The study employed a between-participants survey design whereby mock jurors were randomly assigned to one of two label conditions: ‘Label+info’, in which mock jurors were informed that the defendant was autistic and were given further information about the condition and how the individual was affected by it; or ‘No label’ in which no diagnosis or information about ASD was provided. All participants completed the study on the online Qualtrics data system (www.qualtrics.com). Prior to reading the vignette, respondents in the Label+info condition were informed that the defendant had been assessed by a forensic psychiatrist and was diagnosed with ASD, and they were given further information defining ASD and how it impacted on his behaviours. For example, participants were told the defendant sometimes found it difficult to communicate appropriately, experienced sensory sensitivity, and often felt highly anxious in unfamiliar situations. For the No label condition, respondents received no diagnosis or further information prior to presentation of the vignette. The vignette described a 27-year-old male who was arrested and appeared in court on a charge of assault and battery of a police officer. It comprised two main sections: ‘The Case Summary’ and ‘At Court’. The Case Summary contained background information of the offence; participants were informed that the defendant was behaving aggressively at a train station and when police officers tried to restrain him with handcuffs, he became violent and struck an officer. During the police interview it reportedly emerged that the defendant was trainspotting and was upset because his train was cancelled. The At Court section provided a short excerpt of the prosecutor questioning the defendant in court. The defendant’s crime and behaviour in court was portrayed in a manner consistent with ASD symptomatology and previous research on offending in ASD. This included aggressive behaviours that were reactive to high stress, invasion of personal space and disruption to routine (Allen et al., 2008; Cea, 2014; Freckleton & List, 2009; Kanne & Mazurek 2011; Mouridsen et al., 2008; Tint et al., 2017), and brought about following the defendant’s pursuit of his circumscribed interest in trains (e.g., Barry-Walsh & Mullen, 2004; Chen et al., 2003; Hare et al., 1999; Haskins & Silva, 2006; Helverschou et al., 2015; Woodbury-Smith et al., 2010). The defendant also displayed high levels of anxiety and intolerance of uncertainty (Wigham, Rodgers, South, McConachie, & Freeston, 2015) alongside impaired social-communication, poor eye contact, sensory sensitivities, restrictive and repetitive behaviours, and a need for sameness (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). After reading the vignette participants were asked to rate (on a series of 7-point Likert scales) their perceptions of the defendant’s cognitive functioning, honesty, and likability. Participants were also asked to what extent they believed the defendant was to blame for the incident, whether they felt he should receive a guilty or not guilty verdict and, if they reported that he should be found guilty, how harshly he should be sentenced. Following each rating participants were asked to provide qualitative responses regarding why they gave that rating.