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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions:

1. This scoping review represents a tremendous amount of work in reviewing and compiling information on how social networks may influence individual's body weight. I believe that the topic is important; however, I find the presentation of the results lacking. The authors provide brief descriptions of the studies' results within certain categories; however, there needs to be more synthesis of what all this information means and how you come to that conclusion. Given the variety of countries, populations, and settings used in the studies, I would encourage the authors to considering consolidating information by these factors. For example, consolidating and synthesizing the results for social network effects among African Americans and identifying the gaps for this population would be enable future researchers to take more directed action in the future based on your findings. As it stands right now, it is really difficult to understand how all these pieces fit together.

2. I would encourage the authors to create a conceptual model based off their findings and present this as a figure - this would help ground the concepts where we have evidence and identify areas where there are gaps. This could be done for the overall relationship between weight status and social network factors, and then in the text break down information known about certain populations for which there are multiple studies.

Minor essential revisions:

1. Please spell check the document as there are a number of spelling errors.

2. I would encourage you to revise Figure 1 to more clearly represent the process of your scoping review. Presently, it seems as if the citation review from the Christakis and Fowler paper occurred simultaneously with the database review; however, your methods describe this process as sequential. In addition, the reasons for articles being excluded in the upper boxes needs to be reported.

3. I am unsure what the "research strategy" column refers to in Table 1. Please clarify this Table.

Discretionary revisions:

1. I would encourage you to move the supplementary table into the main text, as I found this table the most useful out of all information you presented.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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