



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMMR_7161
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Transitions in Employment, Ability and Motivation (STREAM): The design of a four-year longitudinal cohort study among 15,118 persons aged 45 to 64 years
Type of the Article	Study Protocols

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper deals with a very up-to-date problem, common to many European countries: the study of transitions in employment and work productivity among persons aged 45-64, in order to support sustainable employability. It is a cohort study, carried out in the Netherlands from 2010 to 2013: the methodology is correct and the sample based on power calculation is representative of the involved population. I agree with the Authors that the methodology could be applied to other countries in North Europe, such as Germany, Ireland and Denmark: however, it must be stressed that Southern European countries, such as Italy, France and Spain, are in a very different situation, with serious problem in employment and self-employment, with a very high unemployment rate. For this reason the results could not be generalized.</p> <p>Anyway, there are some points to be better elucidated on my mind. First, the cohort has been addressed in 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 and at last 57% of the initial invited sample completed the questionnaire. Did the Authors speculate about the reasons of the non-respondents? Has a selection bias to be excluded?</p> <p>One more point: even though the paper is aimed to present the design of the study, it could be worth to anticipate some results about the information gathered by the questionnaire. Do the Authors think that these results will be able to give a sight to the main determinants affecting the transitions in employment?</p> <p>At last, what they think to suggest about the management of the main problem – that is how “to support the development of work-related interventions or regulations promoting sustainable employability among older workers”? Some considerations about the final aim of the whole research are needed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It would be interesting to classify the type of work, (“blue collars”, “white collars” etc), in order to investigate the differences, if any, in the retirement time and in the transitions in employment in general.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The paper deals with a quite new subject for a medical journal (Journal of Medicine and Medical Research): I am sure it is a new but valuable trend in scientific research, as social sciences are more and more linked to health sciences, and work and elderly are relevant points for both to be investigated further. It is desirable that more studies in the field will be carried out in the next future.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer