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Covering letter to the editor

Dear Abigail, Annabel or Nafisa

We thank the reviewers for their constructive comments. We adopted all of the reviewers’ suggestions.

Comments of Reviewer 1

1) In table 2, we excluded for statistical testing (as requested) the very rare disorders (prevalence of less than 1%) because the numbers in the cells were too small.

2) The term ‘trend’ is now only used for a statistical trend (0.05 < \( p < 0.01 \)); when we mean trend analysis, we use the term ‘trend analysis’ or ‘logistic regression statistics’ (see page 8 line 15-16).

3) The concern of the reviewer about the use of the correct STATA procedures was exacerbated by our use of an incomplete description of the statistical procedures we used; the section covering design includes a more detailed description of the weighting process (see page 4 line 25-28, page 5 line 1-2), making it clear that this takes into account the complex sampling design, as suggested by the reviewer.

4) Nicotine dependence has been erased on page 5 (line 19), as requested.

5) The citation style on page 4 has been corrected.

6) The paper has been revised by a native speaker of English.

Comments of Reviewer 2

1) An English native speaker has made extensive linguistic corrections.

2) The unacceptable repetitions on pages 8 and 9 (in the descriptions of the results in table 3 and 4) have been removed, the description of the results in these two tables is more compact and, as a result, much improved.

3) A reduced emphasis on statistical significance by its exclusion of the very rare disorders (prevalence of less than 1%) from statistical testing in table 2 (as requested) because the numbers in the cells were too small.

4) The ‘commonplace’ results (married people are less disturbed) in the discussion are discussed less extensively and described as being more commonplace (see page 11 line 7-12).

5) The drift hypothesis is discussed extensively in the introduction (see page 3 line 13-22).
Comments of Reviewer 3

1) In the introduction, we explain the breeder and drift hypotheses, as requested by this reviewer and by reviewer 2 (see page 3 line 13-22). We also describe in detail in this section the various environmental stressors as a conceptual link between urbanization and psychiatric disorders.

2) At the end of the introduction, we formulate our hypotheses as requested (page 4, line 5-9). In the discussion, we pay less attention to the effect of well-known variables such as gender, social class and marital status (as requested by the reviewer) (see page 11 line 7-12).

3) In table 2, we excluded (as requested) the very rare disorders (prevalence of less than 1%) because the numbers in the cells were too small.

4) Tables 3 and 4 present the ORs and SE with fewer digits (as requested).

5) Nicotine dependence has been erased on page 5 as requested.

6) The repeat description of the results (pages 8-9) is more compact and much improved as a result (as requested).

7) An English native speaker has made extensive linguistic corrections to the text.

We hope that this revised version will soon be published.

And thank for all your help!

With kind regards

Prof.dr. J. Dekker

Dd 25-9-2007