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

Wooryeon Go[1]

1 University of Eastern Finland

Dear. the author

This article provides a valuable analytic measurement method to examine the factors that affect older citizens' stress perception on their aging. In detail, the author focused more on the specific coping strategy, called offensive coping which has considerable effect on preventing and intervening the issue. To realize the niche of the relevant quantitative studies and to discover what researchers have done for contributing to this importance issues were well-indicated and -explained. As a result, the author found the people who are using purely offensive coping strategy have the following features: an aged young-old participants who are still employed, who have higher levels of education backgrounds, who are living in large cities, and who have been doing the broad mental work or activities in their lives. Therefore, this scale could be implied for finding the important features of using offensive coping strategies in order to consider one's aging and the age.

However, I have some questions and suggestions I'd like addressed in this article.

First, in the methods section, before the author used abbreviations, he or she should present it with full-name first except for the very well-known for word like WHO. For example, the scales mentioned with abbreviations (e.g., SWLS and PGCM or At and Ac in the Table 2) hard to clearly understand what they are. Because of unexplained abbreviations, it was not easy to follow the logics in the paper.

Second, it would be better to describe the criteria that how the author selected and narrowed down some of items from many items pool. It was very clear you had pre-survey process to select the items. However, the author mentioned many kinds of scales, but there are few sentences that how to form of the first selection step i.e., 26 out of 91 items, and then how to construct the final selection i.e., 12 out of 26 items with different participants. I might assume that there would be the rational standard and reason why the author selected those important items, but description about the smaller items in the paper could not be the criteria or explanation of the selection. That is, it would be nicer to let readers know reasons why they should be selected.

It was honor and happy to read the interesting but important topic related to stress for elderly people!

Best wishes