

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewers 1 and 2:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: High

Novelty: High

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).

ABSTRACT:

1. The abstract should be structured into background, methods, results, and conclusions.

INTRODUCTION

2. The first paragraph is very long. I recommend the use of a full stop, to divide the ideas within the paragraph:

"The prevalence of suicides in Mexico has been on an upward trend for approximately two decades (Fernández et al., 2016; National Institute of Statistics, Geography and Informatics (2020, 2021), a fact that could be exacerbated when considering the psychosocial effects of the pandemic of COVID-19, the estimates that have been made in other countries such as the United States, China, Bangladesh and the United Kingdom with people in a wide range of ages (15-75 years), point to a prevalence of 11.5% with suicidal ideation in the general population, a higher percentage than is usually reported prior to the pandemic (Farooq et al., 2021), a trend that combines with what was recorded by the National Survey of Health and Nutrition (ENSANUT) 2018, in which it refers that 5% of the population over 10 years old has ever thought about committing suicide, more specifically in the adolescent population (10 to 19 years old) 4% in men and 7% in women, and in the young population (20 to 29 years old) 4% in men and 5% in women."

This problem is identified in different parts of the manuscript. Please, a style revision is needed.

METHODS:

3. It is not clear from the manuscript whether a reliability analysis of the instruments used was conducted. In the text, the authors state:

"The intensity of suicidal ideation obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .53, the factors of intensity of suicidal ideation explained 55.66% of the variance."

Did the authors calculate a reliability analysis? or did the information come from another study? if it is another study it is necessary to cite it.

This problem is identified in different parts of the manuscript.

4. In the subsection "Data analysis" more information is needed to ensure replicability. It is necessary to indicate that the ANOVA assumptions were met.

5. In the subsection "Data analysis". Add information on the effect size used in the ANOVA analysis, and report in the results section.

6. In the subsection "Data analysis". For SEM analysis. Add information on the estimator used (MLR, ML, WLSMV, other), and the matrix used (polychoric, tetrachoric, Pearson). In addition, add information on the cut-off points of the goodness-of-fit indices used.

7. Do you have a sufficient number of participants for the analysis (statistical power) in the main analysis? Has a sample size calculation been made?

8. It is suggested to create a new sub-section on "Ethical issues" and add the statement: "This project had the approval of the Comité de ética de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México - Facultad de Estudios Superiores Iztacala (no. 1417)."

RESULTS

9. The results cannot only focus on the significant values of the ANOVA, but it is also necessary to add information on the effect size.

10. The information on model 1 and model 2, is necessary to put in a new table (i.e. table 3).

DISCUSSION:

11. The manuscript is interesting and opens the door to several issues. It would be helpful to the manuscript to add a subsection on public health or clinical practice implications. For example, the implications of using a model to predict suicide risk within the Mexican public health system.

Interacciones seeks greater transparency in the review process and to provide credit to reviewers. If the editors decide to accept the manuscript, **would you like your name to appear as a reviewer of the article?**

No

AUTHORS' RESPONSE

Dear Editor,

The comments made to the manuscript are appreciated since they are very pertinent recommendations. The modifications made are specified below:

Recommendation	Modification
ABSTRACT: 1. The abstract should be structured into background, methods, results, and conclusions.	The background was further developed and the Results and Conclusions part was specified. Abstract: first line
INTRODUCTION 2. The first paragraph is very long. I recommend the use of a full stop, to divide the ideas within the paragraph	Some paragraphs of the introduction were separated. Second, seventh and thirteenth paragraphs.
METHODS: 3. It is not clear from the manuscript whether a reliability analysis of the instruments used was conducted.	The citation of the reliability and adaptation studies was added in Instruments. Section Method - Instruments: Last line of the third to eighth paragraph.
4. In the subsection "Data analysis" more information is needed to ensure replicability. It is necessary to indicate that the ANOVA assumptions were met.	The complete Data analysis section was written. Method section - Data analysis.
5. In the subsection "Data analysis". Add information on the effect size used in the ANOVA analysis, and report in the results section.	The complete Data analysis section was written and the table 1 was modified. Method section - Data analysis.
6. In the subsection "Data analysis". For SEM analysis. Add information on the estimator used (MLR, ML, WLSMV, other), and the matrix used (polychoric, tetrachoric, Pearson). In addition, add information on the cut-off points of the goodness-of-fit indices used.	The complete Data analysis section was written with the estimator and cut-off points of the goodness-of-fit indices. Method section - Data analysis.
7. Do you have a sufficient number of participants for the analysis (statistical power) in the main analysis?	Citation of queried parameters was added. Method section - Data analysis.
8. It is suggested to create a new sub-section on "Ethical issues" and add the statement: "This project had the approval of the Comité de ética de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México - Facultad de Estudios Superiores Iztacala (no. 1417)." 9. The results cannot only focus on the significant values of the ANOVA, but it is also necessary to add information on the effect size.	At the end of the manuscript, the section on ethical issues was added. Before the references.
RESULTS 10. The information on model 1 and model 2, is necessary to put in a new table (i.e. table 3).	The complete Data analysis section was written and the table 1 was modified. Method section - Data analysis. Second line of the second paragraph of results.
DISCUSSION: 11. The manuscript is interesting and opens the door to several issues. It would be helpful to the manuscript to add a subsection on public health or clinical practice implications. For example, the implications of using a model to predict suicide risk within the Mexican public health system.	Added a paragraph of Public health implications before Limitations sub-section.
	References were added