

**Supplementary material 1.** Article review process.

-----  
**Reviewer A:**

**Recommendation: Revisions Required**  
-----

**Relevance**

Moderated

**Novelty**

Moderated

Presentation and writing

Moderated

**Comments for authors:** Be as accurate as possible when making your comments. List each recommendation so that it is easy for authors to respond appropriately to each one. Indicate in a timely manner where changes should be made (i.e. paragraph 2 of the method section).

**INTRODUCTION**

- Paragraph 6, line 7: ;"....because they are a vulnerable group" Women are defined as a vulnerable group? Improve this interpretation

**METHODOLOGY**

- Participants, line 2: The percentages are part of the results (withdraw).
- The text refers that it is a non-probabilistic purposive sampling, being so, how did they have access to these women, where does the sample come from, and regarding the exclusion criteria, how was the presence and absence of psychiatric Dx or treatment confirmed? Make that clear.
- Procedures line 4. "The questionnaire indicated that the processing of personal data would be confidential, anonymous, and for scientific research purposes" to place on ethical considerations. "For the dissemination of the questionnaire, flyers were created with the information about the research with the access link and through social networks Facebook® and WhatsApp®."
- Specify the dates on which access to answer the questionnaire was allowed. Review your sampling methodology - didn't it snowball? SUGGESTION.

**DISCUSSION**

- 1st paragraph: Do not place the objective of the study in the discussion, nor repeat the results already mentioned in their respective section. The discussion should contrast the most relevant results in light of current evidence.
- Paragraphs 6 and 8: Do not include recommendations in the discussion.
- Paragraph 7: REMOVE, out of context in the discussion.
- Report the limitations of the study
- Where are the conclusions of the study, they should answer the proposed objective clearly and succinctly.
- Recommendations are included after the conclusions.

**GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

-Revise the proposed comments and improve the writing style of the discussion taking into account the recommendations.

---

**Reviewer B:**

**Recommendation: Revisions Required**

---

**Relevance**

Moderated

**Novelty**

Moderated

Presentation and writing

High

**Comments for authors:** Be as accurate as possible when making your comments. List each recommendation so that it is easy for authors to respond appropriately to each one. Indicate in a timely manner where changes should be made (i.e. paragraph 2 of the method section).

Method:

1. It is recommended to add a setting section, where the state of the pandemic in the Mexican context during the time of the assessment is explained.
2. It is necessary to note the dates of assessment since during the different waves of COVID-19 in Mexico the state of mental health may have changed.
3. In the "Ethical considerations" section it should be noted that virtually informed consent was applied.
4. CDMX is indicated in Table 1, but it is not specified what this means. This may not be intuitive for non-Mexican readers.

Discussion:

5. It is necessary to add a subsection in the discussion on "strengths and limitations".
  6. A subsection on "implications in public health and psychology" would be very helpful to the study, as it would allow us to evaluate the degree of applicability of the results and their possible use in the context of the pandemic in Mexico.
-

-----  
**Authors' response**  
-----

**Title: Knowledge about COVID-19, coping and resilience in Mexican women: comparison by stress levels**  
All changes made are available in the document and are in red.

<b>Reviewer A</b>
<p><b>Suggestion or comment:</b> Paragraph 6, line 7: "...because they are a vulnerable group" Women are defined as a vulnerable group? Improve this interpretation</p> <p><b>Change made:</b> The wording was modified, in addition, more arguments were presented that reinforce the premise reported in previous studies which indicate that during the COVID-19 pandemic, women have experienced more complications of a psychological nature, compared to men; as well as for the active role they have played during this health emergency. One of the references (Almeida et al., 2020) that was already in the manuscript was added to support the idea.</p> <p><b>Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)</b> Paragraph 6, line 6.</p>
<p><b>Suggestion or comment:</b> Participants, line 2: The percentages are part of the results (withdraw)</p> <p><b>Change made:</b> The wording was modified, removing the percentages in the description of the sample.</p> <p><b>Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)</b> Participants, line 2.</p>
<p><b>Suggestion or comment:</b> The text refers that it is a non-probabilistic purposive sampling, being so, how did they have access to these women, where does the sample come from, and regarding the exclusion criteria, how was the presence and absence of psychiatric Dx or treatment confirmed? Make that clear.</p> <p><b>Change made:</b> Regarding the exclusion criteria, it is specified that the participants reported in the online evaluation if they had a recent diagnosis of a psychological and/or psychiatric condition.</p> <p>About the kind of sampling, it was discussed between the authors of this study, and it was concluded that it does correspond to a non-probabilistic snowball sampling. Given that when the flyers were published on social networks, the participants who responded were able to share the information with their family and friends, in such a way that they spread the flyer among themselves, and therefore, enter and answer the form in GoogleForms®.</p> <p><b>Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)</b> Exclusion criteria: Participants, line 5. Sampling: participants and more specifically in the procedure section.</p>
<p><b>Suggestion or comment:</b> Procedure line 4. "The questionnaire indicated that the processing of personal data would be confidential, anonymous and for scientific research purposes" to place on ethical considerations. "For the dissemination of the questionnaire, flyers were created with the information about the research with the access link and through social networks Facebook® and WhatsApp®."</p> <p><b>Change made:</b> As noted by the reviewers, ethical issues related to research were removed from the procedure and placed in the ethical considerations section. In such a way that the principles under which the information was</p>

