

Reviewer comment-1

The manuscript addresses an important and timely issue in higher education, particularly regarding the increasing expectations placed on faculty to support students' academic and non-academic needs. The topic is relevant to scholars in higher education, social work, student affairs, and institutional policy. The distinction proposed between Academic Case Management (ACM) and Life Case Management (LCM) offers a potentially useful conceptual contribution. However, the manuscript would benefit from stronger conceptual grounding and methodological refinement before publication.

The title is generally appropriate and reflects the manuscript's central argument.

The abstract adequately summarizes the study's purpose, methodology, and general findings. However, it could be improved by more clearly articulating:

1. The specific methodological approach (collaborative autoethnography) and
2. The conceptual distinction between ACM and LCM
3. The policy and institutional significance of the findings.

The manuscript is generally understandable. However, there are some issues such as repetitive wording throughout the manuscript.

Literature Review ·

The literature review is comprehensive but somewhat overly descriptive and could be more synthesized.

· Greater focus is needed to directly connect the reviewed literature to the manuscript's central argument regarding student case management. Theoretical/Conceptual Framing
The manuscript needs stronger justification for conceptualizing faculty support work as "case management." Methodology · The collaborative autoethnographic methodology is appropriate for exploratory inquiry; however, methodological rigor requires strengthening. Additional details are needed regarding data collection, coding procedures, reflexivity, and trustworthiness procedures. Findings/Discussion · The ACM/LCM distinction is compelling and potentially valuable.

· Discussion would benefit from stronger integration with prior literature and clearer differentiation between faculty mentoring/advising and case management.

The references are generally relevant, current, and sufficient for the topic. However, several citation and formatting issues require correction. For example: · In-text citation inconsistency: Schademan and Thompson cited as 2026 in text but 2016 in references. · Read/Reid inconsistency in citation and reference list. · Some references appear incomplete or fragmented.

Specific Comments:

1. The manuscript addresses an important and underexplored issue with potential relevance to higher education, social work, and welfare policy scholarship.
2. The distinction between Academic Case Management and Life Case Management is promising; however, the manuscript requires stronger conceptual justification for extending the term “case management” to faculty roles.
3. The manuscript’s fit with the Journal of Social Work and Welfare Policy would be strengthened by more explicitly connecting the findings to social work theory, welfare policy, institutional responsibility, and structural inequities.
4. The methodology section should be expanded to improve transparency and qualitative rigor.
5. Broader claims should be moderated given the limited sample and single-institution design.
6. The policy implications should be expanded beyond practical faculty recommendations to address institutional and systemic responses to student need.

Overall Evaluation

This manuscript addresses an important and timely issue in higher education: the expanding role of faculty in addressing non-academic student needs, particularly among first-generation and low-income students. The topic is highly relevant to scholars in higher education, social work, and student affairs. The framing of faculty as engaging in both academic and life case management is conceptually compelling and has practical implications for institutional policy and faculty workload.