**Evaluating Loneliness Measurements across the European Union**

This article makes a much-needed contribution to advancing the research literature on loneliness. By evaluating psychometric properties of existing loneliness measurement tools, the study will yield important implications for policies and practices aiming to curb the growing loneliness epidemic. I applaud the authors for their methodological rigor. The considerations posed throughout the text are thoughtful and the paper is well-written. I have several recommendations that may strengthen the quality, clarity, and relevance of the article to end-users. These comments are summarized below and are also included in track changes in a revised copy of the manuscript, attached to this review.

1. Line 75. I had expected to see a brief conversation (around here or elsewhere) about the psychometric issues that may present themselves when applying existing loneliness measurement tools across different countries, languages, and cultures. I never fully found such a discussion in the present manuscript, except for some procedural information about how the tool was back-translated in the methods. Such a discussion seems highly relevant given that the authors’ short-term goal is to investigate the rigor of these tools’ psychometric properties in a population that spans the EU, with a long-term goal of guiding the selection of measurement tools for EU population-level surveys that seek to estimate and address loneliness. I.e., considerations such as: is loneliness defined differently in different countries? Are questionnaires’ wording interpreted the same way by different cultures? Does content validity change when the tool is translated into other languages? etc. I believe Roger O’Sullivan may have done some work in this area. Any literature or background information you can provide on the matter would likely satisfy my desire for this discussion, assuming that the authors are not able to tackle these issues in analyses. I think it is important to be mindful of such considerations, even if only acknowledging them, given this is a formal evaluation of psychometric properties for an instrument surveyed across populations.
2. Line 103. The conceptual difference between loneliness and social isolation should be clarified (and perhaps presented earlier). A history of research articles conflating social isolation and loneliness also contributes to the conceptual barriers in loneliness measurement. For example, studies that purport to measure social isolation but use questions with language such as “feel socially isolated” (indicating loneliness). This problem has improved much over the past five years but did create confusion in recent history. I provided additional thoughts for this paragraph in track changes in the manuscript.
3. Line 115. It is worth tipping the hat to some of the conceptual work that has been conducted for loneliness by Tom Prohaska, Linda Fried, and colleagues. I have provided some suggested citations in the manuscript’s comment bar.
4. Line 178. Please provide a distinct opening paragraph or a few sentences regarding any psychometric properties of loneliness measures that *are* well-established, or that perform particularly well or poorly, prior to discussing findings that are mixed and gaps in knowledge.
5. Line 314. It would be helpful to the reader to provide a combined table that displays each of the three tested loneliness measures, so that readers can compare their question prompts, specific items, and underlying language. I would find myself wanting to examine those differences when interpreting the study’s results.