



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>2013_BJMMR_7161</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>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</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Study Protocols</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	No major comments	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>This study is based on interesting concepts, two of which could be further highlighted/explained to the reader.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “sustainable employability” seems a very important concept to the framework and it also comes specified early, in line 25. It could become defined even earlier: in the abstract, for example before the last two words.</li> <li>- “work productivity” is a more problematic concept; it is here defined probably differently from the way it appears to employers and practicing supervisors – there, person-level productivity may be assessed with performance figures or €-based ratings of achieved tasks/services/products per time, measures of interest to working life. Here however, work productivity is based on the indirect indices and predictors identified in earlier studies, gathered from the respondents themselves, not from workplaces (registered data later may provide with other possibilities, though probably only for subgroups). In any case, the concept warrants to be a bit more clearly specified, as the ultimate goal is in deepening the understanding needed for development of interventions across the lines of working life. It appears that the concept is about “self-reported indirect measures of work productivity” –the authors most probably find a definition that is more fluent, or can add some wordings to provide explicit definition.</li> </ul>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>In the results and discussion section line 422-&gt; the authors could discuss the potential role of selection (with response rate 70% the most active 70% may belong to the study population) in addition to the role of changing regulations, well worth noting.</p> <p>Ideally, the representativity of the sample as compared to the national statistics of employment groups (reference 4, listed in lines -&gt;39) could be stated.</p> <p>Line 447 VU abbreviation worth opening.</p> <p>Some spaces to be added between words in this otherwise very well-written paper.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>This study protocol is a description of a well-planned multidisciplinary research project with multi-faceted study material with rising potential as the registered data become added in the future. It deals with questions of rapidly emerging importance, has high-level scientific aims and with its large material has high potential relevance for policy makers and for those developing practices to support health and functioning in the society.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Leena Ala-Mursula</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Health Sciences, University of Oulu, Finland</b>