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Author’s response to reviews:

* We thank reviewers and editor for your time and quick turn-around with responses.

Reviewer Reports:


* Under section 2, Methods/design, 2.1 protocol development we identify Arksey & O’Malley and specifically outline Levac et.al as the methodology we will be using.

Reviewer 1:

Reviewer #1: This protocol is improved but I still miss details on what kinds of studies you will include, particularly in regards to study design and outcomes. It seems to me the outcome 'building intergenerational connectivity' needs more clarification. Furthermore, given the broad inclusion criteria it will be helpful to the reader if it is clarified what kinds of studies you will include (ethnographies, focus group-based analysis, individual interviews, or evaluations?). You are now clearer in that this is an evidence map rather than a review - I would suggest changing the title giving that you are actually not going to review the papers, but only describe their content.

* Thank you for your comments. We feel the strength in this review is that we are including all studies, rather than limiting it to one area. This decision to keep the review open ended was made by the research team after discussions with review specialists to reflect that this topic is an early and emerging area of research, therefore our goal is to scope many types of works, should they match the topic area.
We appreciate your point and considered using an evidence map methodology. Miake-Lye et al. outline the differences between a scoping review and an evidence map as: “scoping reviews include “a descriptive narrative summary of the results” whereas evidence maps identify evidence gaps, and both use a tabular format to depict a summary of literature characteristics”. While we will identify gaps, the primary goal of this review is to understand and provide a descriptive narrative summary of peer-reviewed literature. Based on the above definition and our goals, we believe we are performing a scoping review. To clarify this point, we have added the following to 2.1.3.1: “We will be including all studies regardless of methodology or design to provide a rich and descriptive narrative of the current state of research on intergenerational connectivity, while acknowledging that as an emerging field there is no existing research cohesion.”

Tools mentioned in regards to critical appraisal need to be referenced.

* We have added in these citations.

There are currently two headings called 'Discussion'

* We have amended this.

Typos on lines 18/19 - missing 'that'

* We have amended this.

P3, lines 42/43 repeated phrase 'is not required'

* We have removed the duplicate.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper again. I am satisfied that the authors have addressed comments adequately. I agree with authors that this research has the potential to help shape future research around intergenerational connectivity and approaches taken in public health, aged care programs, technology design/development/instructional support for different populations, and other support for usage offered by government agencies, nonprofit organisations, libraries or schools.

* Thank you for your comments and enthusiasm about this area of research.
1. p. 2, line 38-39. This sentence is still rather awkward and could be rewritten slightly to get the idea across. Perhaps "Intergenerational connectivity may provide mutually beneficial opportunities that mitigate social pressures arising from aging populations." This tones down the certainty that the results of the scoping review will be beneficial. It is also not certain or "inherent" (as written) that connectivity mitigates social pressures. The scoping review may provide more evidence or analysis in this space.

* We have changed the sentence to what you suggest.

2. p. 3, line 42, "is not required" is doubled up, please remove one instance.

* We have amended this.

3. Referring to my prior comment #6, I understand the importance of keeping the review manageable. But as a scoping review generating knowledge about the topic, and looking for themes in the literature, I encourage your background/discussion sections of future manuscripts to allow for discussion of such innovation. Some important studies or articles might shed light on relevant themes, while not captured in academic literature.

* Thank you for this comment, we agree wholeheartedly that the background discussion of the scoping review itself will allow for a full discussion of these innovations. To keep the review manageable we did exclude grey literature from the study itself, but our intention is to include it in the discussion/background for a full context.