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Author's response to reviews:

Revision of manuscript: The effectiveness of an anti-stigma intervention in a basic police officer training programme. A controlled study.

Thanks for further comments and suggestions for improvement of the manuscript. We have addressed these issues as follows:

Reviewer: Patrick Michaels

Minor revisions
1. Change in reference numbering: We have corrected the numbering of the mentioned references and changed the number of following references accordingly.
2. Use of repeated measures ANOVA for follow-up analyses: We did consider using ANOVAS but since we had no group comparisons involved we decided to do separate paired t-test in analyses of differences between baseline- post intervention and baseline-follow-up. In this way we think we could also be more transparent in analyzing changes for the two periods separately, which would have been obscured by using repeated measures ANOVA.
3. Content of lectures by people with lived experience: We have added information concerning the content of these lectures, page 7, second paragraph, point 2.

Discretionary revisions
1. Suggestion for changes in wording: we have changed wording in the manuscript in accordance with the reviewer’s suggestion

Reviewer: Beate Schulze

Comments to major compulsory revisions performed
1. We have, as suggested, edited the language of the intervention section, pp 7-8.
2. We have changed the last sentence on page 3 and included the suggestion from the referee concerning sources of the notion of increased contacts between people with mental illness and the police.
3. We have changed the order of the two new columns in Table 2, as suggested. The reason for the two empty cells regarding community ideology and “willing to live with” was that these two did not show significant changes in the pre-post intervention comparisons and thus not included in table 1. We agree that this is not a good reason for not including effect sizes for these two variables in Table 2. We have calculated and added effect sizes for these two variables in Table 2. We have also added sentences discussing possible explanations for the stability and increase in some effect sizes between the post-intervention assessment and the 6-month follow-up assessment, as requested. See end of second paragraph on page 13.