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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Thank you for letting us revise the manuscript "Test-retest reliability of two instruments for measuring public attitudes towards persons with mental illness.

All changes in the manuscript are marked with yellow colour. Following revisions are made:

Referee 1.

Major Revisions

1) We have extended the literature review and included stigma in work life and a text about self-stigma

2) The referee suggests that the full questionnaire should be presented in an appendix. The questionnaire is a quite large document, we have added the reference to the Changing minds campaign where the questionnaire can be found.

3) Concerning the homogeneity of the sample and the fact that the participants of the study were trainees in a helping human service. We have made some reasoning about this and reviewed literature concerning heath care staff and attitudes toward mental illness.

4) We don’t really catch this point. It is a rather large question and maybe beyond the scope of this paper. But if the referee considers this important we will of course try to address it.
Minor Revisions:
1. We have made a clarification that the definition is specific for people with mental health illness.
2. We have changed the text to better suit the true level of knowledge
3. We have clarified the sentence.
4. The manuscript has been reviewed by a native English speaking person.

Comments from the Associate Editor:
We have included a motivation for the use of Cohen’s weighted Kappa and clarified how the percentages have been generated.

Editorial requests:
The abstract have been restructured.
Ethics have been clarified
Competing interests have been included
Authors contributions have been included

Best regards
Dr. Bengt Svensson