

Detailed Response to Review Board Suggestions:

I wish to express gratitude to the editor and the reviewers for providing suggestions that steered this article toward higher quality. Thank you. Please see my responses below in green.

Reviewer A:

I found this revision to be much better and to the point. I must confess that I have always viewed MI as compatible with strengths-based practice so in my mind this isn’t necessarily a revelation.

 Using the principles and going through it point by point was a good idea. Thank you!

You can see above where I drew a line –personally I think this is where the article should stop – so in my opinion it can be tied up nice and neat here. As it stands it is too rambling after that for my taste. I concur that there is a lot of information packed into the last sections of the article. However, with the Editor’s assurance that page limit is not as much of an issue in an online journal and Reviewer B’s comments implying that these sections are important, I would like to continue to include these sections.

Reviewer B:

The author(s) have thoughtfully responded to the original reviews they received for their manuscript. The current manuscript is improved for the changes made to it. I continue to think that, because of the arguments made by authors and given the current importance of both evidence-based and strength-based practice, this article will be an intellectual and practical contribution to the social work literature for its specific and detailed analysis. I find the conceptualization, organization, analysis, and writing to be solid. This manuscript is particularly enhanced by the additional citations provided in the history and argument portions of the manuscript. Thank you!

I have made multiple edits and comments in the text using track changes. These are all technical or stylistic, copy edit-type notes. There are no additional substantive suggestions for improving this manuscript made within its text. All of the edits and comments in the text using track changes were accepted or incorporated, except for one. I agree with the comment on page 17 regarding stages of change providing a lens which may help to seamlessly bridge the SBP and MI foci. However, I also agree that a discussion of the SOC model may distract from the main thrust of the article. Particularly with the recent efforts of MI researchers to distance MI from the SOC model because of past confusion and conflation.

As an educator, direct practice practitioner, and community engaged scholar, I think this manuscript should be published and will be informative for multiple constituencies, as the author(s) have outlined. MI has a robust evidence base and many allied health professionals are familiar with MI. Thus, a clear articulation of the many points of congruence and few nuanced differences between SBP and MI may also serve as a bridge by which other professions might better understand the heart and nature of social work, given the centrality of SBP to the profession. Thank you, I agree.

This closing thought might be worth working into the manuscript, if other edits are being made. Contributions that help social workers translate, frame, and relate our profession to that of others can facilitate and enhance interdisciplinary work and the regard held by others for the profession of social work. This is another important function for social work scholarship. The current article could contribute in this way. Irrespective of inclusion of this point, I think it an additional reason to publish this article. I included some of this language in the “researchers” section of the implications.

I am glad for the opportunity to have read this work and to contribute to the quality of Advances in Social Work.

Again, thank you for taking the time to review this article and provide constructive feedback. I appreciate the suggestions.