Available Online: 25 November 2026 DOI: 10.54254/2753-7102/2026.39498

Session limits and counseling outcome: a review of evidence, client suitability, and implications for stepped care in China

Wenjing Jiang

Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, China

jiangwenjing0306@163.com

Abstract. Session-limited counseling, in which the number of sessions is fixed in advance and typically ranges from one to eight, has become a dominant service format in Chinese university counseling centers, community mental health stations, and online platforms, where demand exceeds available resources. This narrative review examines how session limits relate to outcome, which clients benefit, and which therapist competencies moderate this relationship. The evidence shows a dose–effect pattern with diminishing returns. Clients in routine services receive fewer sessions than the dose associated with reliable improvement, and the required dose varies with case complexity. For mild to moderate emotional, adjustment, and interpersonal difficulties, four to eight sessions approach the symptom relief obtained in longer treatments at lower cost. In contrast, complex trauma, personality dysfunction, and multiple comorbidity substantially raise the risk of premature termination and limited benefit. Client motivation and realistic expectations, a focused problem, preserved functioning with social support, and narrative and reflective capacity predict benefit, whereas chronicity and accumulating risk predict dropout. Suitability is dynamic and should be reassessed in the first sessions, not fixed at intake. Four therapist competencies moderate this link: frame management with collaborative goal contraction, rapid alliance formation, planned ending with consolidation, and ongoing monitoring with tiered referral. Client and therapist factors interact rather than add up. Chinese research remains limited by homogeneous university samples, the absence of validated screening tools, unspecified competency indicators, coarse outcome categories, and scarce follow-up. Priorities include culturally adapted tools, competency training, real-world studies, and a stepped-care referral system.

Keywords: session-limited counseling, dose–effect relationship, client suitability, therapist competence, stepped care

1. Introduction

Mental health services in China are expanding quickly. University counseling centers, community psychological service stations, and online platforms now handle a large share of emotional, adjustment, and interpersonal problems. Session length, counselor availability, and program funding jointly limit the number of sessions that any one client can receive. Naturalistic data reflect this constraint. In a database of more than 6,000 clients, the average client attended fewer than five sessions, and only about 20% improved [1]. This

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

dose is far below the number of sessions associated with improvement in controlled trials. Insufficient dose is therefore a structural feature of public psychological services, not an occasional local arrangement.

Session-limited counseling refers to a structured arrangement in which client and counselor agree on a maximum number of sessions at the outset, most often one to eight, and work toward relief of presenting problems and restoration of functioning. Two adjacent concepts should not be confused with it. The first is brief therapy by orientation, such as Single-Session Therapy (SST), Solution-Focused Brief Therapy (SFBT), and brief cognitive behavioral therapy, whose techniques are designed for few sessions. The second is an administrative limit: the orientation may be long-term, but the institution sets a ceiling. The first is a technical route; the second is a resource-allocation rule. In practice the two overlap heavily. To treat the session limit itself as a variable that affects outcome, however, the object of study should be the administrative limit. This review concerns services in which a ceiling of one to eight sessions is set in advance by the institution.

International research has produced three lines of evidence: dose–effect curves, tests of brief and single-session interventions, and predictors of dropout and premature termination. Chinese studies have begun to report outcomes, mostly in university samples. Chinese reviews, however, are usually organized around the techniques of a particular orientation and rarely treat the session ceiling as an independent variable. Three linked questions therefore remain open: how many sessions help which problems, which clients benefit, and what competencies counselors need. A further difference lies in service context. Time limits abroad are usually negotiated with the client, who expects them and takes part in the decision. In Chinese public services the ceiling is often set unilaterally by the institution, for example six or eight sessions under a program, and the client enters brief work without having chosen it. This difference shapes expectations, alliance formation, and the experience of ending, yet the literature rarely discusses it. It also determines whether international findings can be transferred directly.

This review follows one thread: how the session setting affects outcome. It examines dose–effect evidence, client suitability, counselor competencies, and client–counselor interaction, and then summarizes gaps in Chinese research and proposes directions for research and practice. The review is narrative rather than systematic. Sources are empirical studies, meta-analyses, and reviews published in Chinese and English journals, identified through terms such as session-limited counseling, brief and single-session therapy, dose–effect, dropout, and therapist competence. Work from the past decade is emphasized, with a few foundational early studies retained. Searches were not registered, and no formal inclusion, exclusion, or bias assessment was applied. Conclusions therefore describe the outline and direction of the evidence rather than estimate effect sizes.

