

The concerns appear to have been addressed to a substantial degree in the revised manuscript, and the revisions are clearly more than superficial. The updated version demonstrates meaningful engagement with the reviewer's recommendations through stronger conceptual framing, expanded integration of contemporary literature, clearer organization, greater attention to implementation and ethics, and a more explicit articulation of the manuscript's integrated framework. Overall, the paper has evolved from a broad thematic discussion into a more coherent conceptual framework paper, which was one of the reviewer's primary concerns.

One of the most important improvements involves clarification of the manuscript's conceptual orientation. I requested greater transparency regarding the nature of the review and the manuscript now explicitly states in the abstract that it draws on "a comprehensive review of recent international literature (2019–2026)." This addition strengthens methodological transparency and signals that the paper is intended as an integrative or conceptual review rather than an empirical study. However, the manuscript still does not fully describe the literature selection process, databases, inclusion criteria, or synthesis strategy. While this may not be essential for a conceptual paper depending on the journal's expectations, a brief methodology paragraph would still strengthen the manuscript further.

My request for a more explicit integrated conceptual framework was addressed particularly well. The revised manuscript now foregrounds the integrated framework throughout the paper, especially in Section 6, "Toward an Integrated Framework." The discussion is now organized around five clearly articulated principles: participatory ethics, structural analysis, collective care, equity-oriented evidence, and technological humility. These additions significantly improve the manuscript's coherence and demonstrate how the themes of technology, inequality, and workforce sustainability intersect rather than operate independently. The conclusion also reinforces this integrated orientation effectively.

The manuscript also responds well to concerns regarding practical applicability and implementation. The revised version incorporates more applied examples throughout the discussion, including community-led system change initiatives, organizational supervision structures, implementation fidelity concerns, participatory AI design, and workforce support mechanisms. These additions help ground the manuscript's theoretical discussions in real-world social work practice and improve its relevance for practitioners, educators, and policymakers.

The workforce sustainability section was strengthened considerably and now aligns closely with the reviewer's recommendation to move beyond individualized resilience frameworks. The revised manuscript repeatedly emphasizes organizational and structural determinants of burnout, including excessive workloads, inadequate supervision, compensation concerns, and institutional culture. Particularly strong is the discussion of "collective care" as an alternative to individualized resilience discourse. This directly addresses my concern that burnout should be framed as a structural rather than purely personal issue.

Similarly, the technology section now provides a more balanced and nuanced discussion of AI and digital transformation in social work. The revised manuscript includes discussion of practitioner-centered AI design, algorithmic bias, predictive risk modeling, deskilling, ethics-oriented governance, and digital literacy. These revisions substantially improve the sophistication of the analysis and better align the technology discussion with contemporary concerns in social work and digital ethics.

The manuscript's organization and conceptual coherence have also improved noticeably. The revised introduction clearly identifies the "three intersecting forces" shaping contemporary social work practice and establishes a stronger organizational roadmap for the paper. Transitions between sections are smoother, and the progression from evidence-based practice, to macro social work, to workforce sustainability, and finally to technological ethics now feels more integrated and deliberate.

Despite these substantial improvements, a few recommendations remain only partially addressed. Most notably, I explicitly recommended including a visual or tabular conceptual model illustrating how the framework's core principles interact in practice. This recommendation does not appear to have been implemented, as the revised manuscript still contains no figure, diagram, or conceptual table. Adding such a visual model would likely strengthen clarity and usability significantly for readers.

Additionally, while the manuscript now references a "comprehensive review," the methodology remains somewhat underdeveloped. Readers are still not given a detailed explanation of how the literature was selected or synthesized. Depending on the journal's expectations, this could still be viewed as a minor weakness. Some stylistic concerns also remain, including occasional conceptual density, lengthy sentences, and repetitive phrasing in certain sections, particularly in the discussion and conclusion. However, these issues are relatively minor and could likely be resolved during copyediting rather than through major revision.

Overall, the revised manuscript successfully addresses most of the reviewer's substantive concerns and is clearly much stronger in its current form. The revisions substantially improve the paper's conceptual coherence, practical relevance, theoretical integration, and scholarly contribution. With the addition of a brief methodology explanation and a visual conceptual framework, the manuscript would likely be fully publication-ready for many social work journals.