

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript. We have learned many things from the reviewers' valuable comments. We have revised our manuscript following the advice of the reviewers. We hope that our changes address the reviewers' concerns.

We have provided our responses to the reviewer's comments and suggestion below.

Reviewer Name: Anonymous

*This is a very interesting manuscript aimed to identified participants' level of awareness and opinion about the current situation of forensic mental health in Japan, and how it can be changed through psychoeducation. The article is well written, clearly explained and includes all the element required to be published, so there are no comments related to its content. Methodology is simple but the implications of the results are extremely valuable as they can reduce stigma associated to mental disorders and also may promote early identification and treatment in persons with severe mental disorders. The roles of social media is very well described in this paper and also should increase awareness in people of how this social media affects vulnerable populations. Hope to see further research of this tem, including other populations; research in this área is extremely necessary nowadays.*

**Thank you for your encouraging comments.**

Reviewer Name: Anonymous

*It describes a small study and therefore needs to be considerably shortened and it needs major English language editing. I have evaluated it as "Fair".*

**We have revised the manuscript, with omitting some texts and tables. Furthermore, we have again had our manuscript edited by a professional English-language editor.**

*The authors need to clearly explain who the audience was, how was it advertised, how many fully answered both questionnaires.*

**We have added a description of the seminar attendees and how we advertised the**

seminar. As described in Table 3, 69 people completed both questionnaires. We have included this text in the first part of the result section.

*How did the authors deal statistically with unanswered questions?*

The number of “no answer” are clarified in each table. In the pre- and post- comparison analysis (in Table 3), we treated the data of completers (N = 69, or less for some items in which a few participants did not provide an answer), clarifying in the method section that “pairs missing either pre-seminar or post-seminar responses were excluded from the analysis”. Each number of participants included in the analysis is described in each cell of Table 3.

*The result cannot be generalized to people who are not attending a voluntary seminar (ie who are already motivated to find out more about the topic).*

We completely agree with this comment. Therefore, we include this as a main limitation of this study: “The participants, recruited through convenience sampling, may have already been motivated and interested in our lecture. Thus, it is unclear to what level the general population understands forensic psychiatry and how rigid their opinions against forensic mental health are.”

*Instead of using the term “criminal responsibility”, they need to explain that they are talking about the concept of mental disability leading to diminished responsibility for a committed crime. They need to state clearly at the outset what the Japanese law is on criminal responsibility and to omit US and UK in the intro because legislation varies by jurisdiction.*

We briefly described the legislation of Japanese criminal justice system in the introduction section. It explains that the concept of criminal responsibility is crucial in Japan. We deleted our description about the situation in other countries following the reviewer’s advice.

Best Wishes,

On behalf of the authors,  
Akihiro Shiina, MD, PhD