

Review of: "Death needs, culture and emotional death proximity: Keys to intervene in social discrimination"

Douglas C. Nance

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Using Kubler-Ross's antiquated work from 1969 as a major reference source is a significant problem in this work. Her work has never been validated, and her reliability has been challenged. She never described the persons interviewed, and much of her 1969 work has been discredited. "Kübler-Ross saw many patients and gathered many anecdotes, and then used them to create a scientific model that simply is not based on good evidence" (McVean, A. (2019). *It's Time To Let the Five Stages of Grief Die*. McGill University, Office for Science and Society.) The lack of the classic work on death and dying (Ariés, P. (1981). *The hour of our death*. Vintage), as well as the works of Alan Kellehear, (2009) *The study of dying*. Cambridge, and (2007) *A social history of dying*. Cambridge, are important omissions. The constant repetitive use of valence should be varied, as other terms may be more accessible in non-valence-oriented psychology.

Recommendation: REJECTION