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Author's response to reviews: see over
Responses to Referees-

Thank you for the reviews -

We have revised the paper and offered responses to each reviewer in the attached documents.

Referee 1- (READ)

Thank you to the referee- this was a helpful review and we apologise that we failed to pick up a the ‘typos’ and missed changing some key words eg literacy

In response to their major compulsory suggestions-

1. We have removed the term mental health literacy from any sections where we talk about the data and our study results etc
   We now have ONLY one place where we mention ‘mental health literacy’ - in the introduction where the term is used as it refers specifically to research by others on this topic

2. We have reworded the paragraph about ‘biogenic aspects’ - to take into account the referees suggestions (but alas at this time point it is not possible to undertake any further analyses)

   There were interesting and previously unreported differences in public views of risk factors for each disorder studied, with genetic factors rated as most important in autism but psychosocial factors predominating in bipolar disorders and substance misuse more often rated as a risk factor for schizophrenia. This finding is especially interesting given the fact that there is increasing concern that messages regarding the biogenic nature of mental disorders may have increased rather than decreased negative views of adult mental disorders- this effect was not consistently observed in our study as it appeared to differ across disorders, possibly suggesting that age of individuals with a disorder may also influence levels of stigma.

3. Minor essential revisions-
   a) Abstract - we have tried to make clearer (taking into account issues of word count) eg

   We have changed the statement about negative labelling to Labelling of conditions in a negative way was frequent (61%)......

   Discrimination against schizophrenia...we have expanded this statement - In contrast to other disorders, discrimination against schizophrenia was only partly attenuated in those with familiarity with mental disorders (through personal or family illness).

   b) Small errors-

   These have been corrected...

   Discretionary change- we have not been able to act on this suggestion (alas due to time resource issues we are not able to undertake further analyses on the data at the moment), but accept the wisdom of the referees’ suggestion. We will look to explore this if we undertake a further study.
Responses to Referees-

Thank you for the reviews -

We have revised the paper and offered responses to each reviewer in the attached documents.

Referee 2-

Before dealing with the points raised by the referee, we wish to reassure the reviewer that the authors totally accept the important insights offered, and we have made most of the changes suggested. However, there are some issues that, whilst we accept with the referees’ opinion - it was not clear to us how some of the proposed changes (whilst valid in themselves) would actually improve either the text or the readers’ understanding of the paper. As such we have focused on making changes that were flagged up as being important by all authors and all reviewers.

(We have used the bullet point system employed by the reviewer to match up the items)

Ad 1

Title-We are happy to take editor’s advice on this but we have not changed the title again

a) the new title was seen as quite acceptable by the other reviewer.

b) the methods section of the study states we are looking at predicted behaviour

Ad 3 (iv) sentence added to methods (stating that when a case had missing values it was excluded from the analysis)

Yes/no/don’t know- we have removed the phrase forced choice

Comments re: main table (we think you mean table 2 not table 1). We did recode responses and the data presented in Table 2 is already explained by a comment with an *

Also in table 2, we have excluded the bold type (although this was a recommended addition from a previous review).

We looked at the option of adding new columns etc to table 2 but it neither adds knowledge or understanding- we feel it makes the data more rather than less easy to interpret (please note, table 2 is a redrafted version recommended from previous reviews)

Comment about descriptive statistics changed to basic statistics

Comment about significance or gender etc removed

Ad 7

i. in the introductory paragraph of the methods we give the references to all the questionnaires/documents etc reported- the adjectives came from work down in Scotland- one of the reports (Glendinning) is now references
ii. classifying responses - we used standard market research approaches, but in order to assist readers we have added a reference to Denzin et al 2005

Ad 8
All the respondents answered all the questions - the missing values were random: 916 answered everything, the remainder missed out small numbers of items

Ad 9
Re: autism - we state in the introduction disorders ‘presenting’ in childhood; we do not suggest it is a disorder that does not continue into adulthood.

To clarify our views - we have made the phrases ‘commence’ in childhood (for autism) and ‘commence’ in young adulthood (for other disorder)

We acknowledge the reviewers suggestions of different study methodologies (using vignettes)- likewise we acknowledge we are hypothesizing about age of onset- but we comment on this as something that may explain the findings, not that it definitely does. This comment was viewed as appropriate by the other reviewer.

I am not sure I understand the comment about ‘Rain man’ or at least it is not clear that the comment requires a change to the text...the discussion of the film and celebrities with severe mental disorders was linked to how individuals with mental illnesses are portrayed in the media (the fact that the film portrays someone who had autism all his life does not mean the example should be excluded).

Use of different terms - the use of the term ‘childhood neurological developmental disorder’ has been excluded from the introduction and discussion, except where it refers to the study by Mak (quoted in the introduction) and where we identify why autism was chosen as an exemplar for the study

The term major childhood disorder has been removed

We have shortened the statements in the introduction regarding autism etc- except for a short sentence referring to the Mak study and the fact that much research on children actually looks at stigmatisation of parents

Ad 12
We re-read the final sentence- it seemed reasonably clear, BUT - we accept the referees suggestion to improve/clarify the wording - so the last few sentences have been re-written in line with the referees’ suggestion

Ad 13 (document says Ad 3 but we assume 13)- use of references
We have added several references to statements in the introduction and discussion that we think express views/opinions or the current literature and the ones the referee especially wished us to reference

The statement on other research - and the reference to some of the reviews by Angermeyer et al were of interest to us, but this statement did not seem to be suggesting any re-writing and so we have not changed the the introduction (and again this was not an issue raised by other reviews)

We have not added every reference to every campaign because some are not in pubmed format and it is easier to find information about these by simply putting the campaign name into a search engine. BUT, we reference the Dumesnil study which refers to all the campaigns - which is the more relevant reference in regard to the discussion of other programmes
Additional Minor Revision-
1. methods survey description-
   See AD 7: the references are: i. Glendinning and ii. Denzin

Other issues- we think we answered this in the previous reviews, also not an issue with the other reviewer- the referee offers a suggestion which we feel if it is okay we prefer to decline at this stage

2. information on how we dealt with missing data covered- see Ad 8

3. results section/mental health literacy
   P8- to avoid misunderstandings we have removed the word significantly in the first sentence (although the last sentence of the paragraph gives relevant statistics)

4. editing
   Apologies for the typos - metal has been corrected!

   Methods-
   ‘took’ is past tense - it is probably also correct, but as the authors believe they have continuing responsibility for this data/paper that extends into the future we have left the phrase as ‘take responsibility’ (but are happy if a copy editor wishes to change it)

   ‘stepped’- to our understanding this is the correct word - and is frequently used eg stepped care/ stepped terraces...again if a copy editor prefers step-wise then it could be changed