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Reviewer's report:

An interesting study, which offers an overview of aspects have been studied as positive outcomes for interventions that promote social inclusion and respect among older people. The conclusions of the abstract seem more consistent with the results presented than the conclusions of the main text. The heterogeneity of the studies, the risk of bias, variable follow-up time of the elderly and the fact that studies always include volunteers make difficult to say how each intervention affects the health of the elderly. What has been demonstrated were the potential benefits studied by the authors of the primary studies, which is useful for other researchers to plan new studies more assertively and policy makers be aware of which initiatives may be better at promoting the social inclusion of older people. Authors should clarify the exploratory character of the study and its results.

Introduction

Line 37 - The reference to sentence "According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), the world's population aged 60 years and older is expected to increase to more than two billion by 2050; one in five people will be 60 years or older" should be: World population ageing 2013. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division; 2013 (http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/WorldPopulationAgeingReport2013.pdf).

Line 44 - The reference to sentence "In the 'Global Strategy and Action Plan on Ageing and Health', published in 2016, the WHO advocated the development of physical and social settings that support older people to live independently and in good health for longer, but also optimise health and wellbeing for the wider community [6,7]." seems wrong. It should be the document Global Strategy and Action Plan on Ageing and 45 Health, published by WHO in 2016.

Line 52 - "One of these domains, reported as being of fundamental importance to older people in qualitative work [6,10-13] and in national and international policy [3,5,14-16], is respect and
social inclusion". This sentence should be reviewed, it is confusing. Qualitative work is qualitative research?

Line 59 - regarding risk of cardiovascular events due exposure to negative stereotypes of ageing, the cited publication mentioned in conclusions "study suggests that age stereotypes internalized earlier in life can have a far-reaching effect on health. In turn, this finding suggests that programs aimed at reducing the negative age stereotypes of younger individuals could benefit their cardiovascular health when they become older individuals."


The sentence needs to be reviewed.

Methods

Line 81 - Authors cite PRISMA but the reference 29 is the PRISMA-P.

Lines 87 to 92 - Authors should consider taking this paragraph for introduction. It is not method.

Line 102 - figure 13?

Lines 177 to 185 and Lines 190 to 202 - With such broad and specific eligibility criteria, a major limitation of this study is the screening of the studies (by title and abstract and then by reading the full text) has been carried out by only one reviewer. Another reviewer had analyzed randomized samples, but there is no way to guarantee that there were no losses in the screening process. This problem is even more serious considering that more than 27,000 texts were initially identified. The same limitation is even more worrying in relation to the steps of data extraction and risk assessment of bias.

Line 185 - Figure 2 is a result, this shouldn't be in the Methods section.

Search strategy:

What is the search strategy: 9 and 16 and 21 OR (9 or 16) AND 21? Please explain why restrict the search using AND in this case?
Results

I suggest removing figure 4 because it repeats what is already described in the harvest plot. The harvest plot is much more complete and already offers the information correlating to the direction of the effect and risk of bias.

If the authors summarize the contents of tables 1 and 2 in the text, they could consider putting them as supplementary material to make text more readable.

Improve sentence on lines 325 to 327.

There seems to be something missing in the sentence between lines 331 and 332.

I think figures 5-10 need to be revised to make it clearer. The figures seem to overestimate the findings rather than making it clear that they demonstrate the aspects assessed in the primary studies.

For example, legend says:

Red line represents results supported by quantitative evidence - the results were supported or evaluated? Results are reliable? Risk of bias were low? Legend state "this notation is not meant to signify the strength or direction of any effect", but colors like red and green are usually related to negative and positive. In addition, this information only appears in the legend, and may confuse the reader.

In the summaries of the evidence according to each intervention, the design of the study and the risk of bias are discussed separately from results. It is difficult for reader to relate observed result to the characteristics of the studies that produce it (for example 357 to 362).

I have some doubts about how some primary studies were interpreted. For example, on lines 327 to 329, clearly the effect described is related to the Hawtorne effect, as this study was reported in the Harvest plot?
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