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Reviewer's report:

Please describe what "loneliness" means as opposed to isolated. The way it is presented in lines 95 to 97 of the introduction is tautological. And it probably should appear at the beginning of the introduction.

Methods: please define affluent, etc in the sociodemographic data. Is this based on a conventional Japanese classification? How did you decide to which category a person belongs?

The exclusion criteria are not mentioned. For instance, would a women undergoing treatment for postpartum depression be included? How would this affect the results?

Results: I am impressed by the low response rate. Would this be attributable to the fact that women had to mail in the responses?

Discussion: I find it a bit rambling. Loneliness is not related to self perceived quality of health, or size of the social network but rather to some ill defined quality factor in interactions. Also, it seems to be related to regional factors, which I understand is how mothers interact with neighbors.

So wouldn’t relationships with neighbors be part of the informal support system?

I'd suggest that the discussion concern itself only with the psychometric qualities of the Loneliness Scale.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

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

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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