2. Dose–effect evidence and the boundaries of benefit

2.1. The dose–effect model and the uncertainty of an effective dose

Dose–effect research relates the number of sessions to clinical improvement. Quantitative reviews show that improvement accumulates with sessions but at a variable rate: most change occurs early, and marginal gains decline thereafter [1, 2]. Hansen et al. compared trial and naturalistic data and reported two findings [1]. In well-controlled trials, about 60% of clients improved within an average of 12 to 13 sessions. In routine practice, the average client attended fewer than five sessions and about 20% improved. The required number of sessions is not universal either: improvement rate depends on problem complexity, service setting, and outcome measure, so some clients reach their own threshold quickly whereas others need longer treatment [1]. A fixed session standard must therefore be paired with case-level judgements of suitability. Otherwise the question of whether the dose was sufficient can only be answered by the rule itself.

2.2. What limited settings can achieve

Evidence on whether limited settings produce observable change falls into three tiers. Reviews and meta-analyses show that a substantial proportion of clients report relief after a single session and do not seek further help [3], that single-session and brief interventions are feasible for immediate relief [4], and that the efficiency and accessibility of brief approaches are widely accepted, although technique development and training lag behind demand [5, 6]. Studies in Chinese service settings show that brief integrative counseling of up to eight sessions reduced general distress and improved social functioning among university students [7], and that short-term models have been implemented in university centers [8, 9]. Work on specific orientations and populations shows that brief acceptance and commitment therapy improved stress and emotion-regulation indices [10], and that online single-session interventions reduced situational distress such as test anxiety [4]. Together these tiers support a limited conclusion. For mild to moderate emotional, adjustment, and interpersonal difficulties, four to eight sessions approach the symptom relief of longer treatment at lower unit cost. For long-term functional repair, personality change, and relapse prevention, limited settings remain weaker than open-ended treatment [3, 7]. Evidence strength should also be differentiated: meta-analyses and randomized trials support broader claims, whereas single-site uncontrolled reports support feasibility only.

2.3. Premature termination and the double effect of a session ceiling

The main risk of a limited setting is premature termination. Premature termination occurs at a stable rate and is associated with unmet expectations, unclear goals, and a weak early alliance [11, 12]. In a session-limited service, ending takes two forms. Ending on schedule after the agreed number of sessions is not necessarily failure; dropping out before that point suggests that the suitability judgement was inaccurate. One study reported a dropout rate approaching 40% among clients with high depressive symptoms and multiple problems in eight-session counseling [7]. Case complexity, including chronicity, comorbidity, and level of personality functioning, is repeatedly confirmed as a core predictor of premature termination and intervention failure and alters the benefit curve of a limited course [13]. When a client expects deep personality-level change but the service can offer only limited support, disappointment and dissatisfaction are likely. A study of client feedback on single-session consultation found that dissatisfaction centered on insufficient coping strategies, an unclear definition of the problem, and insufficient time [14].

A session ceiling also has a double effect. A pre-set limit pushes both parties to focus quickly and curbs unnecessary prolongation, which is the justification for the arrangement in resource terms. If goals are not contracted in time, however, sessions are consumed by narration, intervention barely begins before the ending arrives, and the client leaves with an unfinished sense of things left unsaid. This tension between administrative efficiency and clinical completeness is the mechanism question that most needs study and is most often overlooked.

3. Client suitability for session-limited counseling

Whether a limited setting works depends largely on whether this client can obtain substantive help within these few sessions. Studies of predictors divide client characteristics into protective and risk features, and the field has moved from static labels toward dynamic judgement.

3.1. Protective features

Motivation and realistic expectations come first. Clients with clear motivation form goal consensus and accept structured tasks early, whereas those with low motivation show limited improvement even when assigned a

limited number of sessions [15]. Chinese studies also treat help-seeking motivation as a precondition for brief intervention [16]. Clients who understand that few sessions cannot address long-standing personality issues, and who aim at relief of specific difficulties, report less disappointment at ending.

Problem focus comes second. Clients whose concerns are triggered by a real event, who present a single request, and whose goals can be reduced to one or two actionable targets fit a limited setting. Chronic problems spanning several years and several life domains tend to be addressed only at the surface. Problem focus is not the same as a mild problem. It means that the problem can be ranked and jointly selected, which depends on the counselor's collaborative structuring rather than on the client alone.

