

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewers 1 and 2

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).

ABSTRACT

1. The manuscript should set out a structured abstract (background, method, and conclusion).
2. The abstract should state verbatim that it is a narrative review.
3. An abstract and title in English should be added.

MAIN DOCUMENTS

4. The manuscript needs extensive English language revision.
5. A recommendation for the authors is to broaden and deepen the ethical implications of the research on COVID-19, and how these may have influenced the mental health of the population.
6. The authors point to the phrase "in our context" several times in the text. For example, in the section on "Freedom and respect in complex contexts". However, in my opinion, it is not clear whether the authors are referring to LMIC countries or a specific country of the authors, such as Mexico, Chile, or Colombia.
7. 7. Authors must homogenize within the text whether they will use Covid-19 or COVID-19 (title).
8. In the section "Data collection as a positive action". The authors state that "three important differences between real and virtual research contexts can be identified". I think they are referring to face-to-face vs. virtual data collection. However, this is not clear from the text.
9. In the section "Data collection as a positive action". The authors point out: "the absence of a research director to whom the subjects of a study can turn to resolve their doubts and to identify their rights as participants". In my opinion, they mean a trained fieldworker who can resolve participants' doubts. However, this does not remain in the text.

REFERENCES

10. Authors are advised to check the references. For example, here "Art 1" should indicate the page number:
"Ibeas, E. J., Vallejos, M. F. C., & Díaz, W. T. (2019). Riesgos y beneficios de la investigación científica. ACC CIETNA: Revista de la Escuela de Enfermería, 6(1), Art. 1. <https://doi.org/10.35383/cietna.v6i1.236>"
"Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C. S., & Ho, R. C. (2020). Immediate Psychological Responses and Associated Factors during the Initial Stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Epidemic among the General Population in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(5), Art. 5."
11. Other references are incomplete. For instance:
"Espinosa, V. M. A. (2016). BENEFICIOS DE LAS ENCUESTAS ELECTRÓNICAS COMO APOYO PARA LA INVESTIGACIÓN. 22."

12. In this case, the reference should be the DOI, not the URL:

“Ticse, R., Villarreal, V., & Díaz-Vélez, C. (2014). Declaración de conflictos de interés y revisión por comités de ética en investigaciones publicadas en SciELO Perú. *Revista Peruana de Medicina Experimental y Salud Publica*, 31(1), 169-

180. http://www.scielo.org.pe/scielo.php?script=sci_abstract&pid=S1726-46342014000100031&lng=es&nrm=iso&tlng=es”

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,

We have received your comments and agree with the modifications. We are sure that these suggestions will enrich the manuscript.

Below are the responses to each comment.

ABSTRACT

1. The manuscript should set out a structured abstract (background, method, and conclusion).

Reply: A structure was incorporated into the manuscript

2. The abstract should state verbatim that it is a narrative review.

Reply: it was included in the abstract:

"Method: a critical review of the current literature on COVID-19 research."

3. An abstract and title in English should be added.

Reply: included in the text:

"Background: The pandemic caused by Sars-cov-2 has generated multiple sustained efforts for its identification, characteristics and mobility of the disease that to date has repercussions worldwide. Given this need, it is necessary to have updated information considering transparent research processes. Method: a critical review of the current literature on COVID-19 research. Conclusions: It is essential to have ethical procedures in the different phases of research that can go beyond personal interests and that guarantee the preservation of people's welfare in the reduction of possible damage to health globally, adequate procedures in the collection of information that is not built to the measure of the researchers, to avoid involuntary segregation of the participants and that this leads to a reduction of significant damage due to implicit biases that are generated by poor planning that pursues the scoop instead of social good.

Keywords: Ethical aspects; SARS-Cov 2; Research report; Evaluation Process Assessment."

MAIN DOCUMENTS

4. The manuscript needs extensive English language revision.

Reply: The manuscript was revised.

5. A recommendation for the authors is to broaden and deepen the ethical implications of the research on COVID-19, and how these may have influenced the mental health of the population.

Reply: a section on mental health was added:

"In addition, the social effects corresponding to a disaster condition during this current pandemic have gradually led to a deterioration in mental health (MH), such as the appearance and increase of anxiety symptoms, depressive symptoms, and post-traumatic stress disorder, among others (Hossain et al., 2020). Previous studies on this type of situation have shown that survivors of these conditions suffer complications in their MH, such as fear, stress, depression, irritability, and substance use. These conditions are associated with adverse psychological effects that can be persistent and severe in some cases (Cullen et al., 2020; Hossain et al., 2020)."

[...] "In this way, a study can be manipulated for particular benefits as a result of interests unrelated to the scientific endeavour damaging the neutrality of the researcher driven by other types of motivations related to personal recognition, obtaining economic benefits and substantive promotions, forgetting the general function which is to give answers to society (Aristizábal Franco, 2012; Kohrt et al., 2019). One way to mitigate them converges with the conformation of experienced work teams, which guarantee to some extent the progress and success of studies based on clear and normative policies that avoid exposing study subjects to physical and mental complications (Aristizábal Franco, 2012; Salazar & Abrahantes, 2018; Wang et al., 2020); and, avoiding as much as possible improvisation (e.g. little experience of most of its actors), which by their formative characteristics often lack clear lines of research and inefficient structuring of projects, which reinforce the usual practice of superfluous publications, often associated with the well-known Publish or Perish at the industrialised level (Holmes et al., 2020)." [...]

6. The authors point to the phrase "in our context" several times in the text. For example, in the section on "Freedom and respect in complex contexts". However, in my opinion, it is not clear whether the authors are referring to LMIC countries or a specific country of the authors, such as Mexico, Chile, or Colombia.

Reply: the context that was LMIC was specified.

"Another consideration to detail is what is stated in the Declaration of Helsinki (Ibeas et al., 2019), where it is stipulated that all research protocols must be evaluated by ethics committees, which will be responsible for overseeing the ethical principles and the determination of the possible value of the study considering the scientific validity, methodology, participant selection processes, the balance of foreseeable risks, the benefits of the work under analysis and ensuring the valuation of the participants in decision-making regarding their participation through essential aspects such as informed consent, confidentiality, autonomy and freedom of the participants in all research processes (Ticse et al., 2014). However, in Low- or Middle-Income countries, the early stages of the emergence and spread of the disease only began with the first phase of review of the research work by an ethics committee (Benito-Cóndor et al., 2016; Nosek et al., 2002), which, together with the urgency of knowledge, configures a risk that would make possible the contamination of the actual need for knowledge that benefits the participants involved and prioritises the individualised need of the researcher."

7. 7. Authors must homogenize within the text whether they will use Covid-19 or COVID-19 (title).

Reply: only COVID-19 was used throughout the text.

8. In the section "Data collection as a positive action". The authors state that "three important differences between real and virtual research contexts can be identified". I think they are referring to face-to-face vs. virtual data collection. However, this is not clear from the text.

Reply: I specified that it is a face-to-face data collection.

9. In the section "Data collection as a positive action". The authors point out: "the absence of a research director to whom the subjects of a study can turn to resolve their doubts and to identify their rights as participants". In my opinion, they mean a trained fieldworker who can resolve participants' doubts. However, this does not remain in the text.

Reply: It was clarified that it is the principal investigator or trained field staff.