Dear editor and reviewers,

First of all, we would like to thank both reviewers for their comments on our manuscript.

In the table below we explicate how we have addressed the comments and suggestions made by both reviewers in this first round of revision. We would like to thank for the meticulous revision done, the comments and suggestions pointed out. The overall revision process has been since its very beginning argumentative, constructive and rigorous, what indeed has contributed to improve the quality and understanding of the manuscript.

Comments and suggestions have helped us to improve the methodological analyses done and thus, to improve the overall quality of the paper. We have carefully reflected about each of them, and addressed them in the way considered most suitable.

As required, find bellow two tables including the reviewers' comments and suggestions and our explanation of the changes made. Besides, within the manuscript, parts in which changes have been included are highlighted in yellow. Finally, a clear version of the manuscript is also included.

We believe the paper has not a higher quality and we expect that it will fit the expectations.

Best regards,

Authors

REVIEWER 2	
Comment/suggestion	***How did we address the comment/suggestion?***
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript documenting an online gathering of Roma women during COVID. **General comments** I read this manuscript with interest. It was useful to read about how the documented program was valuable for participants and their communities. Documenting the event in the academic literature is valuable as a case study of community development with a marginalised group. The manuscript has the potential to document the views of the Roma women about survival throughout covid and the role of the online event. In addition, the methods for running the online event with a group who experienced literacy and technology access barriers is also of interest. The manuscript would be stronger with some major edits.	We thank reviewer 2 for his/her comments and suggestions.

Methods The inclusion of research subjects in the research team is a strength of the research methods. There needs to be greater detail about the methods, including the theoretical approach for the qualitative analysis of themes and the steps undertaken. Line 213 says, "Then, the two main thematic dimensions that guided the analysis procedure were identified and discussed among the researchers: a) Drivers for discussing the challenges derived from the lockdown, b) potential benefits that go beyond the RWSG itself to the entire Roma community'. The details of the event could be more clearly described. For example, on page 4 , line 173 the manuscript says, "The second speaker focused on Successful Educational Actions and their potential to ensure high quality education to the Roma community even during the lockdown." It would be good to know what 'Successful Educational Actions' refers to. The conclusions of the event were shared with policymakers. How did this occur? If via a written report, was this published?	Substantial changes have been done in the "Methods section". See line 140. We have better explained how the analysis has been done following the communicative approach. In line 182, we have explained what the Successful Educational Actions are. We have also explained in line 456, in which ways the conclusions of the event were shared with policy-makers. This information was moved to the Results section.
Results It would be stronger to include a greater number of quotes in the results. It would be good to have a better link between the methods and research findings. For example, page 6 line 296 says, "The RWSG is rooted in an extensive research line devoted to promoting the best education and social opportunities for all by overcoming inequalities. Scientific evidence with social impact is at the heart of the RWSG, since it underlays the structure of the event and guides the interventions of the speakers." The methods could describe how scientific evidence informed the structure of the event and guided the interventions. Many of the themes documented in the results do not flow logically from the methods which described two main thematic dimensions to guide the analysis: a) Drivers for discussing the challenges derived from the lockdown, b) potential benefits that go beyond the RWSG itself to the entire Roma community.	Following the suggestions of both reviewers, we have included several extra quotations of the Roma women voices themselves, also explaining their words in the context of the discussed findings. We have also improved the link between the methods and the findings, and we believe that this has strengthened the main argument of the article.
Conclusion	

The conclusion is very strong and highlights the value of the research.	
Language expression The manuscript could be edited for more consistent language. There currently seems to be a variety of styles, from academic to a more everyday style. The manuscript seems longer than needed. The language expression could be more succinct. For example, see page 2, lines 58 to 64. Please include the acronym in brackets at first use. See page 3, line 108. Although use varies internationally, it is stronger in academic writing to refer to 'Roma young people' rather than 'Roma youth'. Some word use needs better clarity. For example, see 'unconscious about' page 3, line 130. "Unveiling this is crucial to overcome the stereotyped image of Roma women as passive and unconscious about social challenges affecting their communities, drawing pathways to strengthen the Roma community's resilience." Please write numerals in full at the beginning of a sentence. For example, see page 4, line 162. Please check for grammar. For example, page 8, line 359.	The paper has gone through substantial English language edition. All language expressions commented by reviewer 2 have been revised
References Please number references in order of appearance. Some statements need references, for example, the data on page 2 line 50, documents the 'latest international data' but does not include a reference. Some references are incomplete e.g. 1; 24. Some references on health status are very old. Although they document pre-covid health status, they could be more recent e.g. 5; 6; 7	Additional references have been added, incorporating more clarity to the main argument.