Baseline functioning and external support come third. Clients who complete between-session tasks and try new behavior outside the consulting room carry change into daily life. Those with little social support struggle to maintain gains from a few sessions and are more likely to relapse after ending. Between-session tasks are therefore not optional homework in a limited setting; they are the main channel for extending the dose.

Narrative and reflective capacity come fourth. Clients who describe emotions and circumstances clearly and show basic self-reflection reach workable case conceptualization sooner, and the alliance forms faster [17]. A coherent self-narrative also helps them organize problems and absorb intervention strategies within few sessions, which raises the efficiency of brief work [18].

3.2. Risk features, screening tools, and dynamic suitability

Risk features cluster around a history of multiple trauma, personality disorder traits, elevated suicide risk, impairment across several domains, and multiple comorbid conditions. When these features accumulate, the appropriate role of session-limited counseling is crisis stabilization and transition to referral rather than primary treatment [11, 12]. To turn this judgement from experience into procedure, the DISCUS framework assesses six domains: duration of the problem, interpersonal history, symptom severity, case complexity, insight, and social support [19]. Its purpose is not to exclude clients but to indicate where the setting needs adjustment. A high score does not rule out brief work, but it calls for clearer goal negotiation, closer review points, and an earlier referral plan. China has no validated domestic instrument, so screening depends largely on clinical impression and the risk of mismatch rises [3]. Research on specific populations likewise suggests that complex adolescent problems and long-standing emotional difficulties should not be placed in a standard limited model without modification [20].

Suitability is not a one-off label. Some clients who look complex at intake still gain partial benefit once the goal is narrowed to a concrete issue, so they should not be excluded at the screening stage [21]. A workable approach distributes assessment over time. Screening answers whether the client enters a limited setting; the first two sessions answer whether work can proceed within it, and if no focused target emerges by then, the setting should be adjusted or the client referred [18]. Studies of single-session and brief practice further show that suitability is modifiable and that accurate early assessment improves the course of intervention [22, 23]. The specific difficulty in China is that a fixed ceiling does not adapt to case complexity, and complex cases are still assigned to limited programs when resources are tight. A more realistic response distinguishes within the limit. Fully suitable clients enter the standard course; partly suitable clients move to brief work with an extension option, or brief work combined with medication and psychiatric care; unsuitable clients are referred early. The function of the suitability judgement is therefore not to decide who is excluded but to decide how resources are allocated.

Table 1 summarizes domains that can be assessed at screening and in the first two sessions. The items are working prompts rather than diagnostic criteria.

Table 1. Suitability domains and assessment points in session-limited counseling

Domain	Protective features	Risk features	Timing and focus
Motivation and expectations	Self-referred; relatively clear goals; understands the limits of brief work	Referred by others; vague motivation; expects personality-level change	Intake: reasons for seeking help, expectations, and what counts as helpful
Problem features	Triggered by a real event; single request; reducible to one or two goals	Long-standing and chronic; spans several life domains; intertwined issues	Intake: onset, spread of the problem, whether issues can be ranked
Functioning and social support	Study or work capacity preserved; available family or peer support	Long absence from study or work; scarce social support	Intake and first two sessions: completion of between-session tasks
Narrative and reflective capacity	Describes emotions and circumstances; basic self-reflection	Fragmented account; limited capacity for self-reflection	First two sessions: whether preliminary case conceptualization forms
Risk and comorbidity	No self-harm or suicide risk; no multiple comorbidity	History of multiple trauma; personality disorder traits; high suicide risk; multiple comorbidity	Assess at screening; start referral immediately if risk emerges

Note. Protective features favor benefit within a limited setting; risk features call for caution or transfer to another service format. The table summarizes the literature cited in Section 3 and is intended to guide assessment focus and setting adjustment; it does not constitute diagnostic criteria.

4. Therapist competencies specific to limited settings

Generic competencies such as empathy, alliance building, ethical awareness, and case conceptualization remain necessary in a limited setting, but they do not explain differences in outcome under a session ceiling. Chinese competency frameworks are modeled largely on long-term work and say little about time-limited practice [24, 25]. In routine services, competence is not linearly related to outcome either. A study of 43 therapists and 1,247 clients found only a weak overall association, yet clients treated by the most competent therapists showed reliably higher improvement rates than expected by chance, and those treated by the least competent therapists showed reliably higher deterioration rates [26]. Specific skills therefore seem to matter at the two ends of the practitioner distribution, which implies that training and supervision should target clearly deficient practice rather than assume broad technical improvement.

