

Reviewer's comment	Author's comment
<p>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"</p>	<p>The title has been revised in accordance with the reviewers' comments to <u>"Implementation and Life Impacts of Taiwan's Time Bank Multi-Empowerment Program Across Six Townships"</u></p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract has been revised in accordance with the reviewers' comments, with additional text incorporated (as indicated in red on page 1).</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The research background has been revised in accordance with the reviewers' comments, with additional text added (as indicated in red on page 2).</p> <p>The research questions and objectives have been revised in accordance with the reviewers' comments, with <u>three specific research questions</u> added (as indicated in red on page 3).</p>
<p>Weaknesses / Suggestion: 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.</p>	<p>The research design and methods have been revised in accordance with the reviewers' comments, with additional text added (as indicated in red on page 10).</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>The complete tables have been moved to the appendix at the end of the manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' comments (as indicated in red on page 27).</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>The conclusion and recommendations section has been revised in accordance with the reviewers' comments, with a <u>new seventh point added</u> on research limitations and directions for future research (as indicated in red on page 22).</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>The references have been expanded in accordance with the reviewers' comments.</p>

sufficient and mostly recent, but minor updates and additions could improve comprehensiveness and accessibility for the scientific community.	
---	--

<u>PART 2:</u>	
Reviewer's comment	
However, the abstract could benefit from a brief mention of the theoretical framework and policy implications to enhance clarity of scope.	The research design and methods have been revised in accordance with the reviewers' comments, with additional text added (as indicated in red on page 10).