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Reviewer's report:

This is an important and timely research as measurement of loneliness is increasingly becoming important especially in mothers caring for infants and toddlers.

It is a well written paper, well justified, appropriate methods and analysis and the discussion is well focused.

Just some few points

1. In line 155-156, the desired sample size was set as a quarter of 2000 which is 500, at the end only 430 were sent questionnaire and only 248 replied. This is less than 50% of the desired sample size. I expect the authors to have either improvised by sending more questionnaires out before analysis. As this was not done, it should have been mentioned as a limitation of the study.

2. The analysis for the SF-10 and SF-3 were based on the completed UCLA-LS3-J which is a 20-item questionnaire. An increasingly important observation is that responses to a set of questions may be affected or biased by the presence of previous questions on the same scale. It would have been nice to know if the answer to the 3 questions of the SF-3 would have been the same were the other 17 questions of UCLA-LS3-J not present in the questionnaire. This is important as the study did not evaluate for test-retest reliability or discriminant validity.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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