

Reviewer-1

The manuscript is important for the scientific community because it provides empirical evidence on the implementation and outcomes of a community-based time bank program, a relatively underexplored approach to promoting social capital, mutual aid, and community wellbeing. The study's large, stratified sample and multi-site comparison offer valuable insights into how different models of time banking operate and affect participants' social, emotional, and practical lives. Its findings can inform both policymakers and researchers interested in community development, aging populations, and social innovation programs.

The current title is generally suitable as it clearly indicates the focus on the "Time Bank Multi-Empowerment Program" and its implementation across multiple townships in Taiwan. However, it could be made more concise and highlight both the outcomes and impacts for clarity. An alternative title could be: "Implementation and Life Impacts of Taiwan's Time Bank Multi-Empowerment Program Across Six Townships" Or: "Exploring the Social and Personal Outcomes of Time Bank Programs in Taiwan's Communities" These alternatives emphasize both the program and its effects, making the focus immediately clear to readers.

The abstract is generally comprehensive. It clearly states the study's aim, research sites, sampling strategy, participant demographics, key findings on perceived benefits and life impacts, and the identification of township-level time bank models. It effectively summarizes the scope, methodology, and main results, giving readers a clear overview of the study. However, it could be slightly improved by briefly mentioning the methods of analysis (e.g., chi-square tests for site comparisons) and the overall implications of the findings, which would make it more informative for readers scanning the abstract.

The English quality of the article is generally understandable and conveys the research findings, but it is not fully polished for scholarly communication. Some sentences are long and complex, and there are minor grammatical and phrasing issues that may reduce clarity and readability. Suggestions for improvement: Break long sentences into shorter, clearer statements to improve readability.

Use consistent terminology (e.g., "exchange activities" vs. "redemption") throughout the manuscript. Review subject-verb agreement, article usage, and prepositions for grammatical accuracy. Consider having a professional copyeditor or a native English speaker familiar with academic writing review the manuscript for style and flow. These changes would enhance clarity, readability, and overall scholarly presentation.

Title The current title conveys the general topic but is somewhat long and complex, which may reduce immediate clarity for readers. It could be more concise and focused on the key

aspects of the study: the program, the locations, and the outcomes. Alternative title suggestions: Implementation and Impact of Taiwan's Time Bank Multi-Empowerment Program Across Six Townships Exploring Individual, Community, and Organizational Outcomes of Taiwan's Time Bank Program Time Banking in Taiwan: Participation, Benefits, and Community Transformations Evaluating the Effects of Time Bank Multi-Empowerment Programs in Taiwanese Communities These alternatives aim to be concise, clear, and reflective of the study's scope and findings.

Introduction The introduction provides a clear background on the concept of time banking and situates the study within Taiwan's context, emphasizing the government's promotion of symbiotic communities and the adaptation of traditional labor exchange practices. It also explains the research gap by noting departures from Euro-American models, justifying the study's focus on local implementation outcomes. **Suggestions for improvement:** Consider providing a brief review of relevant international literature to better position the study in the broader scientific context. Clearly state the research questions or hypotheses toward the end of the introduction. Streamline some sentences for clarity and conciseness to improve readability. Overall, the introduction effectively establishes the study's relevance but could benefit from a sharper focus on the study's objectives and contribution to the literature. ---Literature Review / Theoretical

Framework The manuscript provides some discussion of the time bank concept and its evolution from Euro-American models to Taiwan's traditional labor exchange practices, which serves as a foundation for the study. It references prior research on social capital and community participation, linking these ideas to the potential benefits of time banking. **Strengths:** Connects the study to the local cultural context, which strengthens the relevance of the research. Highlights the theoretical rationale for exploring time bank impacts on individuals, communities, and organizations. **Weaknesses / Suggestions:** The literature review is somewhat limited and could benefit from more engagement with both international and regional studies on time banking, mutual aid, and social capital. The theoretical framework could be more explicitly articulated, explaining how specific theories (e.g., social capital, community resilience, or exchange theory) guide the research design and interpretation of results. Consider integrating previous empirical findings to justify the selection of indicators for perceived benefits and life impacts. Overall, the section establishes a foundation but would be stronger with a more comprehensive literature review and clearer theoretical connections. **Results/Findings** The Results/Findings section is thorough, presenting detailed data on both perceived benefits of time bank exchanges and the life impacts of participation. The use of tables, radar charts, and chi-square analyses effectively conveys quantitative patterns across different townships.

Strengths:

Clear reporting of descriptive statistics, mean scores, and proportions, which makes the findings transparent and interpretable. Inclusion of comparative analyses across six sites highlights variability and contextual differences, adding depth to the results.

