



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_41931
Title of the Manuscript:	SAVINGS FOR RETIREMENT IN MALAYSIA: DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF EMPLOYEES
Type of the Article	Original (Research)

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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Recommended title: Profile of Employment Provident Fund (EPF) Contributors and Their View Towards EPF Scheme Abstract need to be improved. Author should include sampling, brief profile of respondents and policy implication. In the abstract author did mention about the "peers effect". However, there is no finding related to this. Problem statement not clearly discussed and still vague. Author should discuss what this topic so important to be studied? Too much discussion on US retirement scheme (401K). Author should highlight the retirement issues in Malaysia. For example, longer life expectancy and Malaysian moving towards aged nation in 2030. Poor financial management of Malaysian employees and retirees. There are many studies have been done in this topic. Author should provide literature review section. Highlight what have been done in the local and international context on social security. What is the underpinning theory in developing the theoretical framework? Need further improve for method section. There is no description on sampling frame and selection of respondents. Any good justification for 300 respondents? Why unequal number for past and existing employees? No explanation on instrument measurement. How about reliability and validity of the instrument. Table 1 – Why majority for Malay ethnicity? Table 1 and Table 2 should have total number (n) Table 4: Title should be "Views from Respondents on EPF Scheme" Conclusion section is too brief and author should tie up with the findings and not giving on general statements. There is no policy recommendation.	The proposed title was adjusted accordingly. Abstract has been improved via including the descriptions on the chosen sampling, respondents' profile, results of the study and policy implication. The details on the peers' effect were excluded due to insufficient evidences. Problem statement was duly revised with more inclusion of highlights on the EPF scheme and related issues in Malaysia. If there is an explanation on the 401K and IRA plans, then this implies as a proxy or comparison against the EPF scheme and related scenarios in Malaysia. Well-taken points and actions were done accordingly in the literature review section. This is not a quantitative paper so the underpinning theory is not needed. The section on methodology was accordingly revised with corresponding descriptions on the used snowball sampling method. On potential respondents, the questionnaires were initially distributed among 700 respondents, of which, this study successfully managed to secure feedbacks from 300 respondents only. Since there is no control on the outcomes of the survey, it turns out that there is an unequal number for past and existing employees. Also, the explanation on instrument measurement was incorporated together with the use of Reliability Test; Cronbach Alpha to check for reliability and validity of the instrument. Table 1 - Given the major population of Malaysia is Malay people, there is a higher chance for a study to get such result as well since no control on the outcomes of the survey. Table 1 and Table 2 (and Table 3 as well)– Total number (n) of corresponding respondents can be found in the main text before the details in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 are reported, respectively. The section on conclusion was duly revised with the consolidation of findings and policy implication/recommendation.
Minor REVISION comments	There current paper is only a descriptive study. Author may need to think for a more advance analysis.	This paper is meant for a descriptive/explanatory-typed of study. The given comment serves as a good suggestion for future studies.
Optional/General comments	Update your references	References were accordingly updated.