Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Point 1: [former #2] The author/s have operated a number of changes; however, the issue stands still. The author/s declare that "This research focuses on the role of servant leaders and their effects on employees' [work] engagement". As the title questions if "Servant Leadership Stimulates Sustainable Psychology", it remains to the author/s to document and demonstrate the relationship between the two {*employees'* [work] *engagement*; *sustainable psychology*} – which looks difficult (as one is a research variable and the second is a concept defining a scientific domain – psychology of sustainability). To make things more confused, the Abstract states the identity "sustainable psychology (*i.e.* wellbeing)". Before going to the research part, these elements should be clarified conceptually (theoretically).
Therefore, it is strongly recommended: that title of the proposed paper, its Abstract, keywords, and content should be all aligned around the research hypotheses and research model (Figures 1 and 2). It is also suggested to mark the hypotheses' places in the Figure 1.

Response 1: Dear reviewer, we appreciate your detailed review of our manuscript, which has only improved its quality. We have revised the title, abstract, and keywords as well as adjusting Figure 1.

Point 2: [former #5] The newly introduced phrase (rows 44-47) does not address the issue; it is neither documented by literature nor in-line with the research model. It might be an issue for the discussions section (?)

Response 2: we have revised the sentence to better deliver the meaning and context.

Point 3: [former #6 & #17] The author/s were careful and have switched "engagement" to "work engagement" across the paper; unfortunately, they missed a few (critical) in the Abstract. In the same line, it is suggested to reformulate the hypothesis 2 for precision and clarity: turn "servant leader" to "servant leadership" and "engagement" to "work engagement".

Response 3: We have corrected the noted issues.

Point 4: [former #7] The issue was not addressed; and the phrase was kept as it was (rows 71-74). The author/s make a promise ("this research focuses on …") which is not supported by their own research – neither by the research model, nor logically – as it refers to "long-term outcomes" and "performance […] after COVID-19".

Response 4: we have revised the section accordingly.

Point 5: [former #9 & #12] The issues of the sample representativeness and the results' applicability area should be discussed.

Response 5: We have added the information in the sampling and limitation section.

Point 6: [former #11} The author/s mentioned the place (not more than a relatively large country); yet the time-dimension remains imprecise (sometime "after the pandemic was controlled").

Response 6: we have added the time period during which the data was collected.

Point 7: [former #13] The author/s failed to highlight their original contributions (as an advance, as compared to the state-of-the-art literature).

Response 7: We have elaborated in this regard in the conclusion section.

Point 8: [former #14] It continues to be a single section (5.Conclusions and Implications) which looks mostly like discussions (results in line with existing theory) and it is rather hard to identify the paper conclusion/s and paper implications, distinctly.

Response 8: we have separated the two domains in this section.

Point 9: [former #15a] It looks like the author/s were quite confused – since it was strongly suggested to add/insert recommendations (*e.g.* to the main stakeholders, as a result of the research work), and they presented some future research possibilities – which is a notable confusion, obviously.

Response 9: We have elaborated on this matter in the conclusion section in accord with your suggestions. We have also separated theoretical and practical implications for further clarification. We hope that the adjustments meet and satisfy your concerns.

Point 10: [former #15b] Abstract announces "results can be beneficial for researchers and practitioners in psychology, leadership, education and other fields" (rows 24-25). These expected results were supposed to be exactly the recommendations expected by the reviewer (and many interested readers and stakeholders).

Response 10: We have revised the abstract with regards to your suggestions.

Point 11: It is strongly recommended to have the proposed paper revised by a native English speaker, mainly as phrase topic (i.e. place and order of words in the phrase; etc).

Response 11: we have revised the manuscript in its entirety and edited various sections to avoid such errors. Please inform us if there are any shortcomings that we might have missed.

We would like to once again thank you for your detailed and positive feedback that only led to increased overall quality of our manuscript. We hope that the edits and adjustments meet and satisfy your concerns.