

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Reducing social isolation and loneliness in older people: a systematic review protocol
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Landeiro, Filipa; Barrows, Paige; Nuttall Musson, Ellen; Gray, Alastair; Leal, Jose

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Rona Dury University of Greenwich UK
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	30-Sep-2016

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	5. A referral to ethical considerations needs to be included. I note the abstract states that this systematic review will be exempt. The quality and integrity of the research papers used should be critiqued to ensure that ethical considerations are met. 12. This is a research proposal therefore not applicable.
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Jitka Pikhartova Brunel University London, United Kingdom
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	12-Oct-2016

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>The protocol for systematic review focusing on reducing social isolation and loneliness in older people is clearly presented and I do not have any major comments.</p> <p>I only propose few small (or very small changes):</p> <p>i) I would add a word 'loneliness' into the title</p> <p>ii) I would like to see few lines describing how authors would manage access and understanding of articles in "any language" so they can interpret them</p> <p>iii) I would like to point out a few typos in References section Ref. No 20 – publication year of the article is missing Ref. No 39 – authors' names should not be written in capital letters Ref. No 45 - to have the section consistent, the title of the article should be in the same style as other title (no capital letters in each word)</p>
-------------------------	--

## VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1:

Many thanks for your comments. The protocol has now been amended to specify that all included papers will be evaluated with regards to their ethical considerations. Although we recognise your point with regards to the inclusion of "study limitations", this section is a journal requirement and has therefore been left in.

Reviewer 2:

Many thanks for your comments. Our responses are itemised below:

- i) "Loneliness" has now been included in the title
- ii) Description of the methods used to evaluate papers in languages other than English for data extraction and quality assessment have been added
- iii) The typos you identified have been corrected.