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Reviewer’s report:

Some language corrections required throughout entire manuscript.

Abstract:

Background: insertion of commas required throughout

Page 2 line 6 - rephrase "generically reduced"

Page 2 line 11 - change to "improves QoL"

Results:

Page 2 line 42 - explanation required as to why there were 13 studies and 20 journal articles - presume this was because the 20 journal articles only represented 13 unique studies?

Introduction:

Page 3 line 21 - spell World Health Organization in full

Page 3 line 26 - change "sense organ" to "sensory"

Page 3 line 31 - define "presbycusis" for the reader

Page 4 line 8-13 - change to "Patient reported outcome measures (PROMs), of which include Quality of Life (QoL) questionnaires, should be systematically included within health care practices"

Page 4 lines 15-18 - change to "....calls on the inclusion of QoL outcome measures, both disease-specific and generic QoL"

Page 4 line 35 - change World Health Organization to WHO

Aim
Page 7 lines 3-11 - rephrase aim to "The aim of this study was to ..."

Method

Page 7 line 20 - I suggest that the literature review design you used was a systematised literature review as you have gone beyond a narrative literature review, but not used the quality appraisal required of a systematic review.

Page 7 - 8 - this section requires further integration so information is not repeated in search one and search two - consider combining some of these sections to avoid duplication

Page 7 line 37-40 - provide rationale as to date range chosen - why would this time frame contain significant findings and results?

Figures 1 and 2 require additional information to show a separate flow for the papers which were excluded (n value and how many duplicates were removed); also need to include information about why studies were excluded in figure.

Supplementary materials - it is not clear how the PRISMA 2009 checklist was used as this was not referred to in the paper - suggest including this within the paper

Results

The results section requires further synthesis. Although there is some integration of results, some papers in this section are reported one by one in isolation with no synthesis or integration in order to highlight the key findings - e.g. "In a study performed by Chew et al. ..." "The study conducted by Mondelli et al ..." "In the study conducted by Carlsson et al..." "In the study conducted by Chia et al ...". This section needs to be revised such that the papers are grouped and common findings are reported rather than reporting the results of papers one by one.

Discussion

Page 15 lines 27-31 - rephrase "When sifting through the material..."

Page 15 lines 43-46 - rephrase "only elderly" to "had a focus on older adults" to make this less of a limitation, but rather a description of the nature of the papers

Page 15 lines 55-60 - rephrase "that requires understanding of the content ..." as the completion of questionnaires by older adults is not about "intelligible" completion but rather to ensure they have the cognitive capacity to complete self-report measures - more careful wording required

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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