

Reviewer's Comment

1. Permanent Housing, Mental Health and Social Well-Being of people experienced homeless are important topics.

2. The title clearly indicates the methodology of the study. The article did not deliver the ambition goal of the first part of the title. Mental health and social well-being were not clearly defined.

3. Literature review: Good. It focuses on Housing first and Supportive Housing models. Given the title and analysis aims to examine “mental health and social well-being”, there should be literature review on these key concepts, which is lacking. “Barriers to Housing Stability” part did not address it.

4. Methods: I appreciate Authors' detailed explanation of this project. For the Modified QIMS, I gathered the modifications includes: individual credibility vs collective credibility; Rapid group analysis vs what? Anything else was modified?

This study aims to “locate qualitative research investigating the personal experiences of people moving from homelessness to stable housing”. Inclusive criteria includes “(2) focused on adults (18+ years) with lived experience of homelessness. Final selected samples are “The resulting sample included nine qualitative peer-reviewed studies that represented the viewpoints of 358 individuals with experiences of homelessness and recent placement in permanent supportive housing programs.” However, in Table 1, it shows 358 participants in the original studies are not all people experienced homelessness. There are staff, managers, other key informants. This is not consistent with the project's goal, which also affects the findings regarding lived experiences of people experienced homeless. Staff, Managers and other key informants' views are important, but they are not the focus of this project. Findings from non-homeless person should not be interpreted as lived experiences.

For Analysis, “The research team performed systematic line-by-line examination and created concise descriptive codes (2–5 words) to represent the fundamental aspects of participant experiences.” Did research team line-by-line examination of the original articles? Line-by-examination of the results section of the original articles? What exactly are the data? It would be helpful to educate the readers.

5. Results: The main concern is related to comments on participants in Methods section. Findings includes analysis, quotes and views of staff, and managers, not all people experienced homeless and living in permanent, supportive housing.

Secondly, key concepts of interest could be clarified. The title suggests mental health, social well-being, the themes includes “personal independence”, “community”. To generalize the findings across studies ranging from different countries and time periods, it is helpful to clearly define and build common understanding of key concepts.

The most intriguing finding is Theme 5 about building trust. It seems really speak about lived experience. While this is an interpretive analysis, some conclusive statements seem to build

on unclear evidence. For instance, Theme 6 “This theme demonstrates how adaptable and personalized housing programs promote stability, respect, and healing for individuals moving from homelessness.” The two quotes in this part did not indicate any “adaptation or personalized housing”. What were flexible housing that people experienced and authors refer to (coded)?