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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) The aim of the study is unclear. The author tried to describe the relevance of the paper in the last paragraph of the introduction, but the last two sentences of the introduction do not follow a rational reasoning. It remains unclear what the aim of the study is. This makes it more difficult to understand why the researchers choose to assess the variables described in the method section.

2) I feel that the results should be described more clearly in the results section. The researchers refer to the tables, but do not describe the findings in the main text.

3) The conclusion is not clear, partly because there is not a clear aim and research question.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) In the results section of the abstract the last sentence is very long and combines two findings that are of a different order (that is 1) characteristics of those who want complete retirement and 2) characteristics of those who are likely to work beyond 65). These should be presented separately.

2) It should be made clear in the introduction what the regulatory retirement age is in Australia.

3) Please be consistent throughout the text with the use of upper- and lowercase b’s when using the term ‘baby boomer’.

4) In the last paragraph of the introduction it would be more suitable to speak of ‘study’ instead of ‘analysis’ in the sentence ‘This analysis examines .... retirement intentions.’

5) The last sentence of the third paragraph of the introduction does not fluently follow the previous statements.

6) The heading ‘Data items’ is not informative; ‘Main variables’ might be more informative.

7) It is unclear how the statistical analyses used help answering research questions, which is partly due to the fact that no clear research questions were stated in the introduction of the paper (‘Statistical analyses’).

8) In the third paragraph of the discussion section the researchers state that the
‘popular stereotype that baby boomers are not savers and are not saving for their retirement needs to be challenged.’ I feel that this statement does not really fit the context of this study.

9) The first two sentences of the conclusion belong to the discussion section.

10) The third sentence of the discussion is unclear and needs to be revised.

Discretionary Revisions

1) I was wondering why the researchers decided not to assess whether the job was stressful. The researchers did assess psychological distress, but not whether this was related to a job. Job-stress can be an important contributor why people want to retire (the researchers actually state in their discussion).

2) In order to use household income as indicator for wealth, I feel it should be related to the number of people in the household or for example to the perceived financial needs.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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