

Reviewer-2

The manuscript is not particularly compelling in its current state, but there is potential for major improvements.

The title does not capture the full spectrum of variables explored, particularly for occupational rank and the injustice of mental health problems among blue-collar workers compared to white- or pink-collar workers. This could be improved.

Missing key methodological details. See section 1.2 under Specific Comments.

1. Major Critiques

1.1 Title

- The title does not reflect the full range of variables explored, particularly occupational rank and its relationship to mental health disparities. Revision is necessary to better align with the study's content.

1.2 Abstract

- Missing essential details such as sample size, test statistics, and key statistical results.

1.3 Literature Review

- Requires reorganization to improve clarity and academic rigor:
 - Occupational ranks (pink, blue, white collar) are defined too late in the methods section. These definitions should be moved to the introduction.
 - The concept of "organizational justice" and "increased sensitivity" is introduced but lacks clear definitions and context.
 - Previous research is mentioned without clear links to specific citations, making it difficult to track the rationale for the study.
 - Greater emphasis is needed on identifying the gap in the existing literature and justifying the study's importance.

1.4 Methods

- Sampling method is unclear:
 - "Purposive sampling" is mentioned but not well-defined.
 - Response rate is not reported.
- The classification of job tenure appears arbitrary and lacks justification.

1.5 Regression Model

- Valliant approach defined but if properly applied, the use of the model in this manuscript's regression framework suggests the authors intended to:
 - Ensure that results are population-representative and robust to the survey's sampling structure.
 - Potentially address **survey design effects** in analysis? Not clear.
- More clarification needed on how the Valliant model was operationalized in the analysis.
- The manuscript should clearly describe how survey weights and design effects were incorporated.
- The **selection process for covariates** in the model must also align with this methodology.
- The Valliant approach supports parsimonious model-building techniques, so the inclusion of variables based on non-statistical criteria may not align with best practices.
- The "kitchen sink" approach is problematic, as it does not prioritize variables based on relevance or correlation.
- A stepwise model-building approach with variables selected based on a correlation table would be more appropriate before proceeding to refined set of variables in final model.
- The p-value threshold of 0.25 for including variables in the model is too high and should be reconsidered.

1.6 Key Findings

- Findings are difficult to interpret as presented:
 - Beta coefficients for PHQ and age are reported as significant, but the **effect size interpretation is unclear**. While beta coefficients provide insight into the relative importance of variables in the regression model, additional context (e.g., standardized effect size, R^2 , or the magnitude of the beta in practical terms) would enhance understanding of the findings. Furthermore, it may be helpful to include a correlation matrix to establish the initial relationships among variables before modeling.
 - The use of a double negative in describing the negative correlation is confusing. Consider rephrasing for clarity (e.g., "As one variable increases, the other decreases").

1.7 Discussion

- The discussion includes insightful points about policy and workplace conditions for blue-collar workers but could better tie these findings back to the concept of occupational justice.
- Paragraphs are dense and should be broken into shorter, more digestible sections.

1.8 Limitations

- The limitations section is good but could include more detail about the statistical approach, specifically the low threshold for variable inclusion in the exploratory model.

1.9 Future Directions

- Suggestions for future research and policy should more clearly link to workplace environments and actionable recommendations.
- Consider cultural factors specific to Mongolia, such as mental health stigma, and address their relevance to workplace mental health outcomes.

2. Minor Critiques

2.1 Tables and Figures

- Tables should be formatted in APA style with consistent fonts and styles.
- Figures use inconsistent fonts, which detracts from overall presentation.
- Landscape formatting could maximize space and condense content into a single page.

2.2 Measures

- Justification for including financial satisfaction is revisited in the measures section but should instead be addressed earlier in the introduction.

3. Additional Recommendations for Improvement

3.1 Reorganize Literature Review

- Move definitions of occupational ranks to the introduction.
- Clearly define "organizational justice" and other key concepts.
- Provide specific citations for prior research to clarify the rationale for the study.

3.2 Clarify Abstract and Findings

- Include key study details such as sample size and effect sizes in the abstract.
- Rephrase findings for clarity, particularly regarding correlation descriptions.

3.3 Enhance Methodology

- Clarify sampling method, response rates, and criteria for variable inclusion.
- Justify the classification of job tenure.

3.4 Refine Discussion and Future Directions

- Strengthen links between findings and occupational justice.
- Propose actionable policy recommendations.
- Address cultural factors relevant to Mongolia, including mental health stigma.

3.5 Improve Tables and Figures

- Ensure all tables and figures are in proper format with consistent styles.
- Use portrait or landscape formatting to condense content where appropriate.