

From Clients to Co-Producers:

An Ecological Approach to Reducing Social Isolation through Time Banking

Overall Evaluation

This manuscript addresses an important and timely topic: the application of co-production principles to reduce social isolation and enhance empowerment in social work and community-based settings. The integration of wraparound mental health services and public housing timebanking provides cross-sector illustrations of how contribution-centered frameworks may reshape service delivery. The paper is conceptually rich and grounded in a strong normative commitment to empowerment and community engagement.

However, while the manuscript is compelling and practice-oriented, it currently lacks sufficient methodological clarity, analytical depth, and empirical grounding to meet the standards of a scholarly journal. The article reads primarily as a conceptual advocacy piece supported by illustrative case narratives rather than as a rigorously documented empirical study or fully developed theoretical contribution.

I recommend major revisions prior to further consideration.

Major Comments

Introduction

1. Although the opening narrative is powerful and emotionally compelling, I recommend restructuring the introduction to first foreground the purpose, scope, and significance of the study. Specifically, the manuscript would benefit from clearly articulating the central research aim, the scale of the issue (including relevant prevalence data or statistics on social isolation, service outcomes, or co-production implementation), and the broader implications for social work practice and policy. Establishing this empirical

and conceptual foundation at the outset would immediately orient readers to the scholarly contribution of the article.

2. Once the purpose and significance are clearly established, particularly with the inclusion of relevant numerical data to underscore urgency, the opening story could be woven into a later section of the introduction or used as a transitional illustration after the framework is introduced. In that position, the narrative would function as a powerful applied example that reinforces the theoretical and empirical argument rather than serving as the initial entry point.
3. In its current placement, the story risks overshadowing the study's analytic focus before readers understand the research problem being addressed. Reordering the structure would preserve the emotional impact of the story while strengthening the manuscript's scholarly framing and clarity.

Literature Review

The literature review lacks sufficient depth. While several relevant sources are cited, the discussion remains largely descriptive rather than critically integrative. The review would benefit from a more thorough synthesis of the existing scholarship, clearer identification of theoretical frameworks, and a stronger articulation of how the current study meaningfully extends or challenges prior research. Expanding engagement with recent and foundational studies in the field would also strengthen the manuscript's scholarly contribution.

Clarify the Nature of the Manuscript (Conceptual vs. Empirical)

The manuscript does not clearly specify whether it is:

- An empirical case study,
- A qualitative evaluation,
- A practice reflection,
- Or a conceptual/theoretical paper supported by illustrative cases.

Descriptions of site visits, conversations with stakeholders, and program outcomes suggest empirical engagement, yet no methodology section is included. The manuscript does not specify:

- Data sources,

- Number or type of participants,
- Data collection procedures,
- Analytical approach,
- Ethical review or IRB considerations.

At the same time, outcome claims (e.g., reduced residential placements, improved stability) are presented without supporting data.

Recommendation:

Either:

- Add a formal methodology section and provide evidence supporting outcome claims, or
- Reframe the article explicitly as a conceptual/practice reflection piece and moderate claims accordingly.

This clarification is essential for scholarly credibility.

Strengthen the Evidence Base

The manuscript makes strong claims regarding program success, including:

- Reduced residential treatment placements,
- Cost savings to the state,
- Long-term stability and empowerment outcomes.

However, the evidence presented is primarily anecdotal. The manuscript itself acknowledges that no formal study was conducted to assess long-term impacts. This creates a tension between the strength of the claims and the available data.

Recommendation:

- Provide descriptive statistics, administrative data, or published evaluations where available.

- If such data do not exist, explicitly acknowledge the limitations and avoid overstating impact.
-

Deepen Theoretical Integration

Although the title foregrounds an “ecological approach,” ecological systems theory is not fully integrated into the analytic framework. The manuscript references systems and resilience scholarship but does not explicitly connect the cases to multi-level ecological analysis (micro, mezzo, macro, policy-level forces).

The discussion would benefit from clearer articulation of:

- How co-production operates across ecological levels,
- How policy and funding structures shape outcomes,
- How structural inequities influence implementation.

Strengthening this theoretical integration would significantly enhance the manuscript’s scholarly contribution.

Engage More Critically with Limitations and Risks

The manuscript presents co-production in largely positive terms. While the strengths are compelling, there is limited discussion of:

- Potential unintended consequences of mandatory reciprocity,
- Power dynamics within peer-led systems,
- Risks of exploitation in timebank contexts,
- Structural constraints (e.g., racism, class, bureaucratic systems),
- Situations in which co-production may not be appropriate.

The Baltimore case, in particular, raises ethical questions regarding federal work requirements and public housing tenants' obligations that warrant critical engagement.

Including a balanced discussion of limitations would strengthen credibility and analytical rigor.

Improve Organization and Reduce Redundancy

Several sections reiterate similar points regarding:

- Treatment-centered vs. contribution-centered approaches,
- Professional authority,
- System pressures,
- Social isolation.

While these themes are important, the manuscript could be tightened considerably to improve flow and readability. Reducing repetition would sharpen the central argument and improve clarity.

Minor Comments

1. Editing and Proofreading:

Several typographical and formatting errors are present (e.g., inconsistent dates in citations, typographical errors in text and references). A thorough copy edit is recommended.

2. Citation Consistency:

There are inconsistencies in citation years (e.g., Needham & Carr cited differently in text and references). Please verify all references for accuracy and formatting.

3. Tone:

Some language reads as advocacy rather than analysis (e.g., "there could be

no better time than now”). Consider revising for a more neutral scholarly tone.

4. Abstract (if applicable):

If not already included, the manuscript would benefit from a clear abstract that states:

- The purpose,
- The nature of the evidence,
- The central contribution,
- And the implications.

Strengths of the Manuscript

Despite the concerns noted above, this manuscript has notable strengths:

- The narrative opening is compelling and engaging.
- The articulation of the five co-production principles is clear and accessible.
- The discussion of professional authority versus client contribution is nuanced and insightful.
- The cross-sector application (mental health and housing) broadens relevance.
- The topic of social isolation is timely and important across disciplines.

With substantial revision, this work has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to scholarship on co-production and empowerment-oriented social work practice.

Recommendation: Major Revisions

The manuscript addresses a significant topic and presents promising insights, but it requires clearer methodological positioning, stronger evidentiary grounding, deeper theoretical integration, and tighter organization before it can be considered for publication.

I encourage the authors to revise and resubmit, as the core ideas are valuable and worthy of further development.