

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

Karen Cordovil¹

¹ Oswaldo Cruz Foundation

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

Congratulations for your work.

I found it original and very important in the epidemiological scenario in which we live, as many countries' populations are aging.

I will make some considerations to increase the chance of being published.

1) Title

- I think the title is not reflecting the essence of your work.

2) Abstract

- The organization of the sessions that should appear in an abstract is unclear.
- The methods and results are not being presented clearly and objectively.

3) Introduction

- the objective of the Abstract differs from the objective of the Introduction.

4) Methods

- The Methodology session is not presented after the introduction
- The methodology session lacks sub sessions such as type of study, study scenario, research subjects (with inclusion and exclusion criteria), data acquisition, or data collection
data analysis, statistical analysis, and ethical issues

5) Results

- The tables presenting the main characteristics of the population are not presented in the results.

In general, the work requires better organization of the sessions in the format of a scientific article.

I leave you to read:

Hoogenboom BJ, Manske RC. How to write a scientific article. Int J Sports Phys Ther. 2012 Oct;7(5):512-7. PMID: 23091783; PMCID: PMC3474301.

Ecarnot, M.-F. Seronde, R. Chopard, F. Schiele, N. Meneveau,

Writing a scientific article: A step-by-step guide for beginners, European Geriatric Medicine, Volume 6, Issue 6, 2015, Pages 573-579, ISSN 1878-7649, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurger.2015.08.005>.