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Reviewer’s report:

The authors’ comment letter did not address my revision, so I am unsure of how or whether the authors’ responded to my comments. It appears that they have addressed the minor revision (regarding avoiding making references to analyses that are not presented), but I cannot tell how they addressed the larger revision concerning the coding of the stigma measures. I’m not sure how they responded to the following point from last time:

“My one suggested “major revision” again concerns the coding of the stigma measures. I remain confused about what the authors are reporting in Tables 2 and 3. Based on the authors’ response it seems that the p-value corresponds to the continuous variables but the odds ratio reported corresponds to the dichotomized cut-points in Tables 2 and 3. Is this correct? If so, my impression is that this is unorthodox – that the p-value should correspond to statistic reported in the table. Therefore, it seems that the authors should report the continuous variable + corresponding p-value OR the dichotomous variable + corresponding p-value in the tables. Given that there’s no known meaningful differences based on these cut-offs, I would think that the continuous variables would be more appropriate. The authors could explain in the text any points of potential confusion. OR, if I’ve misinterpreted the authors’ response and the p-value corresponds to the dichotomous cut-points, then I recommend that authors: (1) describe how they arrived at the cut-points in the statistical methods section, (2) note the results of the continuous variables in the text of the results section (i.e., run the models with the continuous variables and simply note the adjusted statistic and p-value in the text – perhaps the regression coefficient (B + SE) if that is most appropriate), and (3) discuss the implications of the use of cut-points in the discussion (e.g., the importance in differences between 75 and 50 pts on NLD as opposed to smaller changes on the scale).”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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