

## Review of: "The Pandora Box from 12 Countries: Who Benefits More from Modern Interventions?"

Iglima Dwi Kurnia<sup>1</sup>

1 Universitas Airlangga

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I appreciate your thoughtful work; it seems like a very unique manuscript that tackles a very significant topic. This paper is based on the SHARE study, which looks to be a very interesting and information-rich study; your results are numerous, fascinating, and well-detailed, but sometimes they aren't presented clearly. At first, it is more difficult to understand the results because the structure is not the traditional one. I would like to address a few additional points in particular about your article:

Title: The title seems a little uninteresting and unclear to me; perhaps the author could include a little summary of the study or its findings?

Abstract: The procedures and findings are not made evident enough; I would recommend providing more detailed information so the abstract to give a sense of the study's findings. Furthermore, there is a significant difference between the conclusions in the paper and the abstract.

Background: I would advise the author to provide additional details regarding the article's study object and to more precisely state the purpose of this paper in the final section.

chapter which contains background, please emphasize what phenomenon you encountered so that it becomes the topic of your research, of course supported by relevant data

Materials and procedures:

The research method is good. I think the author should have positioned this paragraph before the results. I believe there should be more information about the SHARE study, such as what kind of survey it was. Were there any criteria for inclusion and exclusion? I propose that the writer explain

the results and discussion are quite good, add your opinion to the discussion which is supported by theory

Conclusions must answer the research objectives

