

Reviewer comment-1

The manuscript's importance lies in its timely synthesis of various alternative economic frameworks in response to pressing global crises. It serves as a valuable resource by gathering and explaining complex theories. Most significantly, it creates a crucial interdisciplinary bridge between economic theory and the field of social work. By connecting these alternative models to the "Grand Challenges for Social Work," the author provides a clear, actionable framework for researchers, educators, and practitioners, paving the way for new avenues of study and community intervention.

Response: Thank you.

The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured. I would add a sentence on methodology. The last sentence is strong but could be more concise.

Response: We have noted that this topic review is based on a (non-systematic) review of the trans-disciplinary scholarship. The final sentence has been edited to enhance concision.

The different sections are structured logically and flow coherently from a broad problem statement to specific solutions and applications. Strong and effective introduction. It grabs the reader's attention, providing the necessary context and outlining the paper's purpose and structure. The literature review section provides the theoretical foundation for the paper's argument and demonstrates scholarly engagement with the relevant literature.

Response: Thank you.

Specific Comments:

The manuscript is of exceptional quality. It is well-researched, cogently argued, and written with a high degree of scholarly precision. The author successfully synthesizes a wide range of complex theories and data to address a timely and significant topic. Its primary contribution—linking alternative economic frameworks to the practical and ethical mandate of social work—is both novel and important. The referencing is thorough and current, and there are no ethical issues or major deficiencies.

Response: Thank you.

Reviewer comment-2

The manuscript represents a significant contribution to the field of social work, showcasing the authors' dedication and expertise.

Response: Thank you.

However, to fully realize its potential, it needs to be reorganized for improved clarity and effectiveness. Currently, the document is formatted as a lengthy essay with various subtopics. To enhance coherence, it is recommended to divide the content into distinct sections, such as an introduction, literature review, and implications for practice. This structured approach will facilitate a better understanding of the material and its relevance to the field.

Response: Thank you. Although we would prefer to maintain the thematic section titles, we would – if so preferred by the editor and editorial staff – change the section headings as suggested. Specifically: “An Age of Chaos” would become “Introduction”; “Alternative Economies” would become “Literature Review”; and “Social Work and Alternative Economies” would become “Implications for Practice.”

The abstract lacks comprehensiveness and does not clearly specify the type of article being presented. Is it a systematic review or a theoretical paper? Additionally, there is no discussion of the methodology employed. The abstract should be revised to enhance sentence structure. Furthermore, the term "essay" in the sentence "Towards that end, the current essay provides a brief overview of several alternative economies" should be replaced with "the current article" or "the current study," unless the journal intends to publish this manuscript as an essay.

Response: We have explicitly noted that this is a topic review article based on a (non-systematic) review of the trans-disciplinary scholarship.

To enhance coherence, it is recommended to structure the content into clearly defined sections, such as an introduction, a literature review, and implications for practice. This organized approach will facilitate a better understanding of the material and its significance within the field.

Thank you. As noted above, although we would prefer to maintain the thematic section titles, we would – if so preferred by the editor and editorial staff – change the section headings as suggested. Specifically: “An Age of Chaos” would become “Introduction”; “Alternative Economies” would become “Literature Review”; and “Social Work and Alternative Economies” would become “Implications for Practice.”