

Author responded to Reviewer

Comment	Action
Briefly clarifying the sampling method (e.g., purposive sampling) and accredited programs) Explicitly stating the U.S.-based context.	This was added.
There are several grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, punctuation inconsistencies, and occasional conceptual repetition.	We have carefully reviewed the entire document and edited it to ensure clarity.
The entire document was edited to ensure clarity.	Added headings in the literature review and changed "themes" to "findings".
Curious about any references from schools or CSWE or other sources about institutions that are incorporating anti-racism education into curriculum. I.e., Michigan, Silberman, Columbia, Smith? There are examples of how schools are attempting to incorporate anti-racism educational pedagogy and that seems missing here. At least a look at these examples as either successful or not.... or making attempts.	Thank you for this suggestion. We agree that the manuscript needed greater attention to how institutions are attempting to operationalize anti-racist pedagogy in social work education. We added discussion of CSWE's 2022 EPAS and included examples from Columbia, Silberman, Smith, and broader university-level teaching initiatives at Michigan to illustrate emerging curricular and pedagogical approaches. We also clarified that these examples reflect institutional efforts and models of implementation, while noting that evidence of effectiveness remains limited.
Would there be a consideration to name ending anti-Black racism at the core of our anti-racism work?	added in the conclusion
Would you consider the focus is on uprooting anti-Black racism uprooting white supremacy capitalizing Black and not capitalizing white--- you may consider this as practice in antiracism pedagogy.	This was already stated throughout the manuscript.
"with 39.8% identifying as non-White." - You break this down	Thank you for noting this. We agree that

in the cart, maybe describe in the narrative too?? The default of non-white is problematic. As if white is the standard and everything else is not. Page 7 Same here: “5.5% (n = 20) identified as another gender.”	describing 39.8% of participants as “non-White” unnecessarily positions White as the default reference group and obscures the specific racial/ethnic composition of the sample. We revised the narrative to describe the sample using the disaggregated racial/ethnic categories presented in the table/chart.
5.5% (n = 20) identified as another gender.”	Thank you for this observation. We agree that the phrase “another gender” is imprecise and can position cisgender identities as the default. We revised the narrative to report the gender composition using the specific categories shown in the table.
is there any new research about this? since the new EPAS this may or may not have shifted but would be worth exploring and expanding on.	We added on paragraph on the 2022 EPAS.
Please write in the United States	This was written out.
think about adding what this would look like- faculty need time for reflexivity built in to teaching schedules so that there is time for self interrogation otherwise this is a moot point.	Thank you for this point. We agree that the original language was too general and did not specify what actionable anti-racist practice would look like. We revised the text to clarify that this includes ongoing self-interrogation, critical reflection on whiteness and power in teaching, revision of course content and pedagogy, and equipping students to identify and challenge structural inequities. We also added that such work requires institutional support, including protected time within teaching schedules for reflexivity and pedagogical development.
Given the content of this manuscript , consider a positionality statement of the authors	added statement on positionality and current federal legislation context
added statement on positionality and current federal	This was added.

legislation context	
Perhaps if the data is available add the types of institutions as a variable	We appreciate the reviewer's suggestion about this type of data, as it was good point, yet not available. It is a good consideration for follow up.
Discuss the current context in which this discussion lies and the limitations that faculty face.	Thank you for this important point. We agree that the original discussion did not adequately address the broader institutional and policy context in which anti-racist teaching occurs. In revision, we expanded this section to acknowledge that the burden of delivering anti-racist curriculum often falls disproportionately on Black faculty and other faculty of color, frequently alongside tenure and service pressures. We also added discussion of the institutional mechanisms needed to support this work, including workload recognition, protected time for reflexivity and pedagogical preparation, administrative support, and the importance of academic freedom in sustaining faculty capacity to teach anti-racist content. We added citational support.
more policy driven implications	Thank you for this important point. We revised the manuscript to strengthen the policy implications by adding more specific institutional recommendations.