4.1. Frame management and collaborative goal contraction

Frame management means announcing the session limit, the structure of the work, and the ending arrangement in the first session, contracting a broad request into goals achievable within few sessions, and distinguishing what the service can and cannot do. If goal contraction fails, sessions are consumed by problem narration and intervention hardly begins before the ending arrives. Negotiating a client's request for more sessions also belongs to frame management.

4.2. Rapid alliance formation and early intervention

A long-term alliance can grow slowly; a limited setting leaves no such room. Alliance quality in the first two sessions predicts outcome more strongly than in long-term work [27], and a strong early alliance is associated with lower rates of premature termination [27]. Counselors must therefore identify the core conflict quickly, keep the agenda focused, and avoid unbounded exploratory work [17]. Fast does not mean rushed: early intervention presupposes that the client already feels understood.

4.3. Planned ending and consolidation

Ending does not mean that the problem is fully resolved. Its tasks are to consolidate gains, teach self-regulation strategies, and prepare for relapse [9, 28]. Counselors accustomed to long-term rhythms often open new topics as the agreed limit approaches, which produces a sense of incompleteness and lowers satisfaction [11, 29]. Announcing the ending in advance, reviewing changes, naming usable strategies, and specifying where to seek help after relapse form the core sequence of a time-limited ending [30].

4.4. Ongoing monitoring and tiered referral

Counselors need to monitor the fit between client and setting continuously. When risk is too high or the issue exceeds what the setting can hold, limited work should stop, risk should be managed, and the client should be referred to longer-term or psychiatric services rather than carried forward to use up the allocated sessions [13]. Accurate suitability assessment and tiered referral are regarded as core time-limited competencies [24]. Clients often experience referral as abandonment, so the reason should be explained and the handover completed, or referral becomes a new dropout point. These competencies do not match current training. Most counselors are trained in long-term orientations, and technical habits clash with an administratively limited service. This is a mismatch in training systems rather than an individual deficiency.

5. Client–counselor interaction and mechanisms of change

Outcome under a limited setting is not the sum of client characteristics and counselor competence. A well-suited client with a counselor who cannot manage the frame may still lose direction midway, and even a highly competent counselor cannot fully offset multiple risk factors [27]. Two implications follow. Suitability cannot be judged on the client side alone; case allocation should assess the fit between this client and this counselor. A session ceiling also does not produce effects by itself; the administrative setting becomes clinical gain only through the counselor's concrete work. From a common-factors perspective, change derives mainly from the client's own resources and actions, and the counselor's task is to activate those resources within limited time rather than to complete deep personality repair [19, 25]. Between-session tasks are thus not an add-on but the main route to extending the dose, and the capacities a client takes away at ending explain maintenance better than insight gained in the room. The core technical question of session-limited counseling is therefore not how to fit more intervention into less time, but how to keep the client working after leaving.

6. Gaps in Chinese research

First, samples are not representative. Most studies draw small samples from university counseling centers, and real-world data from community settings, general hospitals, and online platforms remain scarce [7, 29]. University samples are highly homogeneous in age, functioning, and help-seeking motivation, so findings transfer poorly to adults, patients with chronic conditions, and clients with low motivation [31, 32]. Second,

there is no culturally adapted suitability instrument. China lacks a screening scale for its own populations, screening relies on clinical impression, mismatch is hard to detect in time, and suitability cannot be controlled as a covariate in research [3]. Third, time-limited competencies have not been operationalized. There are no trainable indicators or assessment methods, most practitioners are trained in long-term work, and training in goal contraction and planned ending is insufficient [5, 24]. Without indicators, training cannot be evaluated.

Fourth, outcome categories are coarse. Most studies report only whether counseling was effective and rarely separate full recovery, partial benefit, no change, deterioration, and dropout. Partial benefit is therefore counted as success, average scores conceal the real distribution, and the practical question of who improves under a limited setting cannot be answered. Fifth, follow-up is largely absent. Studies usually measure outcome at termination and omit one- to three-month follow-up, so maintenance and relapse cannot be assessed and the quality of ending cannot be judged [1, 2]. Without follow-up, planned ending and dropout are also indistinguishable in the data.