collected and analyzed are specified. In the procedure section, it was included that the GoogleForms® form had informed consent.

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)**

Procedure (informed consent) and Ethical considerations.

**Suggestion or comment:**

Specify the dates on which access to answer the questionnaire was allowed. Review your sampling methodology - didn't it snowball? SUGGESTION.

**Change made:**

In the procedure section, it was added that the participants had access to the form in GoogleForms® between June 25 and October 23. In that period, it was published five times, every three weeks. Regarding the type of sampling (snowball), the modification was made, and it was specified in the design section.

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)**

Procedure (access to answer the questionnaire) and Design (sampling).

**Suggestion or comment about Discussion:**

- 1st paragraph: Do not place the objective of the study in the discussion, nor repeat the results already mentioned in their respective section. The discussion should contrast the most relevant results considering current evidence.
- Paragraphs 6 and 8: Do not include recommendations in the discussion
- Paragraph 7: REMOVE, out of context in the discussion.
- Report the limitations of the study
- Where are the conclusions of the study, they should answer the proposed objective clearly and succinctly?
- Recommendations are included after the conclusions.

**Change made:**

Given that both reviewers made suggestions regarding the discussion and conclusion of the research, the authors by consensus consider it pertinent to rethink the discussion, in addition to including limitations and suggestions for future research. Therefore, new points were written or deepened, always considering the suggestions provided by both reviewers.

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)**

Discussion

**Reviewer B**

**Suggestion or comment:**

It is recommended to add a setting section, where the state of the pandemic in the Mexican context during the time of the assessment is explained.

**Change made:**

In the procedure section, the health situation in which Mexico was at the time of carrying out the investigation was reported, in terms of the number of cases of morbidity and mortality and containment measures for the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Therefore, an institutional reference had to be incorporated to support the information provided.

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)**

Procedure

**Suggestion or comment:**

It is necessary to note the dates of assessment since during the different waves of COVID-19 in Mexico the state of mental health may have changed.

**Change made:**

This suggestion was also made by reviewer A, so it has already been attended.

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)**

Procedure

**Suggestion or comment:**

In the "Ethical considerations" section it should be noted that virtually informed consent was applied.

**Change made:**

In the section on ethical considerations, it was detailed that obtaining virtually informed consent was obtained by choosing one of the two available response options. In other words, if the participants gave their consent to participate in the research, they clicked on the "Yes, I accept" option, displaying an emergent notification with the questionnaire questions. On the other hand, if they chose the "I do not accept" option, a new notification was displayed thanking them for their time and ending the form.

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)**

Ethical considerations

**Suggestion or comment:**

CDMX is indicated in Table 1, but it is not specified what this means. This may not be intuitive for non-Mexican readers.

**Change made:**

"CDMX" was replaced by "Mexico City". "Estado de México" was replaced by "State of Mexico". To specify that it refers to the capital of the country.

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)**

Table 1

**Suggestion or comment:**

It is necessary to add a subsection in the discussion on "strengths and limitations".

**Change made:** Study limitations were reported

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line):** In discussion section is available

**Suggestion or comment:**

A subsection on "implications in public health and psychology" would be very helpful to the study, as it would allow us to evaluate the degree of applicability of the results and their possible use in the context of the pandemic in Mexico.

**Change made:**

At the end of the discussion, and before the limitations of the study, it was mentioned that the findings obtained to contribute in terms of public mental health, because the current state –at that time– of mental health of Mexican women was evaluated, with intended to be useful for designing psychological interventions based on group characteristics. As well as highlighting that it must have a mental public health action protocol in the event of health emergencies like COVID-19.

**Location of correction (page number, paragraph, and line)**

Discussion.