

Peer Review

# Review of: "Actionable Health Investments for Longevity: Empowering Consumers to Shape the Healthcare Ecosystem"

Jens R. Coorssen<sup>1</sup>

1. Institute for Globally Distributed Open Research and Education (IGDORE), Tallinn, Estonia

I read "Actionable Health Investments for Longevity: Empowering Consumers to Shape the Healthcare Ecosystem" by Mittler-Matica et al. with great interest. I was not disappointed. I do, however, have a few minor comments that I hope will help the authors improve this manuscript still further.

1. The section between the Abstract and the Introduction might be subtitled a 'Prologue'. Or just include it in the Introduction.
2. In parallel with the "Exponential Growth in Proactive Care and Prevention Research" has been an exponential growth in fly-by-night offers, snake oil, and charlatanism, often in a well-camouflaged guise of scientific nomenclature. The hype cycle begins, continues, and finally ends, if at all, when enough consumers realize they have been taken in. While this is superficially addressed from pages 7-8, I feel it certainly deserves more emphasis. Personal responsibility is indeed critical, as is empowerment, as noted later in the article, but there is also the issue that many in the population are susceptible to hype because they simply are not equipped to critically sort through the (pseudo)scientific claims being made. Please add comment.
3. The propensity to jump on recent scientific findings, even when only in animal models, before they are fully vetted. Somewhat related to the point immediately above. Please add comment.
4. Page 7 - despite limited scientific studies on what a switch to more proactive healthcare might mean to populations, there are studies of specific groups. At least a sentence or so commenting on what these indicate would be useful.

5. There is also an issue that ‘vetted practitioners’ often are not, or have questionable backgrounds in terms of areas of expertise they now claim. This is true of MDs who claim a background in areas that they really have no training in (but hey, people will believe just about anything if a ‘physician’ tells them it is so!), to ‘functional medicine’ practitioners who have taken a course through an institution in the USA but often have no serious medical background (or even an education in biology); there is a reason that medical associations in most countries (which, admittedly, have their own issues) do not recognize this training.
6. Page 9 – first sentence: “Over time, especially in Western and Central Europe, the consumer or patient expects the system to guide him through his healthcare journey and has an all-inclusive health mentality.” Make the sentence gender-neutral.
7. Page 9 – would be more broadly relevant if this had a more global rather than solely European focus. Similarly, on page 10, the finances refer specifically to Germany. Yes, I understand that is where the authors work, but I think it is important to emphasize the broader relevance of the issue being addressed. The published paper deserves that wider audience.
8. While accessible health platforms and biohacking are on the rise in terms of usage, another issue is that one can’t take much (or any) of these data to your regular healthcare provider because they don’t know what to do with the information, assuming they even understand it! Many, if not most, refuse to even look at it. What is the proactive individual to do?
9. Having relatives in Europe (as well as North America), I can say with some confidence that the first response to the suggestion of reducing ‘recreation/leisure’ spending and diverting it to personal wellness would likely be “but vacations and leisure time/spending are relaxing and thus good for my health, especially my mental health.” How best to address such arguments?
10. Overall, there are still the costs, although I agree that the authors have provided sound rationale. Thus, this plan is still not universal by any means and, although not solely for the ‘rich,’ it would likely still be unattainable by marginalized sectors of society. How large are those groups?
11. The integrated summary on page 18 is really quite good!

## Declarations

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.