7. Research agenda and practice pathways

7.1. Research agenda

Four priorities follow. First, large real-world studies are needed in community, hospital, and online settings that include adults, patients with chronic conditions, and low-motivation clients, and that report both the actual distribution of sessions and outcomes [16, 20]. Second, client–counselor match studies should measure suitability features, specific competencies, and outcome together, test interaction paths, and answer who benefits from which limited model [27]. Third, outcome reporting should be refined and follow-up added: five outcome categories, follow-up at one to three months, and documentation of how the work ended, so that planned ending can be separated from premature termination. Fourth, a domestic instrument should be developed and validated, drawing on the DISCUS domains, reflecting how Chinese clients describe problems and how services are organized, and testing predictive validity across settings [3, 18].

7.2. Practice pathways in China

At the service level, session-limited counseling should be one tier of a stepped system rather than a uniform format for all clients. Screening should be combined with dynamic assessment in the first two sessions. A short form at intake covers onset, spread of the problem, previous help-seeking, risk, and support. After the first two sessions the counselor judges whether a focused goal can be set and whether an alliance has formed, and records the decision to continue, adjust, or refer. A referral pathway linking session-limited counseling, longer-term psychotherapy, and psychiatric care should be established, with explicit entry criteria, a named contact for handover, and management of waiting periods, so that complex cases are not forced into limited programs [11, 13]. Institutional rules should also retain flexibility: some clients should be allowed an extension or a combined service after assessment, which makes the ceiling a default rather than a hard constraint [6, 28].

At the training level, a specific module should be moved into internship and continuing education. Training and assessment should cover the four competencies: frame management with goal contraction, early alliance formation, planned ending with consolidation, and monitoring with tiered referral. Trainees' actual case records should be rated rather than only their knowledge [5, 24]. Remedial training after practitioners have settled into long-term habits is more costly, because technical habits are hard to revise once formed.

8. Conclusion

This review treats the session ceiling as an independent variable and links evidence from dose–effect research, brief intervention trials, dropout prediction, competency studies, and common factors into a single chain. The session setting shapes outcome through goal structure, alliance rhythm, and the mode of ending. Outcome is further moderated by client suitability and specific counselor competencies, and the three interact rather than act separately. Compared with existing Chinese reviews, the contribution lies in three shifts: from a specific orientation to the administrative session limit as the object of analysis; from a static label to a staged, adjustable decision about resource allocation; and from generic competence to four trainable competencies. The limits of the review are also clear. As a narrative review it offers no numerical answer about an optimal number of sessions, and the available evidence does not support one. Chinese evidence still comes mainly from university samples, and its applicability to adults in community settings remains to be tested.

References

[1] Hansen, N. B., Lambert, M. J., & Forman, E. M. (2002). The psychotherapy dose-response effect and its implications for treatment delivery services. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 9*(3), 329–343. DOI: 10.1093/clipsy.9.3.329.

[2] Li, F., Huang, J., & Wang, Y. (2015). Review of research on the dose–effect relationship in psychotherapy. *Chinese Mental Health Journal, 29*(7), 530–534. (in Chinese)

[3] Li, Y., & Chen, L. (2024). Mechanisms and suitable populations of single-session counseling: A review. *Medicine and Philosophy, 45*(8), 56–61. (in Chinese)

[4] Wang, J., & Liu, X. (2024). Clinical application and research progress of brief single-session psychological interventions. *Chinese Mental Health Journal, 38*(3), 245–250. (in Chinese)

[5] Bai, Y., Zhang, T., & Yang, G. (2024). Development and prospects of brief psychotherapy. *Academic Journal of Naval Medical University, 45*(7), 787–795. (in Chinese)

[6] Chen, F., & Liu, L. (2017). Application of brief cognitive behavioral therapy in emotional disorders. *Shanghai Archives of Psychiatry, 29*(2), 103–109. (in Chinese)

[7] Wang, C., & Wu, R. (2021). Outcomes of brief integrative counseling in university settings. *Chinese Journal of School Health, 42*(12), 1889–1892. (in Chinese)

[8] Fan, F., & Fei, J. (2018). Practice and reflections on short-term models in university counseling. *Chinese Mental Health Journal, 32*(8), 625–629. (in Chinese)

