

Reviewer's Comment 1

1. Permanent Housing, Mental Health and Social Well-Being of people experienced homeless are important topics.
 - a. **Response:** We thank the reviewer for recognizing the importance and relevance of examining permanent housing alongside mental health and social well-being among people with lived experience of homelessness.
2. The title clearly indicates the methodology of the study but mental health and social well-being were not clearly defined.
 - a. **Response:** We appreciate this feedback and have added clear conceptual definitions of mental health and social well-being in the Introduction to align the manuscript with the study's title and analytic focus.
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.
 - a. **Response:** We have expanded the literature review to include focused discussion on mental health and social well-being in the context of permanent housing.
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?
 - a. **Response:** We have clarified the specific methodological modifications to QIMS and their rationale to improve transparency and reader understanding.

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.

Response: We appreciate this important distinction and have clarified our analytic approach to ensure that lived experience findings are derived exclusively from participants with direct experience of homelessness.

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.

Response: We have clarified the data source and coding process to specify that analysis focused on participant quotes extracted from the Results sections of included studies.

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.
 - a. **Response:** We clarified analytic boundaries by revising the Results section to ensure that lived experience findings are derived exclusively from participant quotations. Staff and administrator perspectives are used only to contextualize structural conditions and are not interpreted as lived experience.

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.

Response: We strengthened conceptual clarity in the Results section by explicitly linking synthesized themes to the study’s definitions of mental health and social well-being by facilitating interpretation across diverse contexts.

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.

Response: Thank you for this observation. In response, we revised Theme 5 to clarify the interpretive link between participant quotations and analytic conclusions. Specifically, we added language early in the theme to emphasize trust as a relational process grounded in participants’ lived experiences and to avoid over-conclusive interpretation.

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)?

Response: Thank you for this important observation. In response, we revised Theme 6 to ensure that interpretive claims remain grounded in the qualitative evidence. Specifically, we clarified that the theme reflects participants’ perceptions of stability and responsiveness within housing environments rather than formal program adaptation or individualized housing customization. We also adjusted the theme label and opening language to more accurately reflect what was coded from participant quotations.

Reviewer’s comment 2:-

1. The manuscript addresses a critical gap in homelessness and housing research by synthesizing qualitative lived experiences rather than focusing solely on quantitative outcomes. the title is clear and fits the subject matter.
 - a. **Response:** We thank the reviewer for this positive assessment and for recognizing the contribution of centering qualitative lived experiences in homelessness and housing research.
2. Overall the English is clear and professional. I found some minor issues, including typographical errors (e.g., “PERMNANENT HOUSING” header) and occasional repetitiveness across sections that could be streamlined.
 - a. **Response:** We corrected typographical errors and streamlined repetitive language across sections to improve clarity and readability.
3. References are relevant and include recent sources (2018–2022).

Suggestions:

- Add more recent literature on Housing First and supportive housing post-2022.
 - Include disability and intersectionality-focused housing studies to broaden scope.
 - **Response:** In response to this suggestion, we incorporated additional post-2022 literature on Housing First and permanent supportive housing and expanded the literature review to include disability- and intersectionality-informed housing research to broaden the manuscript’s scope.
3. **This manuscript makes a meaningful contribution to the scientific community by centering the lived experiences of individuals transitioning from homelessness to permanent housing. It is well written and seems methodologically sound. I would make the revisions suggested and any others to make this even stronger. Thank you for allowing me to review this article!**
- a. **Response:** We appreciate the reviewer’s thoughtful and encouraging feedback regarding the manuscript’s contribution and methodological soundness.