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Reviewer's report:

Title: Loneliness and social isolation interventions for older adults: a scoping review of reviews

The paper was an interesting read and generally written in a style that was relatively easy-to-read. The background information in particular, provided a really good overview of social isolation and its relevance with respect to disease and the ageing population. However, a number of changes are necessary to help improve the paper.

Minor

- Please ensure that all sources of information are accurately referenced. For example, the statistic "50% of individuals aged over 60…" in the background section of the abstract needs to be referenced.

- Please include the date on which the search was conducted.

- More consistency is required with respect to tenses, use of numbers, and what is included/not included in each section.

- A number of limitations are listed in the scoping review. Consider other limitations beyond whether relevant papers were missed and not included, such as the differences in defining social isolation/loneliness. Please also discuss some strengths of the scoping review.

- Sentences are often too long and can be split into 2 or multiple. Brackets are used quite often which can disturb the flow of the sentence. Try incorporating what is in the bracket into the sentence instead and splitting it into smaller, multiple sentences.

- Appendix could be better formatted if the 3 different searches are separated into different labels e.g. appendix 1.1, 1.2, 1.3; also it may be better as text instead of screenshots as screenshots may require figure titles/legends

Major
• More detail and clarity is required to better explain certain concepts and how they will be used in the scoping review. There is mention of how other authors use social isolation/loneliness interchangeably, thus emphasise that these terms will or will not be used interchangeably in this scoping review. More explanation would also be useful for interventions given in the included papers. For example, what does a communication program entail?

• The issues in the current world/literature that are identified need to be further elaborated upon to help readers understand the implications of these issues.

• Need to show a more obvious link to social isolation/loneliness at times. For example, paragraph 7 of the background section needs more flow between itself and the preceding paragraph and a more obvious link to social isolation/loneliness.

• Have authors of included papers been contacted? It would be beneficial to contact the authors (if they haven't already been contacted) regarding the inclusion criteria of their paper so that it can be included in Table 1, as opposed to stating that it was not reported by the author. Additionally, information regarding characteristics of the included papers may be better and more clearly communicated to readers by inserting it into Table 1 or as a separate table.

• Need to give full name TIDieR checklist as it is the first time that it is appearing in this paper. Also need to explain what it is - what kind of checklist? what is it a guide for? What features/aspects of TIDieR are effective for reporting/describing interventions? Benefits? How does TIDieR work with respect to social isolation/loneliness? Why is TIDieR unable to show which aspect contributes most/what CAN TIDieR show?

• Examples are used a lot - which are helpful at times, however it doesn't always cover all the aspects i.e. it is often mentioned in this paper that some included papers have X characteristic e.g. paper Y, but there are other papers that also have this characteristic, so it would be good to have those discussed also.

Again, the research topic was very interesting and has a lot of potential, however it would benefit from further editing and improvement to help clarify certain concepts and strengthen the piece.
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