

Peer Review

Review of: "Improving Counselor Supervision and Documentation Through the Integrated Supervision Casenote"

Ruth Falzon¹

1. Department of Counselling, University of Malta, Malta

The paper attempts to integrate three distinct types of models (Psychotherapy, Developmental, and Process). While ambitious, the distinction between the Discrimination Model (Process) and the Psychotherapy Model (Lens) becomes blurred in the case study. In the Discrimination Model section, one of the roles is Counsellor. In the Psychotherapy section, the lens is Person-Centered. The paper does not clearly explain how the Counsellor Role in the Discrimination model differs from applying the Person-Centered Lens. This risks redundant documentation or role confusion for the supervisor.

The authors postulate that the ISC is a tool for supervisor self-reflection. The current casenote template (Table 1) consists mostly of checkboxes. While checkboxes are efficient for administrative documentation, they are poor tools for deep qualitative self-reflection. The Notes section is the only place for narrative, but the paper does not provide a framework or prompts to guide the supervisor in *how* to use the ISC for self-critique beyond simply noticing which boxes they checked most often.

The case study of Holly and Joaquin is described as a hypothetical case example and composite characters. Because the case is hypothetical, the results feel too perfect. Every intervention Holly makes results in a linear developmental progression for Joaquin. To be more persuasive, the paper should address ruptures in the supervisory alliance or instances where the ISC helped a supervisor identify a mistake in real-time. Using a single, idealized hypothetical example limits the paper's face validity for experienced supervisors who deal with messy, non-linear development.

The paper claims the ISC is adaptable for various models (e.g., swapping Hogan for IDM). The table provided is highly specific to Hogan and the Discrimination Model. The paper lacks a Template version or clear instructions on how a supervisor using a different theory (like CBT or Solution-Focused) would reconstruct the checklist. Without a blank, adaptable template, the ISC remains a specific tool for a

specific theoretical orientation rather than a universal framework. The table should be presented as one cohesive document and not presented according to models.

The paper cites ACES Best Practices regarding documentation. There is a potential tension between clinical documentation (what happened with the client) and evaluative documentation (how the supervisee is performing). By mixing self-reflection, supervisee personality traits (e.g., Guarded, Resistant), and clinical updates in one note, the supervisor may be creating a complicated legal record. If these notes were subpoenaed, the supervisor's subjective Self-Reflection or Countertransference notes could be used against them or the supervisee. The paper needs to address the privacy/legal implications of including supervisor vulnerability in the same document as supervisee evaluation.

There is a heavy reliance on Bernard and Goodyear and the Discrimination Model. While foundational, the paper feels like a manual for the Discrimination Model rather than a truly integrated new contribution. It needs to better justify why the combination is superior to using the models independently in a standard narrative note.

Finally, Table 1 is very dense. In a real-world clinical setting, a supervisor might find the checkbox fatigue overwhelming if they have 10-15 supervisees. The paper would benefit from discussing the user experience of the form – how long it takes to complete and how it fits into a busy clinical schedule.

Conclusion – major changes required

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.