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Generally:
A very interesting study focusing on the role of personality in schizophrenia, and furthermore with a focus on gender-differences.
The article is well written and displays some very interesting findings for the field. However, there needs to be done some (primarily) structural changes before the publication of the article:

Background:
In the introduction it should be stated more clearly, that personality and personality traits are both used to underline precursors for later development of schizophrenia, as well as how certain personality traits and personality pathology influence the development of the illness.

(Minor Essential Revisions)

It is stated that: “Most of the alternative models...”. What is meant by alternative models? Section three of the DSM-5 uses the PID-5 instrument as a way to measure personality pathology, and is not considered alternative

(Minor Essential Revisions)

It would be appropriate with a short distinction between the categorically based personality pathology diagnostics inherit in the DSM-system and the more dimensional way of operationalizing personality as represented in the different trait-models used in the literature (including the TCI) (Minor Essential Revisions)

In the section describing differences between males and females, do mention the study by Abu-Akel, Ahmad (2013) (Superior Mentalizing Abilities of Female Patients with Schizophrenia." Psychiatry research) to highlight gender differences in relation to more functional measures (Minor Essential Revisions)

It is mentioned towards the end of the section, that no prior studies have looked at personality traits in schizophrenia and hospital admission. That is correct (to my knowledge), but the subject hospital admission has not been introduced elsewhere in the background section and needs further introduction.

**Methods**
Study design:
This section needs to be better structured (Major Compulsory Revisions)
Inclusion and exclusion criteria. Is it cross sectional study design/ naturalistic etc. ?

Participants:
How was the recruitment procedure? (Major Compulsory Revisions)

After the section describing the participants, I recommend a measure section, describing ALL the measures used in this study (Minor Essential Revisions)

Statistics
This section can be reduced – it most be taken for granted that most readers are familiar with the statistics used in this study (Minor Essential Revisions)

Results
Basic socio- and clinical demographic results lack (age, mean scores for clinical measures etc.) (Major Compulsory Revisions)

Discussion
Generally, this section needs to be better structured. First, results regarding gender differences in the control group are mentioned and then the results looking at gender differences between the control and the patient group. It would provide a better overview of the results from this study if a clearer distinction was made between the different results found. (Minor Essential Revisions)

Most importantly, it seems there is a general lack of intending to explain these findings, why is it that male and female have different profiles? (Major Compulsory Revisions)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.