

Factor Structure of the Brief Inventory of Personality Organization and Its Convergence with DSM-5 Personality Disorders

Fatemeh Zahra. Babaei Afra¹, Alireza. Azizi^{2*}

¹ Master of Clinical Psychology, Am.C., Islamic Azad University, Amol, Iran

² Department of Psychiatry, Social Determinants of Health Research Center, Health Research Institute, Babol University of Medical Sciences, Babol, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: azizi.a.re@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Izet Pehlić ^{id} Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina izet.pehlic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Fahime Bahonar ^{id} Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mahdi Khanjani ^{id} Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The description of the STIPO interview is extensive, yet the manuscript does not report interviewer training procedures, inter-rater reliability, or calibration methods. Because STIPO is a clinician-rated instrument, information regarding interviewer competence is essential for evaluating the validity of the obtained scores.

The manuscript reports using STIPO, IPO-30, and PID-5, but no information is provided regarding translation procedures, cultural adaptation, back-translation, or linguistic validation of the IPO-30 items. Since the central finding involves structural instability, evidence of translation quality is necessary.

In the Results section, Table 1 reports skewness and kurtosis values for all items. However, the authors conclude normality solely because values fall within ± 2 . Given the use of factor analysis and maximum likelihood estimation, additional evidence such as multivariate normality statistics should be reported.

The authors conclude that all extracted factors demonstrate acceptable internal consistency because Cronbach's alpha coefficients exceed .70. However, alpha values for each factor are not explicitly presented in a dedicated table. Reporting Cronbach's alpha, McDonald's omega, and item-total correlations would strengthen the psychometric evaluation.

Table 6 demonstrates positive correlations between the extracted factors and all PID-5 domains. Nevertheless, the authors interpret these findings exclusively as evidence of convergent validity. Divergent validity should also be examined, as uniformly positive correlations may indicate a broad general distress factor rather than construct specificity.

A particularly noteworthy finding is the absence of significant correlations between most IPO-derived factors and STIPO domains. Given that both measures are theoretically grounded in Kernberg's personality organization model, this discrepancy deserves a much more extensive discussion than currently provided.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The confirmatory factor analysis results indicate extremely poor model fit ($CFI = .549$, $GFI = .563$, $RMSEA = .119$). Such values suggest severe misspecification. The authors should investigate modification indices, localized areas of strain, and theoretically plausible model revisions before fully rejecting the original structure.

The manuscript presents CFA results only for the two-factor model, while the Discussion states that two-factor, five-factor, and hierarchical five-factor models were tested. The fit indices for the latter models should be reported in the Results section rather than only mentioned retrospectively in the Discussion.

The exploratory factor analysis procedure requires greater transparency. The manuscript states that nine factors initially had eigenvalues greater than one, yet the final solution retained four factors based on the scree plot. The authors should report parallel analysis results, which are currently considered more robust than the Kaiser criterion and scree inspection alone.

The decision to remove items 1, 7, 11, and 18 because of low or cross-loadings should be justified statistically and conceptually. Specifically, the authors should discuss the content of these items and whether their exclusion alters the construct coverage of the original instrument.

The naming of the newly extracted factors ("Reality Testing," "Moral Values," "Aggression," and "Defense and Identity") appears reasonable but remains largely interpretive. The manuscript should provide a table containing the full item content and explain how each factor label was derived from item semantics.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.