

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". I think this could give emphasis to both the instrument and the validation process. **Title was revised to the provided suggestion.**

It omits key details such as sample demographics, methodological rigor, and implications. It should specify participant characteristics, factor structure, and limitations more clearly. The 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. **Participant characteristics were provided in Table 1. The factor structure was more clearly delineated in the results section (pp. 12-14). Limitations were expanded upon (pp. 17-18). The development of the questionnaire was given more explanation (pp. 7-9).**

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. **The loadings were better refined/explained with the Chronbach's alpha for each subscale in the Discussion section and Recommendations for Scale Refine section that was added (pp. 13-19).**

References are relevant but not sufficiently recent. More recent psychometric validation studies and MI implementation literature should be included. **I researched some of the most recent research on validation studies related to MI. There isn't much out there but I did add a review of a somewhat similar tool in the Literature Review section.**

IRB approval is mentioned, details are minimal. Explicit reporting of ethical safeguards is needed. **More detail was added, "After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board, data were collected March 27, 2023, through May 5, 2023. Using a cross-sectional design, an online survey was used to collect the data. Participation was sought through email messages sent to all registered students within the university's health and human sciences college. Participants were informed that the research team was studying empathy**

among students enrolled in a variety of health and human science degrees, their participation was voluntary, and their responses were anonymous.”

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) [this was clarified in the Discussion] reduce confidence in its current form. Clarify whether the questionnaire is newly developed or adapted from existing scales [hopefully this is clearer in the Development of the Questionnaire section] Provide stronger conceptual justification for item development. Re-examine negative loadings and revise problematic items [again, this is reported in the Discussion now]. Expand discussion of implications for training and practice [I believe the questionnaire needs some refining though possible uses for the tool are discussed in the first part of the manuscript]. Update references to include recent psychometric and MI implementation studies. [several 2020 and newer studies were added] Ensure consistent terminology (e.g., empowerment vs. evocation).[Consistent terminology was updated]

Review comment-2

Yes. The findings of this study will contribute to the existing knowledge.

The authors mentioned a subsection as “Measure”. However, they are testing the psychometric properties of a scale. Therefore, use alternative suitable term. [Development of the Questionnaire]

Not sufficient. The authors should include more recent studies which also assess the psychometric properties of this scale in different contexts. [more similar scales were added to lit review; this questionnaire is unique.]

Specific Comments:

Chronbach’s alpha = 0.527, which is not up to the satisfactory level, may raise the reliability of the this instrument. The authors should also report the Chronbach’s alpha of each component. [This is added in the Discussion section and explained]

“The authors of this study are interested in assessing the baseline beliefs and attitudes of individuals entering into helping professions (beginning training in MI) and how these beliefs might influence their ability to learn and implement motivational interviewing into their professional practice.” For this purpose the scale need further cross cultural adaptation and psychometric validation of the instrument. [Yes, further refinement and testing is needed. I believe the revised draft addresses the need more revising]

The authors should make it clear in the abstract and in the manuscript-

Is this instrument reliable and valid to measure one's beliefs and attitudes about being a helper and helping others? [The revised manuscript noted, "The Attitudes and Beliefs About Helping Questionnaire provided a starting point for attempting to measure the spirit of MI. Overall, these findings support continued refinement and validation of the instrument and highlight the value of iterative psychometric testing in the development of measures grounded in complex relational constructs such as those informed by Motivational Interviewing."]