

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your feedback on our recent submission to Revista Interamericana de Psicología/Interamerican Journal of Psychology, entitled "System Justification in the Social Explanation of the Violence against Minoritized Groups".

We were pleased by the overall tenor of the review, and we appreciate the opportunity to resubmit the revised paper. Below we present our answers and comments to the suggestions and issues raised. In the text, we highlighted the changes we have made in red color so that you can more easily recognize them. We believe these comments helped improve our manuscript, and we think we have done so successfully.

We are confident that this new version of the article is much better than the one we submitted previously. We hope you find the revised manuscript suitable for publication. Of course, we are willing to make any further changes that you or the reviewers believe would improve our manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Authors

Reviewer A

El manuscrito es original y aporta nueva información sobre el tema de la violencia hacia grupos minoritarios. Presenta una comprensión de una teoría que puede discutirse específicamente a través de los resultados de la investigación.

R: We are very grateful for this comment and appreciate the reviewer's suggestions to improve the quality of our article.

También presenta una metodología adecuada para los dos estudios empíricos que desarrolla, siendo claro en los hallazgos y en los datos que analiza. Sin embargo, la discusión es pobre, principalmente para las dos áreas más altas encontradas en los resultados. Se sugiere analizar la explicación de la violencia como sistémica desde los factores socioculturales de la muestra que se utilizó (estudiantes universitarios de Brazil, sus creencias, sus ideologías y premisas del concepto de violencia a través de su historia) así como analizar la explicación de la violencia hacia las mujeres desde la culpabilización de la víctimas desde la perspectiva de género (estudios realizados en Brazil en torno al tema).

R: We now addressed this as follows in the general discussion of the manuscript.

En el manuscrito faltan las conclusiones finales que englobe ambos estudios.

R: We included a conclusive section in the current version of the article.

Presenta 42 referencias bibliográficas siendo un 85% de ellas de origen europeo. Se sugiere mayores referencias interamericanas para darle un análisis cultural acorde al país de origen del texto. De estas referencias, 17 son actualizadas (40%). Es necesario que las referencias finales se encuentren en el cuerpo del escrito y viceversa.

R: We now diversified the cultural origin of references and updated them as suggested.

La escritura presenta problemas de ortografía. Revisar todo el documento.

R: A native English speaker edited the current version of the article, using American spelling.

Reviewer C

Reviewer C made his/her suggestion directly in the manuscript. We have listed each suggestion below and indicated how we have incorporated it into the current version of the article.

Introduction

- Citations that evinced this assumption

R: We followed this suggestion and provided evidence with citation.

- According to the APA 7 norms, this is a level 2 heading, so it has to be flush left in bold and italic.

R: We corrected it.

- In addition to examples, it is necessary to add data and literature supporting and explaining theoretically why violence can be explained by system justification theory and why this theory can explain specifically violence towards minoritized groups.

R: R: We have provided more reacional and theoretical explanations of how violence against minority groups can be related to the justification of the system

- It is necessary to add citations or more information that supported theoretically the idea that the System justification Theory can explain violence as inequality and exclusion. It is not, it seems a logical argument but little supported.

R: We provided more theoretical rationale as requested.

- "Examples of actions that justify the system are stereotyping, the use of some ideologies to explain social facts, and blaming victims for their misfortune." - A citation has to be added.

R: We followed this suggestion and added a citation.

- Although the idea makes sense, it seems like some information is missing. It is necessary to clarify why to analyze the effects of this theory on violence against minoritized groups? Why violence? Why these groups? It is missing information to explain and justify these two critical issues.

R: We have provided additional information and clarified why we focused on these specific targets of violence.

- It is necessary to add a citation. Further, it will be helpful to clarify if these three different types of justification are part of the authors 'or other academics 'proposal or part of the System Justification Theory. If they are an author's proposal, it is necessary to support them theoretically.

R: We clarified this aspect and made explicit the theoretical bases for our proposal.

- It is suggested to add citations that theoretically reinforce the blame's attribution to the victims as part of the System Justification Theory and not only as an assumption of the author.

R: We also provided additional citation to reinforce our rationale.

- What about women and gay individuals? Is there any data about this kind of justification in these minoritized groups? If it is, it is suggested to add, and if it is not, it is essential to mention it.

R: We provided rationale for this possibility.