Visualizations (radar charts, line charts) enhance readability and help summarize complex data. Weaknesses / Suggestions: Some tables (e.g., chi-square analyses) are dense and may overwhelm readers; consider summarizing key results in text and moving full tables to an appendix. The narrative could more explicitly link numerical results to the research questions or hypotheses. Consider highlighting the most meaningful or surprising findings to improve focus, rather than reporting every single variable in sequence. Briefly discussing the effect sizes or practical significance, not just statistical significance, would strengthen the interpretation. Overall, the section effectively presents comprehensive findings, but the clarity and interpretive depth could be improved with better summarization and emphasis on key results.

Discussion

The Discussion section thoughtfully interprets the study's findings and situates them within the broader context of community development and time bank literature.

Weaknesses / Suggestions:

The discussion could better address limitations of the study, such as sample representativeness, potential self-report bias, and generalizability to other regions. Some interpretations are descriptive rather than analytical; deeper exploration of why certain townships exhibited different exchange patterns would strengthen the section. Consider explicitly connecting results to theoretical frameworks mentioned earlier, to show how findings support, extend, or challenge existing literature. Recommendations for future research could be more specific, indicating clear avenues for follow-up studies. Overall, the Discussion effectively contextualizes the findings, but adding critical reflection and stronger links to theory would enhance its scholarly contribution.

Conclusion

The Conclusion section effectively summarizes the main findings and emphasizes the positive impacts of the Time Bank Multi-Empowerment Program on individuals, communities, and organizations. Strengths: Concisely reiterates key outcomes, including increased trust, happiness, and sense of belonging among participants. Highlights the diversity of township-level models, demonstrating the program's adaptability across different community contexts. Emphasizes the practical implications for community development and social policy. Weaknesses / Suggestions: Could more explicitly acknowledge the study's limitations to provide a balanced perspective. Recommendations for practice and future research are somewhat general; specifying actionable steps or policy considerations would strengthen the conclusion. Linking the conclusion back to the

theoretical framework would reinforce the scholarly contribution. Overall, the conclusion is clear and informative but could be enhanced with more critical reflection and concrete recommendations.

The references in this manuscript are generally appropriate and demonstrate a strong grounding in both foundational and contemporary scholarship on time banking, social capital, and community development. The inclusion of classic works (e.g., Bourdieu, Coleman, Putnam) provides a solid theoretical foundation, while recent studies (2023–2025) show awareness of current research trends, especially regarding digital platforms, aging populations, and international time bank practices. Strengths: Broad coverage of both theoretical and applied perspectives. Includes recent empirical studies and international comparisons, which strengthens the manuscript's relevance. Properly cites sources on methodology, program implementation, and social outcomes. Weaknesses / Suggestions: Some references, particularly online resources (e.g., Boyle, 2011; Cahn, 2009), could be updated or supplemented with peer-reviewed literature to ensure scholarly rigor. While most references are in English, several are in Chinese; consider including translations or summaries for international readership. A few seminal studies on co-production and community engagement could be added to further contextualize the findings in a global framework. Overall, the references are sufficient and mostly recent, but minor updates and additions could improve comprehensiveness and accessibility for the scientific community.

Your manuscript offers several notable strengths, including a rich and substantial dataset with 204 participants, clear organization of the results, and strong cultural grounding through your integration of Taiwan's huan-gong tradition into the time-bank model. The overwhelmingly positive responses across all benefit and life-impact items provide compelling evidence of participant satisfaction and meaningful engagement, and your multi-site comparisons add valuable insight into how different community contexts shape these experiences. These elements position your study as an important contribution to understanding time banks as culturally embedded forms of mutual support.

At the same time, several areas could be strengthened to enhance the manuscript's analytical rigor and overall impact. The theoretical frameworks referenced earlier in the paper, particularly those related to social capital, reciprocity, and community resilience, are not fully integrated into the interpretation of the results. More explicit linkage between your findings and these theories would increase conceptual clarity. The analysis itself relies heavily on descriptive statistics, and while these are useful, they limit the depth of your conclusions. Including additional analyses, discussing potential confounding variables, or providing interpretive insights beyond numerical patterns would enrich the findings.

The uniformly positive responses also raise methodological questions that remain unaddressed. The manuscript would benefit from acknowledging possible response biases,

such as social desirability or limited critique among participants, and considering whether any challenges or negative experiences emerged.

Additionally, greater detail about your measurement instruments, including how items were developed, whether reliability was assessed, and how sampling was conducted across sites, would improve transparency and strengthen the credibility of the results. In places, the narrative repeats descriptive statistics without offering deeper interpretation, and the observed differences across sites, such as Dalin's consistently high ratings and Dapi's lower ones, require more conceptual explanation.

Finally, while the manuscript highlights the unique features of Taiwan's model, the contribution to the global time-bank literature could be further articulated by specifying what lessons can be generalized beyond the Taiwanese context. Addressing these areas would significantly enhance the clarity, analytical strength, and overall contribution of the manuscript.