

The author's yellow-highlighted comments in reviewer-1 and reviewer-2

Reviewer comment-1

I would take away "The"

The word "The" is now removed from the title

Abstract is not comprehensive. It was unclear what type of article this was. Was it a systematic review or some other theoretical paper? There was no discussion of methodology used. The author/s mention that *"The main factors influencing the effectiveness of field instructors are explored in this study"*, however, the title of the article is *"The key contributing factors to field placement effectiveness"*. Also mentions *"The findings offer valuable insights"* however, *"findings or results"* was not a section in the article.

The abstract was revised to include texts as follows:

"This systematic review paper explores the historical evolution of field education to better understand its role in social work education. The development of social work as a recognized profession necessitates adherence to specific criteria to ensure legitimacy and impact."

"Overall, this article presents key factors that influence the effectiveness of field instructors, consider alternative educational delivery systems, and the broader implications for social work programs. The paper provides insights for program and field directors, focusing on refining instructional models and enhancing student outcomes in online and applied educational settings."

The introduction seems long. The rest of the manuscript appears "scattered or unfocused". The title says "online MSW programs" but the article did not focus on online

The MSW word was removed from the title, but the article still discusses student outcomes in online and applied educational settings

Several outdated references were used, if not for historical context, then I would suggest updating those that are more than 10 years old.

The references used in the manuscript are appropriate, recent, and sufficient for its scope. They establish a solid foundation for the study and support the key points discussed. Efforts were made to pair older references with newer ones, such as (Bogo & Sewell, 2019; CSWE, 2008).

Reviewer comments-2

The manuscript is indeed important, not only for online MSW students but also for those enrolled in other applied programs that require practicum experience. It addresses key aspects of experiential learning and provides valuable insights that can enhance the structure and delivery of online education in these fields. Additionally, the inclusion of citations from existing regulations and council requirements strengthens the manuscript's relevance and credibility. I believe the manuscript could be further enriched by expanding on the implications for other online and applied programs, as many of the suggestions and findings are applicable and transferable across a range of disciplines.

This was addressed in the Implication for practice section including the following: “**This paper provides valuable** insights into the factors influencing field instructors' strengths and limitations regarding their supervision of students, particularly those enrolled in online social work and other **applied programs** (Bolliger & Halupa, 2018).

The title is generally suitable, but I would recommend revising it to make it more accessible to a broader audience. The abbreviation "MSW" is not defined in the introduction, and journals typically avoid using abbreviations in titles unless they are universally recognized (e.g., LGBTQ+). As "MSW" may only appeal to those familiar with the field of social work, a more general title would help attract a wider readership. A suggested revision could be: "Key Factors Influencing Field Placement Success in Online and Applied Programs: A Focus on Master of Social Work (MSW) Education." This revision provides clarity while still highlighting the specific focus on MSW education.

The title was revised as” **Key Contributing Factors to Field Placement Effectiveness in Online and Applied Programs.**”

Overall, the abstract is well-written and provides a solid overview of the study. However, given that the study places significant emphasis on the history of the field, I would suggest briefly mentioning this historical context in the abstract. Including this aspect would help capture the readers' attention and provide a more well-rounded preview of the manuscript's content, highlighting both the historical foundation and the current focus of the research.

“ This systematic review paper explores the historical evolution of field education to better understand its role in social work education. The development of social work as a recognized profession necessitates adherence to specific criteria to ensure legitimacy and impact.”

Literature Review: The literature review is thorough and well-executed, providing a rich discussion of the importance of practice, regulatory requirements, the need for more instructors, and the challenges faced by online programs. However, since the focus of the manuscript is on online MSW programs, I suggest expanding the section on the specific challenges encountered by both students and instructors

would enhance the manuscript. Additionally, this section could be placed earlier in the literature review to establish context for the reader.

in online training. A more detailed discussion of these challenges

Sections 2.0.1 to 4.0.6: These sections provide a wealth of relevant and important information, including a comprehensive discussion of the history of the program and the development of its curriculum. While this historical context is valuable, I believe the formatting of the section titles could be improved to better distinguish the transition from the historical background to the discussion of existing challenges (starting from section 4.0). This distinction is crucial because section 4.0 marks the beginning of the study's main focus and should be clearly separated from the historical content.

Conclusion and Implications: Rather than concluding directly with the implications, it would be beneficial to include a dedicated conclusion section that summarizes the key findings before moving on to the implications. This would help the reader better grasp the main takeaways from the study before exploring its broader implications.

However, several sections of the paper discuss specific challenges as

Follows: "4.0. Field Education Challenges", which expands from 40.1 to 40.6

It was clarified in the abstract that the article is a *systematic review paper that explores the historical evolution of field education to better understand its role in social work education*. **5.0. Conclusion was include.**