[9] Zhou, C., & Wu, H. (2019). Application of solution-focused brief therapy in school mental health services. *Chinese Journal of School Health, 40*(7), 1117–1120. (in Chinese)

[10] Zhu, Z., & Liu, X. (2022). Theory and practice of brief acceptance and commitment therapy. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 30*(4), 956–961. (in Chinese)

[11] He, J., Bai, B., & Xia, M. (2020). Dropout in psychotherapy. *Advances in Psychological Science, 28*(5), 794–804. (in Chinese)

[12] Swift, J. K., & Greenberg, R. P. (2012). Premature termination in psychotherapy: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 80*(4), 547–562.

[13] Ogrodniczuk, J. S., Piper, W. E., & Joyce, A. S. (2005). Predictors of premature termination in time-limited dynamic psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy Research, 15*(2), 137–149.

[14] Boyhan, P. A. (1996). Clients' perceptions of single session consultations as an option to waiting for family therapy. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, 17*(2), 85–96. DOI: 10.1002/j.1467-8438.1996.tb01078.x.

[15] Liu, C., & Wang, Y. (2016). Client motivation: Integrating theory and practice in counseling and psychotherapy. *Advances in Psychological Science, 24*(2), 261–269. (in Chinese)

[16] Wang, E., & Zhou, Z. (2017). Factors influencing counseling outcomes: Current status and prospects. *Chinese General Practice, 20*(1), 108–113. (in Chinese)

[17] Bernecker, S. L., Levy, K. N., & Ellison, W. D. (2014). Patient attachment and psychotherapy alliance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 34*(6), 455–468. DOI: 10.1016/j.cpr.2014.07.004.

[18] She, Z., Xi, J., & Shi, Y. (2021). Development and clinical application of routine outcome monitoring. *Journal of Psychological Science, 44*(1), 223–229. (in Chinese)

[19] Norcross, J. C., & Wampold, B. E. (2019). *Psychotherapy relationships that work: Volume 2. Evidence-based therapist responsiveness* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press. New York.

[20] Zhang, J., & Liu, Q. (2020). Brief psychological interventions for adolescents: Current status and prospects. *Psychological Development and Education, 36*(4), 497–504. (in Chinese)

[21] Bundy, N. (2022). Time, complexity, and the meaning of help: A systematic review of people's experiences of single-session therapy. *Journal of Systemic Therapies, 41*(2), 68–87. https://doi.org/10.1521/jsyt.2022.41.2.68

[22] Talmon, M. (1990). *Single-session psychotherapy*. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco.

[23] Young, K., & Jebreen, J. (2019). Recognizing single-session therapy as psychotherapy. *Journal of Systemic Therapies, 38*(4), 31–44.

[24] Jiang, G., & Wu, C. (2024). Constructing a competency framework for counseling and psychotherapy practitioners in China. *Journal of Psychological Science, 47*(1), 237–245. (in Chinese)

[25] Wu, C., & Jiang, G. (2019). Research on common factors in counseling. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 27*(3), 639–643. (in Chinese)

[26] Branson, A., Shafran, R., & Myles, P. (2015). Investigating the relationship between competence and patient outcome with CBT. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 68*, 19–26. DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2015.03.002.

[27] Baldwin, S. A., Wampold, B. E., & Imel, Z. E. (2007). Untangling the alliance-outcome correlation: Exploring the relative importance of therapist and patient variability in the alliance. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*(6), 842–852. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006X.75.6.842.

[28] Sui, S., & Yang, J. (2022). A brief intervention model for acute stress: Development and clinical application. *Chinese Mental Health Journal, 36*(6), 481–486. (in Chinese)

[29] Li, S., & Wang, J. (2022). Dropout from university counseling: Prevalence and predictors. *China Journal of Health Psychology, 30*(8), 1236–1241. (in Chinese)

[30] Hoyt, M. F. (1994). *Single-session therapies: Perspectives on one-meeting interventions*. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco.

[31] Chen, Y., Sang, Z., & Xi, P. (2021). Effects of an online stress-reduction group intervention for university students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 29*(6), 1348–1352. (in Chinese)

[32] Sang, Z., & Chen, Y. (2023). Therapeutic factors in online brief group counseling during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychology Communications, 6*(1), 28–33. (in Chinese)