Review comment-1

The manuscript addresses a meaningful gap in motivational interviewing (MI) research: assessing the compatibility of helpers' beliefs and attitudes with the spirit of MI. This is relevant for training, supervision, and implementation across helping professions. However, the study's contribution is limited by weak internal consistency and insufficient conceptual grounding in literature. The potential impact is promising but requires refinement.

The title needs revision because it is overly technical. A clearer alternative could be: "Validating the Beliefs and Attitudes About Helping Questionnaire: An Exploratory Factor Analysis". TI think this could give emphasis to both the instrument and the validation process.

It omits key details such as sample demographics, methodological rigor, and implications. It should specify participant characteristics, factor structure, and limitations more clearlyThe manuscript provides context with less depth in reviewing existing MI-related scales that has been utilized. The Method describes sampling and analysis, with a more detail on item development for the author emphasis is on the instrument itself and conceptual grounding is needed.

The tables are informative, where interpretation of negative loadings (e.g., item 2) is weak. In the discussion, it identifies limitations but does not fully explore implications for scale refinement or practice.

References are relevant but not sufficiently recent. More recent psychometric validation studies and MI implementation literature should be included.

IRB approval is mentioned, details are minimal. Explicit reporting of ethical safeguards is needed.

The manuscript demonstrates potential and yet requires major revision. The questionnaire is promising, yet methodological weaknesses (low Cronbach's alpha, unclear conceptualization, limited sample diversity) reduce confidence in its current form. Clarify whether the questionnaire is newly developed or adapted from existing scales. Provide stronger conceptual justification for item development. Re-examine negative loadings and revise problematic items. Expand discussion of implications for training and practice. Update references to include recent psychometric and MI implementation studies. Ensure consistent terminology (e.g., empowerment vs. evocation).