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Reviewer’s report:

This study examined the association between negative and disorganized dimensions of schizotypy using factor analysis and categorical analysis. The results showed that the disorganized schizotypy was characterized by ambivalence and anticipatory anhedonia, while negative schizotypy was characterized by both anticipatory and consummatory components of anhedonia.

It is interesting to explore the associations between two dimensions of schizotypy and very few studies have done that. However, there are some issues for the authors to consider.

First, the title is not fit for this article. It should be changed to a better one.

Abstract:

1. The “abstract” need to be re-organized since the results was described in the method section. And in the results and conclusion section, they only gave the conclusion

Background

1. Page 3, author stated that “the number of dimensions (of schizotypy) is highly dependent on the rating scales used to assess schizotypal traits”. I would suggest they give some examples here, especially for the disorganized dimension. What is disorganized schizotypy and which scales could be used to measure this dimension?

2. Page 4, is there any hypothesis could be stated after the aims?

3. Instead of the confirmatory factor analysis, why author did not use the correlation analysis to explore the associations between disorganized dimensions and pleasure experiences scores? Any special consideration do they have?

Methods and Results

1. Please report the validity and reliability of all scales for your sample.

2. On page 6, author said “the dimensionality of schizotypy, rated by the CSS, SAS and TEPS...”. I disagree that they call the TEPS as a scale measuring schizotypy. I think it is not appropriate to say that just because the anhedonia level was proved to be inversely correlated with pleasure experiences.
3. Are there any gender differences on schizotypal traits? If yes, when you screened the subjects according to mean and sd, the different criteria might be considered.

4. The model in the CFA should be set based on the previous findings and the author’s hypothesis. If the previous studies showed that there are three dimensions of schizotypy, including positive, disorganized and negative schizotypy, then why did author still tested the first model with one factor in CFA? Is there any reason to set all 8 models in CFA?

5. Is it allowed to have correlations between disorganized and negative schizotypy factors in your CFA models?

6. Figures could be helpful to illustrate your models and make it easier to understand.

7. In the replication study, the two subscales were extracted from physical anhedonia scale measuring anticipatory and consummatory components. Is there any prior study support this statement? If yes, this should be put in the background section or described in details. How do these two subscales work?

8. Is there any difference on the self-reported scales’ scores of samples from two studies? And are they similar as the previous studies? The descriptive analysis on all scores could be presented first in the results section.

Discussion

1. Some information, such as the measurement of schizotypy dimensions could be present in the background section, as well as the consideration of the structural model. It will also be helpful to generate your hypothesis.

2. Please check the whole discussion section, cite papers when it need. It is not clear that if the study were done by previous researchers. Such as, on page 10, “the authors tested the three-dimensional model…….”, please cite papers when it needs, and make it clear. As well as the last paragraph of page 10.

3. This study found that social anhedonic subjects may present only higher anticipatory anhedonia, but not consummatory anhedonia. Is there any explanation on that? The discussion may be extensive.

Minor issues:

1. For categorical analysis, the statistical values should be reported in the table 2 and 4. F values? t values or chi-square values?

2. On page 3, “In the study by Kerns, ……”, no reference was cited.

3. On page 11, ‘in the two studies by Kern…’, no citations.

4. I think author take the TEPS as measure of negative schizotypy is farfetched. I would suggest they split to two studies, the first one examine the pleasure experiences in disorganized schizotypy, on both anticipatory and consummatory components. While in the second study, identify negative schizotypy group, to
compare the cognitive and emotional ambivalence. Take these two studies
together; they examined the associations between disorganized and negative
schizotypal traits.
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