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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr. Ryan Klein,

On behalf of the other authors, I would like to thank you very much for your rigorous review. Your comments enriched the manuscript to a great extent, and provided us various insights enabling us to improve our work. Find below our attempt to address all of your concerns.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. “Familiar” was substituted for the correct term, “family member”.
2. “(n,%)” was put in the right hand column; “formation” and “no doctoral degree” were substituted by “level of education” and “none doctoral degree”; “individual search for professional help” was substituted for “seeking professional help for a psychiatric disorder”; and font size were corrected for all tables.
3. Reviewer is completely right in the sense that Table 3 indeed represents a problem regarding its extension. Maybe a reasonable solution would be to divide this table into two smaller ones. We are sending this review with this solution, so the reviewer can analyze if this procedure improved data presentation. Also, the statistical test of significance, which was highly significant for all variables, was added as a footnote.

Discretionary revisions

1. These terms truly bring some confusion for the reader that is not familiar with this type of research. As such, we briefly described the meaning of the term stigma and cited some of its manifestations at the beginning of the introduction. When social distance was first mentioned, in the second paragraph, we also added a sentence describing the meaning of this construct. The sentence stating that “stigma is resilient” was improved in a way that readers could understand what we wanted to express by resilience. Finally, the last sentence of introduction was modified, according to reviewer’s suggestion.
2. Indeed not enough detail was provided for background and recruitment. Accordingly, this part of “methods” section was improved.
3. This is a very insightful observation. We added a little discussion about the attrition issue in the Discussion. We have also cited a study conducted in Brazil where a very low rate of participation of psychiatrists was observed, to support that in our country such professionals are very hard to enroll.
   Our aim was to assess psychiatrists, but we chose to interview other professionals once maybe we could make a comparison between them in a future study. We feel, however, that this question would not deserve a comment in the methods section; we chose to do so to make the text more objective and in order not to provide the reader too many details that would not be essential.
4. Thank you for this excellent comment. We emphasized that reader should be cautious in interpreting results, and we also further discussed the limitations of our study, as we mentioned above. Besides the fact that some other international studies regarding mental health professionals’ stigma were cited, we also
modified some arguments that could be too radical, also to further stress the caution in interpreting such studies.

Finally, according to the reviewer’s request, the manuscript was thoroughly reviewed by a Native English speaker for language corrections.
Dear Prof. Heather Stuart,

On behalf of the other authors, I would like to thank you very much for your very insightful comments. All the observations contributed to a great extent to the improvement of the manuscript. Find below a point-to-point reply to your concerns.

1. The Reviewer is absolutely right in her concern. This sentence indeed gives the impression that a random sample of psychiatrists was recruited. As such, we modified this first part of the Discussion.

2. We also agree that the results presented by our study were only discussed in a discrete manner regarding this issue. Furthermore, such findings should stimulate initiatives to target mental health professionals. Hence we added a little bit more detail to the Conclusion section, to emphasize the important implications of our study.

3. Accordingly, the sentence mentioned by the Reviewer was rephrased since there is a rather consensus that mental health professionals do stigmatize their patients.

Though quality of written English was not a concern for this Reviewer, the authors would like to acknowledge that this revised version of the manuscript was thoroughly reviewed by a Native English speaker for language corrections.