**The current stage one revision represents a substantial revision to the previous submission, and I am generally happy with the changes that the authors made. They did well in addressing my comments and the comments of other reviewers, and made smart and substantive changes to the work more generally. I will go through the 5 criteria once again, providing any new thoughts if I have any, and finish with some additional comments that I think are important to address at this stage.**

**1A. The scientific validity of the research question(s).**

No additional comments.

**1B. The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypotheses, as applicable.**

The most significant change to this revision is that the authors went ahead and carried out their exploratory analyses, so that now the proposed hypotheses are purely confirmatory. I personally am fine with this change, the authors outlined what they were going to do with their exploration in the last version and did it, so everything seems aboveboard. This is all of course documented by the RR process; ultimately I leave decision-making having to do with this with the editors.

Other than this, the logic, rationale, and plausibility is unchanged, and possibly even improved – just getting the exploratory analyses out of the way seems a good choice.

**1C. The soundness and feasibility of the methodology and analysis pipeline (including statistical power analysis or alternative sampling plans where applicable).**

The analysis pipeline has changed because the exploratory analyses have already been carried out, but the methodology remains essentially unaltered, and sound.

**1D. Whether the clarity and degree of methodological detail is sufficient to closely replicate the proposed study procedures and analysis pipeline and to prevent undisclosed flexibility in the procedures and analyses.**

No additional comments.

**1E. Whether the authors have considered sufficient outcome-neutral conditions (e.g. absence of floor or ceiling effects; positive controls; other quality checks) for ensuring that the obtained results are able to test the stated hypotheses or answer the stated research question(s).**

No additional comments.

**Additional comments:**

* The authors offer to “explicate which of the reported indices/statistics are not used for inference”. I would indeed appreciate it if the authors did this, I think it would help many readers with less statistical expertise and technical acumen.
* Under Results, *factor analyses and internal consistency*: “following exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses in our exploratory fold” – I know the authors did here and I know why this reads as it does, but I can’t help but fear that this phrasing will confuse people.
* Under *Construct Validity: “*(3) health.” Please be more specific here. From the new figure, I’m guessing this refers to the ubiquitous self-rated health question, but it would be great to have that cleared up right here.
* The paragraph beginning – “Somewhat concerning are the modest correlations between scales are supposed to test the same constructs…”

Realistically, 0.6 - 0.7 is really not that low for situations like this. It is worth taking note of, and I think my primary issue here may lie with the authors language – what are you really telling the reader by saying this is “somewhat concerning”? “Modest” is not an appropriate descriptor of a correlation this large. But that said, I think the numbers here are very important to consider.

* The paragraph beginning – “What is clear is that the how loneliness should be measured…”

First, please note the typo. Second, however, is that I disagree with much of the interpretation here, and I think it may be the most important aspect of this manuscript so far.

The authors’ support of the social loneliness subscale makes sense from some perspectives, but not all. Social loneliness seems to have better predictive validity, this is true, important and worthy of mention, and very much worth trying to understand. But it can’t be understood without understanding what is going on with the other “side” of loneliness.

We must consider \*face\* validity. The TLS items, to me, are more closely to the feeling of “loneliness”. This is bolstered by the fact that the single-item measure, for all its faults, arguably has the best face validity: “have you been feeling lonely?” And that item converges more with the TLS and emotional side of DJGLS.

So emotions, negative emotionality, and mental health (depression & anxiety are particularly) are wrapped up in loneliness, we already know this, but it needs to be actively considered. The particular criteria variables chosen to relate the loneliness measures too matter as well. There is the potential for selection bias and imbalance there. There are a lot of questions about family, friends, and social contact. The authors ought to specifically consider what those questions say about the complex phenomenon of loneliness.

I think a more judicious conclusion is that \*both\* aspects of the DJGLS are important, and the TLS and single-item measure are missing out on the social aspect. The emotional part of loneliness may overlap a great deal with typical mental health measures, but that emotional part is still very important! There is still unique variance there. Someone who wants to study loneliness is going to want to look at both sides of the loneliness the authors are finding. So these findings are very important but the framing and communication of findings is critical as well.

Of course, this all depends on the confirmatory analyses as well. Some of what I just wrote may be premature; much of this is certainly discussion material, but I think more care is warranted here.

Thanks again for giving me a chance to review this manuscript. I look forward to seeing how this plays out in the subsequent stages.