**Summary:** The paper investigates “Social correlates of aging and Quality of Life of older adults in rural and urban areas of Southwestern Nigeria: a comparative cross-sectional study”.  Despite being a significant public health concern for Nigeria, this topic has already received considerable attention from numerous earlier and recently published studies.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2820711/>

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0272684X18781781>

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11135-021-01178-8> (almost similar)

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0167494317302765>

The purpose of the study has also been used in the past to explore comparable issues utilizing earlier data on Nigeria. As a result, the paper's main original addition appears to be its application of this study to the southwestern part of Nigeria, and its conclusions largely—and not surprisingly—reflect those of previous research. The majority of references are too old. I am requesting the author to cite the most recent reports and statistics that are accessible.  
The paper needs to be thoroughly proofread by a professional or expert. It is not written to a high degree for academic writing, and there are several grammatical/spelling errors, which frequently make claims and arguments less clear. Additionally, the authors ought to eliminate any similarities from this work. Numerous times, the way that statistical results are interpreted is also wrong. The paper also neglected to mention or cite comparable but equally significant published studies on QoL from the nearest countries. The introduction fails to effectively justify the need for studying the issue, tables and results are not focused on the title, many unusual tables and results are included in the main manuscript, and the paper's findings by themselves are insufficient to support the conclusions.

Below are some comments with more information:  
  
**Abstract**  
  
Lines 20-22: “This study was conducted to assess and compare the social correlates as well as the QoL of older adults in selected locations of Oyo State in southwestern Nigeria.”. The objective didn’t fully support the title.

Lines 31-36: Please show some numeric values/evidence in results. “Urban older adults had higher scores in psychological and social relationship wellbeing though insignificant (p=0.599 and 0.806 respectively).”. Provide that score. More evidence is needed of QoL and other factors from the Chi-square test or logistic model.  
  
**Introduction**

Lines 46-47: “The World Health Organization (WHO) defines older persons as those individuals above the age of 60 years” Please provide an updated definition.

Lines 50-51: “It is estimated that more than 60% of the world’s elderly are found in developing countries, including Nigeria.” Please provide recently available statistics.

Lines 52-53: “Health wise, older persons are prone to a number of non-communicable diseases (NCDs), which are currently responsible for roughly 60% of all deaths” Please provide recently available statistics.

Lines 53-54: “The most common chronic NCDs being cardiovascular disease, cancer, chronic respiratory diseases, and diabetes” Please provide recently available statistics, it seems you refer to old evidence.

Lines 96-97: “In another study, economic status was found to be the most consistent predictor of the four domains of QoL” Please provide all four domains’ names or remove that number (“four”). This number of domains will confuse readers, who didn’t know about domains.

Lines 112-118: Please specify the research gap in this area. Why this study is necessary and so on.

**Methods**  
**Sample size and Sampling technique**

Line 120: It should be “Study Design and Study Setting” instead of “Study design & Study Setting”.

Line 131: It should be “Study Population” instead of “Study population”.

Line 136: It should be “Sample Size and Sampling Technique” instead of “Sample size and Sampling technique”.

Lines 148-149: “An urban (Ibadan South-East local Govt Area) and a rural LGA (Surulere Local Government Area) were sampled by balloting from a list of urban and rural LGAs respectively”. Keep the “L” capital in the “local” word.

Lines 148-149: In lines 122-123 authors explained about 9 semi-urban but in lines 148-149, authors didn’t consider it (Stage I). Please explain this discrepancy in detail.

Lines 153-156: The author should explain details about wards in “Study design & Study Setting” before using these lines.

**Quality of life among older adults**

Lines 208-210: “The dichotomy into good or poor QoL was achieved using an average response of 3 and above (≥78/130; ≥60%) on the Likert scale as good QoL and scores 210 below 3 (<78/130; <60%) as poor QoL”. Please provide a reference for creating this category.

Lines 210-213: “The primary outcome variable was QoL while the independent variables were socio-demographics including age, sex, marital status, religion, location, educational status, health status and social correlates (Social security/Economic security/Social protection).”. Please explain more about independent variables. How many categories among them, how do the authors measure them, etc.

Lines 221-222: The author should write “T-test was used to test for the comparison of means between the two groups.” instead of “T-test was used to test for the comparison of means between 2 groups”.

The authors should have stated how they decided to choose this particular set of potential explanatory variables (e.g., by picking significant predictors QoL from recent literature or using their judgment, etc.).

The authors also should have stated how they decided on variables in the final model. The statistical criteria to include variables in the model (like P-value <0.05 or feature selection) should be mentioned. Please provide some model evaluation techniques (AIC, BIC, AUROC, and others…..) to justify that you used an appropriate model to explain your results.

**Results**

There are some issues with the interpretation of results.

