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Reviewer's report:

The authors propose a narrative review on studies exploring AM in patients with schizophrenia. Although the authors used an appropriate method to select the articles, the review do not consider important articles like for instance the review by Ricarte et al. 2017 (Clin Psychol Rev) which included 78 papers compared to 28 in the present one. This paper should be cited and its strengths and limitations should be clearly reported.

I also had real difficulty to understand the (somewhat confusing) analysis presented in the discussion. Several interpretations are weakly supported by data and theoretical models. For all these reasons, I think a considerable work is needed before considering the paper for publication.

Following are some example of erroneous or missing information found along the paper:

P5, line 14-17: none of the cited publications correspond to publication on AM

P9, line 17: the study by Harrison and Fowler 2004 reported on the link between functional avoidance and memory specificity and did not find significant correlation. This study should be reported and discussed.

P14, line 29: patients with comorbid depression are often not included in studies on AM, this should be reported and discussed.

P14, line 51: I completely disagree with this stigmatizing way of looking at patients’ production. Patients who are included in studies are generally stabilized and only few of them with active delusions can present with delusional or incoherent response. Most of clinicians seeing patients daily would strongly disagree with this prejudice.

P15, line 12: two studies published at the same time revealed contradictory results on the relationship between suicidal attempt/ideation and AM specificity in schizophrenia, please comment on this.

P15, line 29: the publication by Corrigan et al. 2003 is not mentioned although it addresses similar issue related to AM and ToM.

P19, line 51: patients with history of suicide have higher suicide rate… this is somewhat tautological, check for possible mistake
P20, line 32: the idea that patients' goals of working self inhibit the memory research seems extremely questionable and particularly speculative! This somewhat psychological/psychodynamic interpretation of AM deficits in schizophrenia requires citations to be supported. I would rather remove this paragraph that more or less point to dissociative entities within the self and may ground on a confusion between schizophrenia and dissociative personality disorder.

P21: similar critics can be addressed to the kind of "psychological interpretation" proposed to explain AM deficits. The self-defense hypothesis should be better discussed using appropriate citations. In fact, and as mentioned above, functional avoidance does not seem to account for AM deficits in schizophrenia.

P22, line 10: the CarFaX model has already been discussed in Ricarte et al. 2014 and Berna et al. 2016 meta-analysis in contradiction to that reported in the paragraph. Furthermore, citation 27 does not include patients with schizophrenia and the paper by Harrison and Fowler is not cited although relevant for this question.

References: several articles appear twice in the references section!
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