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Reviewer's report:

This scoping review aim to assess reviews loneliness and social isolation interventions for older adults. How loneliness and social isolation interventions were conceptualised and undertaken were a more important concept than the outcomes of the reviews (reflected in the abstract results section - the current aim may need adjustment to clarify this).

33 studies were identified.

Many did not provide a clear definition of the terms used to describe intervention components.

MAJOR

* Abstract. 33 reviews evaluating X interventions. Also include number of interventions in Table 1.

* Results interpretation could be improved. Eg, systematic was the most commonly obtained type of review, followed by….

* Generally, I would like to see more details in the results. The three categorisations of SI/L discussed in results: how many fell within each category? Any cross-over? How many only focused on aged 50+ or 65+? Where were most of the interventions - I would guess UK, USA? How many specified a type? Format? Mode?

* Date of reviews is a result (currently described at length in the discussion)

* "Therefore studies that included participants with a mean age of more than 45 years were included." This sounds like an afterthought. Is it part of your inclusion criteria? If so move this section and integrate into aims.

* "number of people receiving the intervention" does not mean "in group settings or on a one-to-one basis". What I think you mean is "delivery mode", or "group vs one-to-one delivery mode" if you want more detail and think it is different to "mode". "number of people receiving the intervention" means the number of participants in each group. Please alter throughout manuscript.

* Limitation = English only. How many of the reviews were also limited to English?
MINOR

* Intro. Date mentioned for 'Danmark spiser sammen' and Have a Laugh for Loneliness', but not the others

* Table 1 order of studies reasoning? Potentially change to chronological by publication year? Title or aim (both not needed). Authors not needed. Categories of intervention and explanation could be two separate columns.

* Your three categorisations of SI/L discussed in results would be useful to include in a table format (T1 or a new one). Population characteristics also good in a table format.

* Is the "heterogeneous" descriptor actually an outcome of your study. The summary results para in the discussion sounds like you knew this would be the case ahead of time.

DISCRETIONARY

* AIM "map the range of interventions that have been evaluated…" -&gt; to describe the range of interventions to reduce loneliness and social isolation among older adults that have been evaluated, in terms of intervention conceptualisation and components.

* Intro. Start with 'Campaign to End Loneliness' in the United Kingdom (UK) and mention in chronological order (AU is likely most recent).

* Results section separate paragraphs for type, mode etc

TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS

* their lives and to a certain - &gt; their lives to a certain

* however older people (≥ 65 years) are most vulnerable to experiencing loneliness. Needs reference

* table format unreadable. Varying texts and sizes.

* I would separate out European countries - otherwise why not state Australasian or Americas?

* "effective in addressing each of these constructs" reference holt-launstad
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