

# Review of: "Cancer Mortality Among Women in the European Union: A Comprehensive Analysis of Economic, Social, and Health Factors"

Susanne Unverzagt<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of General Practice and Family Medicine, Martin-Luther Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This study examines the influence of various factors describing gender differences on cancer mortality in the European Union, based on an extensive literature review and a specific model.

The results could be used to guide policymakers in improving women's health in the EU.

Therefore, my main suggestion for further improvement of your very important article would be to enhance its readability. Explain your results in more detail in the abstract. What does a 55.0277 increase in cancer mortality mean (e.g., 55 more per 100,000 women would die of cancer)?

What does a -0.0003 reduction mean for an increase in gross national income per capita?

I would recommend shortening the introduction to the main points.

In the data and methods, results, and discussion, it would improve readability if you could use descriptive variable names (e.g., cancer deaths instead of Dc-w).

In your results section, I miss some interpretation of your results in Table 2 to Table 8 and Figure 2. At the moment, this article can be understood by biostatisticians, and it would be very important to include more doctors, guideline developers, and politicians or their advisors.

Could you shorten your conclusion and emphasise your main message?

Please check your limits. Is the first one really a limitation of your study?

It is my hope that these points will be of assistance in the explanation of your results to a wide range of readers.