Online supplement

Factor1 Factor2 Uniqueness "perceived "continuum beliefs" fundamental differentness" Sometimes we are all at least a little like Anne. it 0.893 0.141 0.256 is only the question how pronounced this state is. To some extent, most persons will experience 0.885 0.075 0.251 problems that are similar to those of Anne Overall, Anne's problems are abnormal -0.544 0.428 0.390 People with problems like Anne are normal 0.552 -0.163 0.617 persons like everybody else There is something about Anne that makes her -0.014 0.807 0.341 fundamentally different from other people. Someone with arthritis or a broken leg has just 0.100 0.809 0.383 one thing wrong with them, but a person like Anne is fundamentally different from other people Anne is in a state of mind that normal persons 0.100 0.761 0.455 simply cannot understand

Table S1: Items on continuum beliefs and fundamental differentness. Principal component factor analysis, promax rotated factor loadings.

Table S2: Items on social distance.

Principal component factor analysis, varimax rotated factor loadings.

Please indicate: How willing would you be	Factor 1	Uniqueness
	"social distance"	
to move next door to Anne	0.629	0.604
to spend an evening socializing with Anne	0.812	0.340
to make friends with Anne	0.872	0.240
to have Anne start working closely with you on a job	0.838	0.298
to have Anne marry into your family	0.691	0.523

Table S3: Items on blame, dangerousness and unpredictability.

Principal component factor analysis, varimax rotated factor loadings.					
Variable	Blame	Dangerousness/	Uniqueness		
		unpredictability			
Anne is to blame for her problems	0.856	0.072	0.262		
To some extent, it is Anne's fault that she	0.848	0.026	0.281		
got into this situation					
Anne only has to pull herself together in	0.813	0.141	0.318		
order to get well					
Anne's problems likely result from her	0.773	0.196	0.364		
weak character					
Anne is a danger to other people	0.488	0.583	0.422		
Anne is a danger to herself	-0.084	0.836	0.294		
Anne is unpredictable	0.197	0.856	0.228		

Table S4: P-values for the interaction between intervention type and disorder vignette

	Continuity beliefs	Fundamental difference	Social acceptance	Blame	Unpredictability
P for interaction	0.158	0.125	0.302	0.406	0.272
interventions* disorder					

Table S5: Treatment effects of the interventions on social acceptance, including respondents who recalled the intervention correctly at the end of the interview (n=668)

	Social acceptance	
	ß	р
Intervention		
Dichotomy (Ref)		
Continuum	0.157	0.044
Disorder		
Depression (Ref.)		
Schizophrenia	-0.239	0.002

ß, linear regression coefficient; standardized factor scores were regressed on type of intervention and vignette condition, adjusted for sociodemographic variables.