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Reviewer's report:

The draft describes a study on predictors of working beyond retirement in older workers with and without a chronic disease. Data come from a large cohort study which uses both administrative data and survey data. The topic is in the scope of the journal. However, the revision of the draft did not resolve my concerns with the statistical analyses.

1. The study aimed at predicting working beyond retirement in persons with and without chronic disease. The authors tried to explore if predictors are different (e.g. p4, line 12-14; p4, line 21-23: "It can be hypothesized that these differences between workers with and without chronic disease may also be present in the domains of health, social factors and socioeconomic factors."); p5, line 2-4: "However, it is unclear whether the large and vulnerable group of older workers with chronic diseases is different from those without chronic disease when it comes to working beyond retirement."); see also p14 and p16). Stratified analyses are not sufficient to clarify these differences. This still needs revision (interaction or segment-specific estimates; differences should be tested).

2. I am still not clear about the R2 measure that was used by the authors. In logistic regression there is no explained variance. There are some pseudo R2 measures (like McFadden R2 and Nagelkerke R2). There is also the McKelvey-Zavoina R2 that could be a choice if the authors want to describe explained variance. This still need to be clarified (please check the whole draft).

3. Table 2: The authors present 85 % CI intervals. This is not very common and may be fixed. Was it due the inclusion of variables if p<0.15?
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