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Reviewer’s report:

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   • Very interesting and timely study.
   • It seems, authors did not systematically indicate why they have chosen to look into the variables they selected.
   • Why socio-cultural influences?
   • Why psychological well-being?
   • It seems as though the first paragraph of the Methods section is better suited for the background section as it more clearly establishes a purpose.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   • Qualitative methods were adequately described and well-suited to the age of the population and the questions in which the authors were interested in answering.
3. Are the data sound?
   • The data seemed to reflect only the positive. The possibility that the participants did not want to discuss their concerns to the researchers.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   • Yes.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   • The authors dedicated, roughly, the same amount of commentary on each of their findings within the Discussion and Conclusions section.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   The authors acknowledged that they had a small sample size and stressed the difficulties of recruiting extremely healthy near-and-centenarians.
   but no other limitations were addressed. If they were stated, this was not obvious.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
• In both the Background and Methods sections of the paper the authors mention previous studies that have researched similar questions. They also spoke extensively about their previous quantitative research upon which this study derived.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
• Yes, both the abstract and title were directly and accurately related to the content and findings of the paper.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
• Overall the writing quality is very good but there are simple mistakes that detract from the importance and main purpose that could be easily avoided with further proofreading. For instance, in the second sentence along the work “projected” is used twice. Their inconsistent use of Oxford commas was also noted.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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