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Title: A Narrative Review of Autobiographical Memory Studies on Patients with Schizophrenia Spectrum Disorders

This work carried out a review on autobiographical memory functioning in schizophrenia using 28 quantitative studies. It is an interesting and complete work. I would suggest some improvements.

1. Abstract: Conclusions section it doesn't seem a conclusion section. The information is too general and the CaR-FA-X model appears suddenly. Why is important here? What does this review add to the previous ones on this topic? At methods section you could also name the PRISMA procedure you followed…

2. Background.

2.1. The first sentence ("are some of the most impairing and distressing forms of psychopathology"), it seems to me a little bit sensationalistic, it depends on so many things, have you measured that? I would start with something more neutral of informationa (eg. Prevalence of the diagnoses).

2.2. I’d include in the first paragraph a basic information about what is new in this review compared to previous ones, specially the review of Ricarte et al. ("Mapping autobiographical memory in schizophrenia: clinical implications", Clinical Psychology Review) that also used the CARFAX model as framework. This reference needs more presence through the article, not only in the introduction, as your review is quite similar to this one. You need to declare what is different in your review compared to the previous one of Ricarte et al.

2.3. Second paragraph: "narrative review". Why is a narrative review? Please, could you rationale this?

2.4. "self-discrepancy". I like this idea too, however, I can not see the link with the rest of the introduction, perhaps you could find a better place in the article to argue about it or find a better link with the rest of the introduction for this idea.
2.5. "If the SMS remains nonfunctioning, and the disagreement between these two components unresolved, symptoms of confabulation, disjunctions, or schizophrenic delusions may occur." Is this an original idea? In that case I would support it with references or results that could support it. It seems a too strong asseveration.

2.6. "Lastly, as the lifespan distribution of patients' AMs was not reviewed elsewhere," This is not true, please, see Ricarte et al., in Clinical Psychology Review.

3. Conclusion.

3.1. "In addition, patients' explanations for the importance of personal events seemed more objective, while healthy controls' explanations were subjective." What do you mean with "subjective"?

3.2. The second paragraph about suicide ideation, why is here? You presented in the first paragraph the conclusions on cuing methods and suddenly it appears this… I can not follow the line… Is this another objective? If so, introduce it before in the article…

3.3. Regarding future questions, I would elaborate more mature questions:

(a) Do patients with schizophrenia think about their past?; OF COURSE THEY DO IT.

(b) How frequently do they think about their past?; WHAT FOR?

(c) What kind of functions are being served by AM in patients with schizophrenia? YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO DRAW SOME CONCLUSIONS ON THIS AFTER YOUR REVIEW

(d) What are patients' developmental features, such as interpersonal relationships and attachment style, and how do they contribute to their goals of working self?; DEVELOPMENTAL FEATURES?

(e) How do patients narrate their past experiences?; AGAIN, THIS IS NOT A NEW THING.

(f) What are common themes in their retrieved memories?; BERNA ET AL AND OTHER AUTHORS DID THIS ALREADY.

and (g) How do they make sense of their past experiences? PLEASE, CHECK ON SELF-DEFINING MEMORIES IN SCHIZOPHRENIA.

Finally, please, could you check this reference in case it achieve your inclusion criteria? :

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
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