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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript "Anhedonia in disorganized schizotypy" is an up to date and interesting paper within the field of psychosis proneness and extended psychosis phenotype. In order to proceed with its publication, the authors should take the following comments into account:

1.- A major limitation of the work is the little theoretical justification of the main objectives. The authors do not cite important references in the field of schizotypy (and related topics). For example:

General framework:
(Raine, 2006); (Kwapil, Barrantes Vidal, & Silvia, 2008); (Kwapil & Barrantes-Vidal, 2013); (Linscott & van Os, 2013).

Follow-up studies:
(Kwapil, Gross, Silvia, & Barrantes-Vidal, 2013); (Gooding, Tallent, & Matts, 2005); (Kaymaz et al., 2012).

Multidimensionality and psychometric properties of measures:
(Compton, Goulding, Bakeman, & McClure-Tone, 2009); (Callaway, Cohen, Matthews, & Dinzeo, in press); (Gross, Silvia, Barrantes-Vidal, & Kwapil, 2012); (Kwapil et al., 2008)

First, several clinicians and theoreticians have posited a special relationship between the dimensions of schizotypy (anhedonia, cognitive-perceptual, or disorganization), the hypothesized latent trait underlying risk for schizophrenia-spectrum disorders. Second, there are recent studies in the literature that have examined the multidimensionality of schizotypy (Callaway et al., in press; Compton et al., 2009; Kwapil et al., 2008) and the psychometric properties of these measures (Fonseca-Pedrero et al., 2009; Reise, Horan, & Blanchard, 2011). Third, when you mention that schizotypy is a multidimensional construct should take into account the assessment tool used (e.g., Chapman’s scales, SPQ, or psychosis proneness construct). This fact is very important to understand the theoretical model of schizotypy. There are different theoretical models (e.g., fully dimensional or cuasidimensional) (Claridge, 1997) that have implications in the statistical analysis (dichotomized or Pearson/CFA). These issues need to be addressed in the new version of the manuscript. In my opinion the work needs further theoretical justification in relation to main goals and a greater connection with previous works.
2.- Another shortcoming found in this paper resides in the characteristics of the sample, as it consisted of college students that were drawn from only one University with a significant gender difference, being mainly women. Bias associated to college samples, enrolled in the first courses of non-technological studies, is well known by researchers. In relation to the samples used is interesting to add more information (e.g., previous psychological treatments, history of mental disorders, marital status, etc.)

3.- In the Procedure section should be shown the number of participants that reject to enter on the study, time dedicated to answer the questionnaires, place, etc.

4.- In the Instruments section it is considered of interest that the authors offer some data about reliability of the scores and sources of validity evidence of self-reports. Authors should discuss more in depth the psychometric characteristics of the Chapman’s scales and how they have extracted the RPAS-CONS and RPAS-ANT scores based on empirical evidence. Also, TEPS is indirect measure of anhedonia. TEPS scores measures hedonic capacity.

5.- The authors should control the effect of gender and/ or age (Analysis of covariance).

6.- Please insert the Pearson’s correlation coefficient between total scores of the measurement instruments.

7.- In the previous literature has found no studies analyzing the relationships (anhedonia, disorganization) among the tests used in this work, so I think that CFA is not a statistical technique that should be used here. CFA should be used based on the previous theory and data (or dimensional models).

8.- A more detailed description of the statistical treatment of missing values is advisable. How were the missing values treated? Were these eliminated or did the authors use a statistical algorithm which permits the estimation of the missing values?

9.- The authors of this paper didn’t use any scale to detect those participants who respond randomly, pseudorandomly or dishonestly (i.e., infrequency scales). Thus, it is also recommended to use infrequency scales for the detection of such pattern of responses when studying self-reports (schizotypy).

10.- Please delete or change the following sentence: “determine the level of p”.
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