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Author’s response to reviews: see over
We thank the reviewers for their constructive comments which we followed point-wise.

Comments of Reviewer 1

1) We described the complex sampling design extensively in the method section (see first paragraph). We also explicate which consequences this has for the data analysis.

2) Following the advice of the reviewer, we described as a limitation that it cannot be excluded that response rates were a function of urbanisation due to larger travel distances in rural areas.

3) Unfortunately we could not gather the data of nicotine use in time.

4) Table 1 with risk factors was added in the method section.

5) In table 2 (formerly table 1) we tested for linearity instead of separate tests between all categories. In every cell the unweighted number is indicated.

6) In table 2 we added the analysis pertaining to comorbidity of mental disorders. Also, an analysis was added at the end of the results section in which urbanization was a dependent variable in an ordinal regression. First we entered the diagnostic categories as predictor variables then we entered the risk factors and the interaction terms.

Finally, all minor suggestions were followed.

Comments of Reviewer 2

1) The statistical analysis section was rewritten.

2) In tables 3 and 4 the non-significant results were briefly described.
3) Percentages in table 1 have been corrected

4) Dichotomization of variables was explained (as the threshold of 40 years).

5) The trend for psychotic disorders was not a trend, but a significant result as in the table was shown; this statement has been corrected.

6) We have made a comment on the relation between marriage, sex and psychiatric disorders.

7) We have explained the 20 associations in the discussion.

8) We have explained what we meant with the accumulation of the risk factors in the discussion.

9) We made an effort to contrast our results (12-months prevalence of psychotic disorder) more sharply with those of the Van Os study (life-time prevalence) in the discussion section.

10) We also explained our results more in the light of the Van Os findings.

All minor corrections suggested by reviewer 2 have been followed.

With kindley regards

Prof. Dr. J. Dekker