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Reviewer’s report:

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
  p.4 line 52 – researches should be “research”
  p.11, line 181 – “patients displayed same levels of…” should be “the same…”
  p.17, line 311 – “unsecure” should be “insecure” and again on lines 315 and 316
  p.17 line 322 – “relation” should be “relationships”
  p.17 line 326 – “researches” should be “research”
  p.17 line 329 – “natures” should be “nature”
  p.18 line 355 – “adhesion” should be “adherence”
  p.22 line 443 – “transversal” should be “cross-sectional”
  p.22 line 447 – “built” should be “build”

For ease of reading - Table 1 and 2 should indicate which between group differences are significant (even though this is described in the text)

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

Overall, this is a small study with mixed methods elements (e.g. the use of transcript quotes to exemplify attachment states of minds relative to spiritual figures). It addresses the interesting functional question of whether IWMs are adjusted to compensate for poor primary attachment experiences or whether the early formed attachment style corresponds to the style exhibited with spiritual
figures. This interesting and relatively novel set of questions is drowned out somewhat by the over-inclusive discussion. In my view, presenting the study as more clearly a pilot exploration of the interface between attachment style and spiritual functioning would be more appropriate. The very small cell sizes for some sub-groups and analyses makes the data very preliminary. A briefer, more focused report will probably stimulate some interest and be of use to future researchers.

Some specific amendments and the corresponding manuscript locations are as follows:

p.8 the paragraph describing the recruitment of the healthy control comparator group is very unclear and should be thoroughly revised.

p.13-14, lines 224-239 – The section describing BPRS item level comparisons between patients with different attachment styles and then comparing patients combined with controls is presented without primary data, measures of dispersion, effect sizes etc. These data should be presented more clearly.

p.14 line241-253 – The correspondence and compensation models are tested by comparing cell frequencies for matching or mismatch between attachment states of mind for primary care giver and spiritual figure relationships. However, the frequencies are not clear. The attached table depicts what I extracted from the written material but this appears incomplete. Please revise for clarity.

Parts of the discussion read more like a literature review and cover material that is less directly related to the primary aims and predictions of this study. This detracts from the sections where the authors attempt to carefully analyse and critique the results and link them to previous research (e.g. the consistent association between psychosis and trauma).

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**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.
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