

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_130654
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing the Level of Competency and Ethical Practice as Clinical Psychologists/Therapists
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript highlights the critical link between competency and ethical practices in delivering effective mental health care. 2. It provides a global perspective by incorporating insights from clinical psychologists in diverse cultural settings. 3. By focusing on evidence-based approaches like CBT and DBT, it addresses key therapeutic practices. 4. It offers timely solutions to modern challenges, such as maintaining confidentiality in the digital age. 5. The recommendations for education, training, and supervision contribute to advancing clinical psychology and ethical standards. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Clear but could be refined for better clarity and impact as "Enhancing Competency and Ethical Practices in Clinical Psychology and Therapy"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, capturing the core elements of the study, such as the focus on enhancing competency and ethical practices, the methodological approach, and the key findings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, focusing on competency and ethical practices in clinical psychology. It could be improved by clarifying key terms, exploring cultural influences, addressing ethical challenges in emerging technologies, and expanding on competency assessment and mentorship practices. Strengthening these areas would enhance its contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript provide a strong foundation, covering key areas such as clinical psychology, competency, and ethics. However, adding recent reviews on competency models, ethical issues in telepsychology and AI, and studies on cultural considerations in psychological practice would enhance the manuscript's relevance and depth. These additions will help expand the scope and ensure the manuscript stays current with emerging trends in the field.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is clear but could benefit from improvements in clarity, conciseness, and flow. Minor grammatical adjustments are needed to meet academic writing standards. Proofreading and editing would enhance precision and readability.	
Optional/General comments	The article is well-structured but requires clearer articulation, improved readability, and more detailed methodology. It would benefit from recent references and addressing minor grammatical issues. Expanding on findings and implications could enhance its scholarly contribution. With these revisions, the article can make a stronger impact.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	R. Naganandini
Department, University & Country	Vinayaka Mission's Annapoorana College of Nursing, Vinayaka Missions Research Foundation, Deemed to be University, India