

Review of: "How do older adults cope with their aging and age? A scale for an offensive coping strategy of older adults"

Gema Perez-Rojo¹

¹ Universidad de San Pablo CEU

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript reports on How do older adults cope with their aging and age? A scale for an offensive coping strategy of older adults

In this regard, I applaud the authors for their worthwhile undertaking which reflects the relevance of the topic. However, on reviewing this manuscript I cannot recommend it for publication.

It is recommended not use like keywords terms included in the title and use words that help to find this article when people are searching for scientific literature to this topic.

I would like to make some suggestions to the authors. For example, the authors include the term elderly along the article, but this term is generally considered ageist and stereotyped because it does not take into consideration the heterogeneity of older people which increases with age, for this reason I highly recommend use "older people" or "older adults".

They use some colloquial terms like "followers". It is recommended to change these terms for other more formal.

In the text they should include the last name of the authors, like Lazarus, not R.S. Lazarus.

They write "Gunther (1994, 11)" and I am not sure whether is a literal cite.

One of my main concerns is about the introduction section, because although the article is focused on older people, the introduction is in general and even include little results related with this group of people. And they defined the main features of coping strategies to deal with old age, but they do not explain the sources used in order to develop these characteristics.

They use some scales that assess quality of life and well-being and personality traits and resilience to create their scale, but they do not explain how these scales are related to coping. And they do not explain why they chose specific items. I do not know whether there is a theory that support it.

They do not include information about content validity.

Overall, although I find the study's findings very valuable, the paper needs some work in order to be of a suitable standard for publication to improve its significance and to increase its appeal or impact on the broader scientific readership in the field. The aim of these comments is only to improve the quality of the article.

