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Reviewer's report:

This paper examines the validity of a well-used western measure of psychopathology in two middle eastern samples. Association with the big 5 factors of personality are reported. An interesting pattern of similarities and differences across cultures emerged, with differences regarding the correlates of cold-heartedness, one example of an interesting divergence.

The study has many strengths, including addressing a question of interest to journal readers, containing an appropriately sized samples from under studied populations and being presented in a very well written ms. I had a few thoughts about it, as detailed below.

Introduction

I would be grateful if the authors would add a short consideration of the cross-cultural validity of big 5 personality measures. There is some relevant coverage in the discussion, but I think this needs to be covered more broadly and in the introduction, as it is relevant to the interpretation of the results presented.

Analytic approach

The approach to analysis is certainly acceptable. However, I did wonder whether the authors considered running confirmatory factor analyses to see whether the configuration of items on factors held across culture. Setting this up as a multi group analysis and testing successively tighter forms of invariance might have been the way I would have approached the analysis. This model could have been extended to include the FFM correlates as well. I wonder if the authors have considered this approach?

As I read the ms, further, it appears that the authors have conducted analyses of this sort (p 19 line 46 and beyond), and say that the factorial structure may differ between cultures and that this may explain some of their findings above which assume that the factor structure is the same.

I feel uncomfortable with the current presentation of these results. In general, I think it is usually unhelpful to refer to analyses in the discussion that are not presented in the results, as the methods and findings are not presented fully enough to evaluate them. I agree that the small sample size etc may weaken theses analyses and the finding got other studies must also be considered. However, as I read the ms, I thought this sort of analysis would be appropriate and I
think other readers will agree. Therefore, I would prefer these CFAs to be reported more fully in the results section.

Minor comments

Spelling out the abbreviations in the table titles would make them easier to read.

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?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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