

Review comment-1

This manuscript is important for the scientific and professional social work community because it addresses several of the most urgent and rapidly evolving challenges confronting the field, including artificial intelligence and digital transformation, structural inequality, environmental injustice, and workforce burnout. The paper makes a meaningful contribution by integrating these issues into a unified conceptual framework rather than treating them as isolated concerns. Its synthesis of recent international literature provides a timely and interdisciplinary perspective that is highly relevant for researchers, educators, practitioners, and policymakers. The manuscript is also significant because it advances contemporary debates regarding the future direction of social work practice and research. In particular, its emphasis on equity-oriented evidence, participatory ethics, macro-level structural intervention, and collective care offers an important corrective to overly individualized and technocratic approaches that have increasingly shaped human services. The proposed framework has the potential to stimulate further empirical research, theoretical development, and policy discussion regarding sustainable and justice-oriented social work practice in the twenty-first century.

The title is suitable and accurately reflects the manuscript's central themes. "Transforming Social Work Practice: Technology, Inequality, and Workforce Sustainability in the 21st Century" effectively captures the paper's broad scope and emphasizes its focus on contemporary challenges reshaping the social work profession. The title is timely, academically appropriate, and likely to attract readers interested in social work innovation, structural inequality, organizational well-being, and technological change. The title's greatest strength is its clarity. It clearly signals the manuscript's three major areas of focus—technology, inequality, and workforce sustainability—while also conveying that the paper is concerned with large-scale transformation within the profession. The phrase "in the 21st Century" appropriately situates the discussion within current global and professional developments. However, because the manuscript ultimately proposes an integrated conceptual framework grounded in participatory ethics, collective care, structural analysis, and technological humility, the authors may also consider a title that more explicitly reflects this integrative and forward-looking contribution.

Possible alternative titles include:

- Reimagining Social Work Practice in the 21st Century: Technology, Structural Inequality, and Workforce Sustainability

- Toward an Integrated Framework for Social Work Practice: Technology, Equity, and Workforce Sustainability

- Social Work at a Crossroads: Technology, Structural Inequality, and Collective Care
- Transforming Social Work for the Digital Age: Equity, Technology, and Workforce Sustainability
- Rethinking Social Work Practice: Technology, Social Justice, and Sustainable Workforce Development

Overall, the current title is strong and publishable, though a slightly more focused or conceptually explicit title could further highlight the manuscript's integrative framework and theoretical contribution.

The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the manuscript's primary themes, arguments, and overall contribution. It clearly identifies the three central challenges examined in the paper—technological transformation, systemic inequality, and workforce sustainability—and successfully communicates the paper's integrative and forward-looking orientation. The abstract also appropriately highlights the manuscript's emphasis on evidence-based practice, macro social work, organizational determinants of burnout, and participatory ethics. A particular strength of the abstract is its conceptual coherence. The progression from technological change, to structural inequality, to workforce sustainability mirrors the organization of the manuscript and provides readers with a clear roadmap of the discussion. The conclusion of the abstract also effectively captures the manuscript's overarching framework grounded in collective care, redistributive justice, and participatory ethics. Although the abstract is strong overall, several minor improvements could further strengthen it: 1. The authors could briefly clarify the methodological approach by explicitly identifying the paper as a narrative, integrative, or conceptual literature review. This would improve transparency regarding how the literature was selected and synthesized. 2. Some sentences are lengthy and densely packed with concepts. Slightly simplifying the wording could improve readability and accessibility for a broader audience. 3. The abstract could more explicitly state the manuscript's primary contribution to the field, particularly the development of an integrated conceptual framework linking technology, structural inequality, and workforce sustainability. Overall, however, the abstract is well written, academically appropriate, and sufficiently comprehensive for the scope and purpose of the manuscript.

The references in the manuscript are proper, recent, sufficient, and properly cited.

The manuscript would be strengthened by:

1. Clarifying the review methodology and literature selection process.

2. Including more practical or applied examples throughout the paper.
3. Providing greater balance when discussing abolitionist and transformational frameworks.
4. Adding a visual conceptual model for the integrated framework.
5. Expanding discussion of implementation and policy implications.

Overall, this is a highly publishable manuscript that makes a meaningful conceptual contribution to the future direction of social work theory, research, and practice.