

## Reviewer comment-1

\*\*\*\* (Please see my comments in red)

In APA, the author must put the page number for direct quotations. The word "church" is capitalized when it is not being used as a proper noun. (page number for direct quotations were added and the word "church" was no longer capitalized when not being used as a proper noun)

The headings and subheadings do not follow APA style. The Introduction/Lit Review section is too detailed and confusing. By the end of the first page or two, the reader should understand what this paper is about. In this case, I was on page 6 before I read what this current study was investigating. (The introduction heading was changed to indicate on page 2 that this is a literature review)

Its overall length needs cut, as well. Methods - this section should describe the quantitative process, including sampling procedure, the instruments' reliability and validity, etc. It seems the survey was comprised of two standardized scales, but they did not include citations for those scales. Further, the article states it is about "spirituality," but it seems entirely focused on Christianity. (The methods section was organized to better explain the quantitative process, sampling and spirituality was changed to say "christian" as this was the focus and wanting the reader to be more clear on the scope).

References within the scale to "Church" and "the Bible" indicate a bias towards religious views of just one faith. I'm not sure that the instrument is sufficiently able to measure the spirituality of people from other faiths. Table 1 - would be more beneficial if it showed percentages, rather than frequencies, although knowing someone has tried a substance one time does not really indicate anything at all. (The scope was made clear to measure for people who practice the Christian faith).

A more helpful measure would be using the substance routinely. A table with the demographic information would also be helpful, as we only know how many were Latino or African American, but we do not know the other races or ethnicities present. (Table 1 shows routine usage of the different substances. Also, the results sections describes race demographics to include Latino, AA and other races).

Table 2 seems less a measure of spirituality and more a measure of Christianity. If a Buddhist were to complete this survey, it would not appear that they are spiritual at all. In terms of the ANOVA, it was unclear where these three groups came from. What was different between the groups? (The article title, and scope were changed to describe this study was completed on individuals from the Christian faith only).

It was mentioned that one group has been sober for less than a year and one group was actively using, but it was not clearly explained how many were in each group and whether the groups were equivalent in their demographic makeup. I disagree with the author's conclusion that the findings of this study contribute to the body of literature. (The conclusion was re-written to describe how these Christian spiritual practices can be protective factors for relapse prevention).

The methods used do not control enough for other variables that could be impacting the outcomes. Their conclusions draw from both spirituality and religious practices; however, they do not measure spirituality with these instruments, and it is limited to only Christian religious practices. If they wanted to revised the article to specifically state that it is measuring how Christianity affects sobriety, then it would be more fitting; however, better descriptions of the data analysis would be required. (The conclusion was re-written to describe how these Christian spiritual practices can be protective factors for relapse prevention).

## **Reviewer comment-2**

Title of the manuscript is not clearly defined and not correlated with the research findings. (The title of the manuscript was changed per reviewer's #2 comments here)

the abstract of the article comprehensive- Too brief. (The abstract was re-written and edited per reviewer's comments)

Literature part is not organized well Methodology part is not clear No discussion on findings, Not adhere to APA 7th version. (The literature review section was edited and expanded for better organization. A conclusion and clinical implication section was added and edited to adhere to APA 7<sup>th</sup> version format).

### **Specific Comments:**

1. Organization of the literatures cannot articulate clearly the research gap and research questions. (Reviewer's comments addressed and edited in this section)
2. The operationalization of the definition of spirituality and relapse prevention in relation to the measurement used in this study was unclear. (Reviewer's comments addressed and edited in this section)
3. The Section of methodology was unclear, including sampling methods, inclusion and exclusion criteria. (Reviewer's comments addressed and edited in this section)

4. Unclear and missing concrete research questions and hypothesis. (Reviewer's comments addressed and edited in this section)
5. Lack of discussion of the findings. (Reviewer's comments addressed and edited in this section)
6. Conclusion are not grounded on findings, (Reviewer's comments addressed and edited in this section)