- Citation is necessary to reinforce this assumption theoretically.

R: We provide citation as requested.

Study 1

- It is suggested to use the same concept throughout the document. In the beginning, this variable was named 'minimization of the perpetrators 'responsibility, 'and now it is named 'blaming the perpetrators', this concept has the opposite sense, so in necessary to clarify to the lector in which definition the study will be based.

R: We now kept the consistence when naming the variables.

- I would appreciate expanding the explanation about the procedures for the assignment of participants, specifying the kind of sampling and if any provision of anonymization was obtained.

R: As required, we have provided detailed information on the procedures we used in the Method section of Study 1.

- **This is repeated below. It is suggested to leave this information in the heading of instruments and procedure.**

R: As suggested, we left information in the heading of instruments and procedure.

- **The questions may be a slight bias affected. The control question looks very general, without contextual information that can allow respondents to make a judgment. However, the condition's questions were more explicative of the situation, added information about the causes for the violence, and invited to come out the prejudices. Furthermore, people can talk about why they think violence happens against blacks, women, and gays, but this does not necessarily reflect their approval. These issues have to be considered in the limitations of the study.**

R: We addressed this issue in the general discussion of the article.

- **The explanation about this procedure is confusing. I would appreciate a further description of the methodology to calculate the continuous dependent variable and the independent variable 'types of justification'.**

R: We clarified this aspect as requested.

- **Based on the above explanation, it seems that the continuous variables formed were the types of justification, but they were used as independent variables so is difficult to understand which is the continuous variable that is considered as the dependent variable.**

To clarify these issues, it is necessary to specify your dependent variable, and to explain how it was formed.

R: We clarified this aspect as requested in the Data analysis Section.

- **This definition has the opposite meaning to 'minimizing the responsibility of the aggressor,' so it does not match with the types of System justification that the authors stated. Could you please explain how the variable's calculation was done to fit with the theory?**

R: We have clarified this issue by naming this category uniformly throughout the text as the perpetrator blaming.

- **I would appreciate specifying the test that this symbol attends and justifying its use.**

R: This is reporting the simple effect in the ANOVA results, as required by the APA guidelines for writing statistics.

- **It is suggested to present your hypothesis at the beginning of this paragraph and explain the results that confirmed it.**

R: As suggested, we presented our hypothesis at the beginning of this paragraph and explain the results that confirmed it.

Study 2

- **It is suggested to explain why the authors think this type of justification will be more alluded to?**

R: We explained this aspect better as requested.

- **Same comment as in study 1. I would appreciate expanding the explanation about the procedure for the assignment of participants, specifying the kind of sampling and if any provision of anonymization was obtained.**

R: We also provide additional information about procedures we followed.

- **Could you please specify the name of the dependent variable?**

R: In the data analysis section, we provided the name of the dependent variable as requested.

- **Same comment as in study 1. It is difficult to understand which is the continuous variable that is considered as the dependent variable. And also, if a general measure was made for each type of blame, how was the categorical variable 'type of blame' formed? It is necessary to specify your dependent variable and explain how it was formed to clarify these issues. Also, further explanation of the procedure of how the independent variable 'type of blame' was created is needed.**

R: We clarified this aspect in the text as requested, as it was more detailed in the method section of Study 1.

- **It is recommended to add the hypothesis established for study 2.**

R: We provided the hypotheses as requested.

- **As mentioned, this second study's main objective was to compare the personal and social answers. However, the results showed little about this aim, and also, some of the results suggested that they were on the contrary of what was expected. This is necessary to be mentioned in the discussion.**

R: We clarified this issue better in discussion of Study 2.

- **Still, it is confusing how this manipulation was done by assigning a target group of the violence to the participants. As suggested before, it is necessary to clarify this point in the method.**

R: We clarified better the procedures we used in the method section of both studies.

- **In the discussion, it is recommended to mention the no significant differences detected concerning target violence in study 1; also, the difference only for black individuals and on the contrary as expected in study 2.**

R: As suggested, we addressed these issues in the discussion of Study 2 and integrated them more fully at the beginning of the general discussion section when comparing the results of the two studies.

- **Further theoretical information is needed to support this idea.**

R: We provided additional information as requested.

- **It is recommended to specify and explain these contributions deeper.**

R: We specified better those contributions as requested.