**The thin *frontera* between visibility and invisibility: Felicia Luna Lemus’ *Like Son* (2007)*\****

Taking into consideration of the different issues raised by the Reviewers 1, 2 and 3, the following changes have been made:

**Reviewer 1**

In the following lines, I will expose some of the modifications and improvements that I have made on the essay, as proposed by Reviewer 1. I will follow the order in which they are found in the review. However, these are just some general explanations about these changes, which have been implemented throughout the text in the form of clarifications, explanations, inclusion of quotes, etc.

* In general terms, the novel has been contextualized as part of a Chicana Feminist tradition which attempted at redefining the constraining *frontera* of the gender role differentiation. Thus, the endeavors of the first Chicana Feminists have been mentioned and highlighted, as they are conceived as a (first) revolution for the conceptual definition of Chicana identity, as well as for the reality of this community. In this sense, the work of contemporary Chicana writers such as Felicia Luna Lemus and her work particularly, are presented as revolutionary in the sense that they pave the way for the definition of “an all-inclusive, flexible, and individually designed 21st century Chicano/a identity.”
* Nahui Olin’s name, Carmen Mondragón has been amended. However, after some research on the dates of her birth and death, I came to the conclusion that the most accurate ones are those proposed in the essay, as they can be found in most of the sources about the artist. On the other hand, the idea that she was/is invisible has been clarified.
* The notion that the inclusion of an existent historical figure in the novel creates a sense of “real fictionality” has also been explained and made more explicit.
* As proposed by the reviewer, I have expanded on the implications of the inclusion of Temperance Fountains in the novel, both for the historical and conceptual meaning for the development of the character’s identity.

Taking into account Reviewer 1’s suggestion that the most relevant weakness of the essay is its lack of “sense of why or how it is relevant to contemporary queer criticism or Chicano studies” (as described thoroughly in section “On the knowledge and use of previous scholarship”), I have attempted at inscribing the novel within not only a Chicana Literary Tradition, but also LGBT and Chican@ queer discourse. In this sense, the crucial impact that Lemus’ work for the visibilization and inclusion of non-normative individuals in the Chicano/a community, but also to “challenge the construction of heteronormativity and (…) of the Chicano ethnic and cultural identity.” Morever, Lemus’ work has been deployed as a fictional representation of most of the theoretical postulates that relevant voices in the field of LGTB studies have defended in the last decades (Stryker, Halberstan, Muñoz, among others).

**Reviewer 2**

* The Spanish version of the abstract has been revised and rewritten, as propose by Reviewer 2.

**Reviewer 3**

* No changes were proposed by Reviewer 3.