Enhancing Support Mechanisms in Rehabilitation Counseling: A Pathway to Independence

James. Ma[1], Seyed Alireza Saadati[1*]

[1] Rehabilitation Department, York Rehab Clinic, Toronto, Canada

* **Corresponding author email address**: ar.saadati@yorkrehabclinic.ca

Editor	Reviewers
Seyed Hadi Seyed Alitabar Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada hadialitabar@kmanresce.ca	**Reviewer 1:** Gholamreza Zourmand Department of Physical Education and Sport Science, Huanggang Normal University, Huanggang, China. Email: gh.zourmand@hgnu.edu.cn **Reviewer 2:** Mehdi Rostami Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paper presents a coherent argument for enhancing support mechanisms in rehabilitation counseling. However, the transitions between sections could be smoother to guide the reader more effectively through the argumentation. Specifically, the leap from discussing evidence-based practice to professional identity and then to organizational issues feels abrupt. Introducing subheadings or a brief overview of the argument structure at the beginning could improve readability and coherence.

The research question is relevant and significant; however, it lacks depth in its current formulation. Expanding on how specific support mechanisms can be enhanced would offer a clearer direction for the paper. For example, identifying particular evidence-based practices or technological innovations that have shown promise in rehabilitation counseling could provide a more focused inquiry.

The literature review is comprehensive, citing significant works in the field. However, it could benefit from a more critical analysis of the literature. Discussing the limitations of current studies or conflicting findings could offer a richer context for your argument. Additionally, incorporating recent literature would ensure the review's timeliness.

The paper would be strengthened by including case studies or empirical data to support its claims. While the theoretical discussion is valuable, concrete examples or data would provide tangible evidence of the effectiveness of proposed enhancements in support mechanisms.

The writing is generally clear, but there are instances where sentences are overly complex, potentially obscuring meaning. Simplifying these sentences and avoiding jargon when possible would make the paper more accessible to a broader audience. Additionally, careful proofreading is needed to correct minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies in citation formats.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Introduce subheadings to structure the argument more clearly.
Deepen the research question by specifying aspects of support mechanisms to be explored.
Enhance the literature review with critical analysis and recent studies.
Incorporate empirical data or case studies to substantiate theoretical claims.
Simplify complex sentences and ensure the text is free of grammatical errors.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.