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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. It is absolutely necessary to revise the manuscript in terms of correct language use including spelling, punctuation as well as formatting of the manuscript. If possible, a native speaker should modify it.

2. Abstract
The research question is not stated in the abstract. The methods section of the abstract is too short and unexplicit about how the study was performed and for what reason which statistical tests were used. In the results section the authors mention significant differences, however without giving further explanation on the direction of the differences. A limitation section is very unusual for an abstract. On which ground the authors draw the conclusion remains unclear.

3. Introduction
The authors should refrain from using first-person narrative (“As far as I know,…“). Also, some usage of language and phrasing (e. g. personality of impulsivity) is confusing and needs to be modified. Furthermore some statements the authors make lack accurateness and are oftentimes difficult to understand.

4. Methods
The authors should explain how the participants were diagnosed for personality or psychotic disorder. How many had any of these disorders and needed to be excluded from the study? What about other mental illnesses?

5. Results
The authors need to give at least a reference for reported rates of suicidal ideation and attempts in China. This would should be placed in the introduction and possibly picked up in the discussion section.

The description of results of variance analyses is very detailed but also confusing. I suggest reporting results for impulsivity and aggression scales one by one as depicted in Table 2. In Table 2, what does superscript a, b and c stand for?

Given that three comparisons were calculated for each variable, for which comparisons do the p-values given in Table 2 account for? The many findings reported in a detailed manner in the results section cannot be retraced in Table
6. Discussion:
I would suggest to first resume the main findings and second go from top to bottom reporting and discussing the findings in the discussion section. Previous studies, especially those from China, on suicide ideation and attempts as well as the personality characteristics impulsivity and aggression should be presented here.

The authors did not describe in previous sections of the manuscript how they examined demographic characteristics such as satisfaction with the major or relationship with the parents. Correlational analyses would have indicated an association between these two factors with impulsivity and aggression and finally with suicide ideation and attempts.

The reasoning throughout the discussion is very difficult to follow. The authors do not give references for the given reports at all! Many statements seem more like personal opinions. Current findings need to be put into context with finding from previous studies finally leading to conclusions.

The discussion section needs a complete revision.
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