Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

We appreciate your comments. All were valuable to reinforce the manuscript. ¡Thank you!

Point 1: Literature review (in both the Introduction and Literature Review sections). The literature review needs to be improved. The authors need to make sure that the works cited actually relate to the subject at hand. In a few places, the authors make assertions that are difficult to substantiate, and the authors would be better off just stating the facts. For instance, on page 2, what makes agriculture the "backbone" of the Mexican economy? Is it surprising that food production has its origins in the agricultural sector?

Response 1: A review of the facts and statements was carried out. For instance, in the introduction section, line 51 is supported with [19], line 52 with [20-23], or lines 60-66 with [27,28] (please see page 2). In this sense, regarding the question, what makes agriculture the "backbone" of the Mexican economy? A more extensive justification about agriculture as the backbone of the economy in Mexico was added to the text when recording the sector's contribution to the total value of production, the level of employment, and the income generated (please see page 2, lines 74-78). Additionally, about the question, is it surprising that food production has its origins in the agricultural sector? The answer is no; however, the statement was to reaffirm the sector's importance, based on [37-40]. (please see lines 78-82). Concerning the literature review section, for instance, line 123 is supported with [75,76], line 127 with [77], or the studies according to their authors. (please see pages 3,4 and 5).

Point 2: On page 2, is it really true that small-scale mezcal producers "suffer the most from the country's environmental, social, and economic problems?" Uribe Reyes doesn't mention the mezcal sector at all in the work that the authors cite (42). Neither does the press release from IICA (39) nor the article in Comercio Exterior (41), and the thesis by Sanchez Juarez appears to be about coffee growers. But the authors cite all of these works to make claims about the mezcal sector.

Response 2: Uribe Reyes, throughout the manuscript, talks about the problems of hunger, poverty, and marginalization from the small producer's context in Mexico, and in this sense, the author takes up these variables by adding the implications and negative impacts on the environment (please see page 24). About the IICA's press release, the information is displayed talking about the marginalization and punishment of the small-producers, registering that from the center to the south and southeast of Mexico, there are 85% of rural production units without access to markets and almost subsistence. The article in Comercio Exterior, makes evident that the industry with market access has progressed and grown. At the same time, Sánchez Juarez's book was added to reinforce the exclusion of small producers in Mexico.

Point 3: On page 3, is the female gender really "invisible and discriminated against in all areas"? I am able to look online and easily find articles about women in the mezcal sector, so they don't seem invisible. Also, what is the connection of the article on honor killings and Islam to the mezcal sector?

Response 3: The sentence makes evident the situation of women in the world context primarily, hence the relationship with the article honour killings, and then move to the context of the mezcalilleras, with poor attention and support, based on [61,67].

Point 4: Missing from the literature review is an overview of the mezcal sector and the major trends and issues facing the sector. Of particular importance are any differences among producers, especially along the lines of gender and scale of operation.

Response 4: The sector's major trends and issues are registered on page 3; after this, gender differences between mezcaleros and mezcalilleras were registered within the production process (please see page 3).

Point 5: The authors establish that the mezcal producers are located in communities with extreme poverty. What is the economic status of these producers, and how does it compare with the communities at large? How much do the producers earn from mezcal, and how much from other income sources?

Response 5: The economic status of mezcalilleras was registered and compared with other states in Mexico. Besides, the mezcal profit established as the subsistence activity of the mezcalilleras is recorded (please see page 10).

Point 6: Page 13: "Statistical", not "Statisticall." "Pearson" test, not "Person."

Response 6: The corrections observed were made, and in addition, one more round to the text to verify additional errors was made.

Point 7: The findings get lost in technical terms (socialization, externalization, etc.). On pages 5-6, the questions could be numbered at the front of each question using the terms in parentheses (e.g., E1, E2, E3...) so that it is not necessary to have the term in parentheses at the end of the question as well.

Response 7: To clarify technical terms of Socialization, Externalization, Combination and Interiorization, the definitions were recorded in the methodology, results, and findings (please see pages 5, 6, 13, and 16). Besides, the number of questions was registered at the front (please see pages 5 and 6).

Point 8: Pages 12-14 are particularly dense, and many readers would benefit from additional text that guides them through this passage. For instance, why is it important to rank the Pearson test results? Is it necessary to report the rankings when a table with the test results follows? How could the text that follows the table be used to explain the importance of years of experience to a mezcal business and of transferring knowledge from one generation to the next, sometimes from one gender to another?

Response 8: Regarding adding an additional text, reference is made to the study carried out in males applying the SECI model (please see page 13). About the question; why is it important to rank the Pearson test results? The manuscript added a statement about the importance of statistical tests (please see page 14). Regarding the question: Is it necessary to report the rankings when a table with the test results follows? The response is yes since every table must be preceded by its explanation to understand the reader better. Related to the question: how could the text that follows the table be used to explain the importance of years of experience to a mezcal business and of transferring knowledge from one generation to the next, sometimes from one gender to another? The answer is the following: first, we must note that the business variable was not considered as such in the study; however, as can be seen, the correlation of the variable "years producing" is found to get involved with another mezcalillera (S3), the collaboration and communication with external agents (S4), the consideration of customer needs (E4), the analysis of profitability before producing (C1), and in the interest in hiring personnel or acquiring equipment to improve the production (I3), statistically meaning that they are open to involving their traditional knowledge with another mezcalillera and possibly with the new generations and even men.

Point 9: The conclusions in their current form emphasize technological improvements to complement traditional production techniques, with the topic of gender only mentioned once. The manuscript would have a much stronger ending if it summarized how digital platforms and intergenerational communication could be used to impart knowledge to producers, including women and the new generation.

Response 9: The conclusion was reinforced summarizing the topics of digital platforms related with intergenerational communication and for men (please see page 16)