Lines 237-239: “An extra 69 respondents were appoached over the minimum sample size of 416 to make allowance for incomplete or improperly filled quesionnaires.” Please replace this line in the methods section.

Lines 237-239: “An extra 69 respondents were appoached over the minimum sample size of 416 to make allowance for incomplete or improperly filled quesionnaires.” Please check the spelling of “appoached” and “quesionnaires”.

Lines 244-245: “Older adults in the rural area had a mean age of 69.1+7.5 years compared to respondents in the urban area witha similar mean age of 69.1+7.1 years.” The statistics are missing in Table 1. The authors should specify this information in a table. A space is missing in “witha”.

Lines 258-259: In Table 1, use <0.001 when it is less than 0.001.

Explain the meaning of “\*” in the table footnote.

In this table, the reviewer seems some extra variables which didn’t explain in lines 210-213.

It also seems that the author didn’t maintain the serial of explanation of Table 1 or vice versa. Please, to catch the reader’s interest please keep the flow similar to the table and interpretation.

“**χ2**”, explain the necessity of the chi-square test value in this table. As the authors didn’t explain this value in their table interpretation part, I think it is not necessary to show it on the table.

Use “n” instead of “N”. All of the above comments are applicable to all tables.

Lines 254-255: “With regards to the family type most of the respondents were monogamous with a slightly higher proportion in the rural area 290 (60.7%) as compared to 284 (59.2%) in the urban area.” Is it family type or marriage type? Authors should put similar names of all variables in whole manuscripts.

Lines 260-261: “The details of the respondents’ social, family and living status by location are presented in the supplementary file (S2&S3).” The author should write “The details of the respondents’ social, family and living status by location are presented in the supplementary files (Table S2 and S3). It is applicable to the whole manuscript.

Lines 263-265: “Among farmers, traders and artisans that were the major occupations, artisans constituted the highest proportion of the respondents (27.0%) followed by the farmers (24.3%).” The author should include traders information in this line and also should use the word “respectively”.

Lines 266-267: “Among both rural and urban respondents, a significantly higher proportion 72.8% and 57.9% were earning wages below the minimum monthly wage of ₦18,000 ($59) respectively.”. The author should explain the techniques of making this category in the method section. It is applicable to all categorical variables. In Table S3, reviewers didn’t find “$59”.

Lines 266-270: The author should mention/refer to the table number.

Lines 284-289: The interpretation of Figure 1 seems to be redundant because of Table 2. Both explained health status. Please explain more about this variable in the methods. The statistics will confuse readers.

All tables should be in a similar style. Reviewers notice in Table 1 a column with “total” information which is not provided in Table 2 and Table 3. Please include the “total” column also in Table 2, 3 and 4.

I think table 1 and 2 is not necessary in the main manuscript, as the “location” variable is not the outcome variable in this manuscript, I will suggest sending them in supplementary files.

As the primary outcome variable in this manuscript is QoL, the author should explain more about Table 3 and 4 as well as its logistic model results. Please remove the serial number from Table 5.

Tables S2, S3, and S4 showed different background data with the same dependent variable. The author should keep them all on a single table with different headings. This comment is also applicable to table 1 and Table 2.

The author should write “and” instead of ‘&’. Applicable for the whole manuscript.

Line 327: “Fisher’s Exact test”, this term is missing in the methods section. Please explain why authors do that.

Lines 334-335: The odds ratio lower than 1 should be rewritten in percentage.

**Discussion**  
Lines 355-356: “……..is expected since mortality increases with age; a finding found to be established in other studies”. The authors used the term “is expected”, is it a hypothesis? If not please remove.

The references used by authors for identifying similar studies seem sporadic, low evidence from African papers, and most of the references are too old. There are numerous studies on this topic in that region that established several results similar to this paper, but these papers were hardly cited. Please adjust and rewrite the whole discussion related to your result and this study.

Lines 379-380: “Overall and in all the domains, the mean QoL scores of the study respondents were comparably above average.”, lines 383-384: “Findings in which a greater majority of respondents exhibited good QoL”. line 386: “Lack of financial support could also affect their QoL negatively”. Did the author mention them in the result?

Lines 390-391: “Possession of assets in old age was found to be associated with better QoL which was significant among urban respondents.” The author considers the reference “has assets” but the line is interpreted as “no assets”. Should be re-write. This type of explanation (discrepancy between result and explanation in discussion) should be removed from several parts of the discussion.

The discussion part should be rewritten and should focus on outcome variables. It will be better to discuss the information of supplementary tables and be more specific on the outcome variable.

**Conclusion**

The conclusion needs to be more specific and highlight key findings. This should support the result. Suggested to provide less discussion. As authors discuss the reason for each association in the discussion part.