

Identifying Factors Facilitating Employment Readiness in Individuals With Physical Disabilities

Siti Hajar. Ismail¹, Allison. Wong^{2*}, Salma. Al-Hinai³

¹ Department of Developmental Psychology, Universiti Sains Malaysia, George Town, Malaysia

² Department of Developmental Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

³ Department of Psychology, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman

* Corresponding author email address: a.wong@queensu.ca

E d i t o r

Sennur Tutarel Kışlak^{id}
Department of Psychology/Faculty
of Language, History and
Geography, University of Ankara,
Ankara, Turkey
kislak@ankara.edu.tr

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Mahdi Khanjani^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University,
Tehran, Iran.
Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh^{id}
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran,
Iran.
Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The manuscript states that participants were recruited through “disability support organizations, online community networks, and vocational rehabilitation centers.” (paragraph 2, Methods). Please specify the names of major organizations or at least the types (governmental, nonprofit, advocacy-based) to strengthen transparency and replicability.

In paragraph 2 under “Measures”, the manuscript explains that the interview guide was based on literature and expert consultation. It would strengthen methodological rigor if the authors described how many experts were consulted and what criteria they met.

In the Methods, the authors state that “Saturation was achieved after 24 interviews...” without elaboration on the indicators used to determine saturation. Please clarify whether saturation was assessed at theme level, code level, or both.

In paragraph 1 of the Discussion, the sentence “This perspective is strongly supported by previous research...” makes global comparisons but does not delineate what is new about Canadian experiences revealed in your data. Strengthen the section by explicitly stating the study’s unique contribution to Canada’s policy landscape.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In paragraph 1 under “Data Analysis”, coding procedures are described, but the manuscript does not specify whether multiple coders were used. If so, please report inter-coder reliability or describe a consensus-building process.

In the Findings section, the demographics paragraph states that participants lived in several provinces, but the manuscript does not indicate urban vs. rural distribution, which may strongly shape employment accessibility. Consider adding this level of detail.

The demographic description lists “mobility impairments, neuromuscular conditions, chronic pain, limb differences...” (Findings, para 1). However, later thematic quotes primarily reflect mobility-based experiences. Please ensure representation of all disability categories through varied participant quotations.

In Table 1, several open codes (e.g., “decision-making control,” “self-paced training strategies,” “adaptive routines”) appear conceptually overlapping. Consider consolidating or clarifying distinctions between constructs like autonomy, adaptability, and self-management.

In the narrative following Table 1, positive experiences are richly illustrated. However, negative or contradictory cases (e.g., failed accommodations, lack of family support) are underrepresented. Including disconfirming evidence would strengthen validity.

The manuscript quotes participants frequently (e.g., “Learning new software made me feel like I could finally compete...”, Findings). While illustrative, too many anecdotal quotes without analytic synthesis may weaken thematic clarity. Consider reducing redundancy or adding analytic commentary following each quote.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.