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Title: Impact of self-perception of aging and cancer on health of older patients in oncology: A one-year longitudinal study

The paper follows a sample of older oncology patients over a 12-month period to assess self-perception of aging (SPA) and view of cancer as predictors of physical and mental health. Given the prevalence rates of cancer, particularly among older adults, it is a timely topic with potential implications for flagging older patients who may be more vulnerable to poorer health.

A main concern is the lack of clarity regarding the statistical analyses, making it unclear what exactly was done. If SPA, view of cancer, and physical and mental health were assessed at all 4 time points (baseline, 3, 6, and 12 months), why are only baseline and 12month comparisons made in the Table 1?

Likewise, in the regression analyses, the authors refer to "evolution of SPA" and "evolution of health" measures that seemingly include all 4 time points, but it is unclear how these 4 time points are incorporated into the analyses. In Tables 2 and 3 they appear to be simply summed or averaged into a single measure. Why not analyze trends in associations among SPA, view of cancer and health over time so that each of the 4 time points is apparent and prior time points are accounted for in the analyses? This could be achieved through longitudinal growth curve modeling or perhaps weighted contrast testing.

Related to that, the regression models predicting the "evolution of health" (again how this variable was computed is not indicated) did not appear to control for baseline health - how do we know whether those older adults with worse baseline SPA and cancer views didn't already have poorer baseline health?

A more minor point, there is no indication of the significance of the overall regression models.

All causal language (effect, leads to, impact, predicts, etc.) throughout the paper is misleading and should be revised to reflect the correlational nature of the study. This issue also occurs in the title (e.g., change "Impact of… on health" to "Associations of….with health")
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