The description comparing World Bank’s retiree’s [longevity](http://dict.youdao.com/w/eng/longevity/?spc=longevity#keyfrom=dict.typo) with the case of United States is not an unbiased comparison. First, the sample of U.S., includes only man and woman reaching age of 65 today. There’s an obvious selection bias here. In the sample of World Bank, it includes everyone that retirees and deceased in the past 6 years. Therefore, there are people in the World Bank sample died prior to the age of 65. While in the sample of US, this group of people were excluded. The US sample selected a group of “healthier” people in the first place.

Second, there should be more factors to be controlled rather than simple comparison, factors such as racial and ethnic composition, gender, occupation, education level, income level, etc. These factors of World Bank retirees could be significantly different from the average case of United States, which might potentially cause the difference of longevity in a significantly positive or negative way.

Of course, these are difficult to measure, that’s fine and understandable. But World Bank has many people from developing or under-developed countries, who only came to World Bank in their 40s and even 50s. By that time, their health might have deteriorated in their home countries, where standard of living is lower compared to the US. I also searched online and got a World Bank’s income distribution, we know that salaries for grade E and below are merely okay even accounting for tax exemption. So, it might be useful to have a separate distribution for this kind of low-income retirees (a minor issue though compared to the selection bias and entrance into US issues mentioned earlier).

In summary, the conclusion above was not made on a thoughtful and thorough basis.