgement.

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

10. Is the writing acceptable?
The article is well written and enjoyable. Note that Bahr (2009) is cited twice (#5 and #11).

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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