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Reviewer's report:

This is a re-submission of a description of a large-scale examination of workplace sexual harassment and its impact on depression. The authors modified the title appropriately and I am satisfied with how they handled analyzing the data by gender. Their decision to keep the organizational factors in the manuscripts is not scientifically justified, however, and these factors continue to detract from the manuscript. Specifically, the authors have chosen to keep the organizational factors in the manuscript because they "were part of our study aims." They argue that it is important to publish null results, which I agree with completely IF there had been any justification for the inclusion of the factors in the first place. The authors have not offered any justification for examining the organizational factors, and I believe it's because there is no empirical or theoretical justification. If there is, they should include it. If there is no justification for why there were in the study aims in the first place, they should remove this from the analyses. This would leave a much more straightforward article.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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