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Dear Editors,

We would like to submit the revised version of the manuscript with changes highlighted – *The Stigma of Obesity in the General Public and its Implications for Public Health - a Systematic Review*  


We thank the reviewers for their helpful comments. We made the suggested changes to further improve the manuscript and hope it will be eligible for publication. Please find attached below our point-to-point reply to the reviewers’ comments. A native speaker revised the manuscript regarding language and grammar. We additionally went back and shortened too complex sentences.

It would be a great pleasure if you consider our manuscript for publication. We are looking forward to your response and thank you in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Claudia Sikorski
## Appendix:

**Reviewer Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Answer to comment</th>
<th>Changes in manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewer 2 - Perla Werner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Please add a clear statement of the aim of the manuscript in the abstract section, at the end of the background sub-section</td>
<td>We added a clear aim of the study to the abstract as well.</td>
<td>Abstract: This study seeks to answer how representative samples of the lay public perceive people with obesity or overweight status (stigmatizing attitudes); what these samples attribute obesity to (causal attribution) and what types of interventions are supported by the lay public and which factors determine that support (prevention support).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Reviewer 3- Anna Odone** | | |
| 1. The quality of written English is still to be improved. | We had a native speaker revise the whole manuscript and also went ahead to simplify sentences. | See whole manuscript, highlighted passages (e.g. introduction). |
| 2. The first paragraph of the results section (Study characteristics) and figure 1 present different results. How many potentially relevant articles were identified? 35 or 45? How many articles were rejected as not fulfilling the selection criteria? 29 or 39? In addition, numbers in figure 1 need to be carefully checked. | We apologize for the mix up in the numbers and corrected all numbers in the figure and in the manuscript. Since we changed and extended the search strategy as proposed, we did not remember to change the numbers concordantly. | Page 5, last para: From those, 45 potentially relevant articles were identified after screening of abstracts. Twenty-two of these were found in reference lists of the identified articles. After retrieving all full articles, 38 further articles were rejected as not fulfilling the selection criteria. Figure 1 |
| 3. “Introducing elaborate models on causes of obesity to the lay public might be a starting point in stigma reduction.” This sentence is not clear, what do you intend by “introducing elaborate model”? Please consider better explain or eliminate the sentence | We rephrased the sentence and hope its intention is more clear now. | Abstract, last line: Introducing a multidimensional concept of the aetiology of obesity to the lay public might be a starting point in stigma reduction. |
| 4. Authors should add “to” before the word “evaluate”. Other similar language errors and typos are present along the text. Please carefully check spelling, grammar and punctuation. | We made the suggested change and checked the whole manuscript for further typos. | Page 4, second para: Respectively, comprehensive knowledge on these components of weight stigma will further help to evaluate existing models of stigmatization as well as promoting the development of new models. |
| 5. The information on how many articles were firstly identify with the literature search should be add and included in the paragraph “Study characteristics” | We added the suggested information to the results section as proposed. | Page 5 last para, page 6 first para: Initially, 1024 articles were found in the search. From those, 45 potentially relevant articles were identified after screening of abstracts. |
| 6. “Entered into a regression equation, causal attribution of obesity to behavior (internal) contributed to the explanation of variance the most (r² = 0.10).” | The dependent variable here is the degree of stigmatizing attitudes. We feel it would confuse the reader if we moved that to | Page 7, last para Entered into a regression equation with stigmatizing attitudes as the dependent variable, causal attribution of obesity to behavior. |
This sentence should be moved to the next paragraph on “Causes of obesity/causal attribution.

the next section, especially since results of the same study but with focus on causal attribution are discussed right immediately after. We changed the wording of the sentence, however, to make clear that stigmatizing attitudes is the dependent variable.

(INTERNAL) contributed to the explanation of variance the most ($r^2 = 0.10$).

7. Please avoid to use colloquial expression such as “One might regard this…”

We made the suggested adjustments.

Page 11, second para: This circumstance can be regarded as a willingness to support measures that do not influence or restrict the entire society (as it would be with tax rises) but only those that show more of an ideational effect.