

Reviewer-1

This cross-sectional study examines depression in a population that may not be the focus of many researchers. The findings provide some interesting points that could be used to direct future research and interventions.

Survey should be more specific to include the mental health issue and type of study design, example: “A Cross-sectional Study of Depression and Job Tenure in the Mongolian Workplace”

Sections of the paper covered the necessary information of the research.

Specific Comments:

The phrase “In this study” are used at the beginning of two paragraphs in Discussion and then in the Conclusion section. This seemed repetitive when read. Some other minor instances of writing and formatting could be “refined” to be more concise or to increase clarity.

With revisions as suggested above and in the questions/suggestions area, accept for publication.

Questions about, or suggested improvements to, the manuscript:

- Objectives and hypothesis should be stated more clearly in introduction.
- Were more specific inclusion/exclusion criteria used in the selection process of participants? Maybe provide more details about the “Purposive Sampling” method? Were all employees of these organization invited to participate? How many employees declined the invitation?
- Sources of information bias are noted. However, could there be issues with selection bias and misclassification of depression? This should be discussed.
- A discussion regarding sample size may be warranted, i.e. is the sample size adequate, how was the final sample size determined or was it?
- Should consider a flow diagram to describe participants eligible and excluded.
- Should discussion generalizability of study in discussion section.