

Reviewer's comment:-

1. The manuscript addresses the intersection of attachment theory, reactive attachment disorder (RAD), and social work practice. Given the rising prevalence of childhood trauma and the challenges in foster/adoptive care, this paper is highly relevant to social work, child welfare, and mental health fields. It consolidates theory, empirical findings, and practice implications, making it an important contribution for both researchers and practitioners.

2. It is clear, descriptive, and accurately reflects the content. "Attachment Theory and Reactive Attachment Disorder: Implications for Child Welfare and Social Work Practice." This alternative emphasizes the applied practice element for social workers.

3. The abstract provides a solid summary of the paper, clearly outlining the scope, theoretical grounding, and applied implications. **Suggestions:** briefly mention the evidence base (e.g., Bucharest Early Intervention Project, RAD prevalence) to strengthen its scholarly impact.

4. The language is clear, professional, and appropriate. Minor proofreading is needed:

Remove redundancies (e.g., repeated mention of Bowlby's contributions). Standardize tense consistency when moving between historical and current literature. Fix occasional typographical slips (e.g., "within in" should be "within the")

□ **Introduction:** Strong contextual grounding; statistics on child abuse immediately establish significance.

□ **Theory & Historical Development:** Well-developed, traces Bowlby, Ainsworth, Main, and Schore effectively. Could be shortened slightly to reduce redundancy.

□ **Social Work Contributions:** Valuable but somewhat brief compared to other sections; could expand on how attachment theory shaped policies.

□ **Evidence & Research:** Thorough, integrates both historical and recent studies (e.g., BEIP).

□ **Implications:** Strong practical application for foster care, adoption, and therapy. The caution about harmful "attachment therapies" is particularly valuable.

□ **Summary:** Synthesizes well, though could more explicitly state research gaps.

5. References span classic theorists (Bowlby, Ainsworth) to recent studies (Douglas et al., 2025; UNICEF, 2024). The manuscript uses a wide range of sources including empirical studies, reviews, and meta-analyses

Minor issues:

- A few older references are repeated multiple times; consider trimming.
- Could add more recent U.S.-based empirical studies on RAD prevalence/treatment to strengthen current applicability.

6. No major ethical concerns are evident. The paper relies on secondary sources and does not present original research requiring ethical approval.

7. The manuscript is original in synthesis and appropriately cited. Direct quotations are properly attributed.

8. The article does not appear to be a chapter or reprint of a previously published work.

9. Article is Well-researched, comprehensive, and practice-oriented. Some minor redundancies, need for light proofreading, and possible strengthening of the abstract and social work contributions section.