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Reviewer's report:

General

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

This is a stimulating sister paper to Cruesta et al (2000), examining cross sectional correlations between insight and selected neurocognitive performance as well as asking does neurocognitive scores predicted later insight. The design seems reasonable. However

1 I think the study assesses neurocognitive performance and don't seem to be specifically testing neurocognitive dysfunction where normative data or controls would be necessary. I would clarify this.

The main beef i have with the paper is that the author's use of 2 methods to minimise the likelihood of a type 1 error using both bonferroni adjustments and data reduction methods. Could their eagerness to prevent a type 1 error have inadvertently resulted in a type 2 error?

1 I would need to be more convinced about the use of bonferroni's (Pergneger et al ,1998)

2 Also they reduce the data then use bonferroni's....... all this correction in a relatively small sample size?.......the 'trends' that they have found have been demonstrated previously so is the interpretation a bit too absolute.

3 The author's have used data reduction and factor analyes extensively in the past, but it may be helpful for readers less conversant with these techniques to describe exactly what software and what methods were used.

4 Could we be given the results of the regression analyses

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

I would check the references as I found a number of errors usually ascribing work to the wrong journal.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the
major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes