

Review of: "How Social Infrastructure Saves Lives: A Quantitative Analysis of Japan's 3/11 Disasters"

Go Shimada¹

¹ Meiji University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I really enjoyed reading this work. Social infrastructure is an important theme to study. The value of this research is to examine it quantitatively using experimental methods. This paper is exciting. I have two comments and one question.

(Comments)

1. To understand better on this analysis, it would be better to describe a little bit more on 138 treated group areas and 424 control group areas. Where are these neighbourhoods? Are they close to each other or scattered across three prefectures? If there is any description of the treated and control groups, it helps us better understand the difference. In this regard, it would be helpful to include descriptive statistics of both groups and overall.

2. I also think it would be better to use the term "comparison group" rather than "control group". The control group suggests there is an intervention for another group, but not this group (such as RCT). This study is different.

(Question)

Is it possible to distinguish social infrastructure from physical infrastructure? For instance, if there is no road to access a community center, the center will not function. It seems to me there is a complementarity of both infrastructures rather than social or physical infrastructure.