

1 **Title:** Investigating the structure of Schizotypy through the “Multidimensional Schizotypy Scale” and
2 “Oxford-Liverpool Inventory”: an Exploratory network analysis approach in the healthy population.

3
4 **Authors:**

5
6 Pierfrancesco Sarti^{1,2, †}, Werner Surbeck^{2, †}, Giacomo Cecere², Noemi Dannecker^{3,4}, Rahel
7 Horisberger², Nils Kallen², Wolfgang Omlor², Anna Steiner², Dario Palpella^{5,2}, Nicolas Langer⁴,
8 Johanna M.C. Blom^{1,6, *}, Philipp Homan^{2,7, *}

9
10
11 **Affiliations:**

12
13 ¹Department of Biomedical, Metabolic and Neural Sciences, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia,
14 Modena, Italy

15 ²Department of Adult Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Psychiatric Hospital, University of Zurich, Zurich,
16 Switzerland

17 ³Neuropsychology Unit, Department of Neurology, University Hospital of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

18 ⁴Department of Psychology, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

19 ⁵Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Milano-Bicocca, Monza, Italy

20 ⁶Centre for Neuroscience and Neurotechnology, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy

21 ⁷Neuroscience Center Zurich, University of Zurich and ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

22
23
24 † **Shared first Author** - These authors contributed equally to this work.

25
26
27 *** Corresponding Authors:**

28 Prof. Dr. med. univ. Philipp Homan, PhD

29 Stv. Klinikdirektor und Chefarzt

30 Psychiatrische Universitätsklinik Zürich, Erwachsenenpsychiatrie und Psychotherapie

31 Lenggstrasse 31, 8032 Zürich, Schweiz

32 E-mail: philipp.homan@bli.uzh.ch

33
34 Prof. Johanna M.C. Blom, PhD

35 Department of Biomedical, Metabolic and Neural Sciences

36 University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Via Giuseppe Campi, 287, 41125 Modena, Italy

37 E-mail: joan.blom@unimore.it

38
39
40 **Word Count:** 4445 excluding references

41
42
43
44 **Keywords:** Schizophrenia spectrum disorder, Exploratory graph analysis, MSS, O-LIFE, network
45 psychometric, network model

46 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

47

48 **Abstract**

49

50 **Background:** Schizophrenia spectrum disorders and schizotypy share traits across positive, negative, and
51 disorganized domains. Instruments like MSS and O-LIFE provide insights into these dimensions. Despite
52 challenges posed by cultural variations and measurement methodologies, these instruments offer nuanced
53 perspectives on the spectrum of schizotypy, spanning from its expression as a personality trait to its potential
54 implications in clinical settings. **Methods:** Through an Exploratory Graph Analysis (EGA) applied to a sample
55 of 1059 healthy subjects, we compare the resulting networks with the original factorial structure of the two
56 questionnaires and explore how each one conceptualizes schizotypy. Comparing both models quantitatively
57 and qualitatively these models, we seek to elucidate the unique insights provided by each instrument regarding
58 the spectrum of schizotypy as a personality trait. **Results:** EGA analyses unveiled a three-dimensional
59 structure plus an additional one consisting of items related to the concept of "Disconnection". Confirmatory
60 factor analysis showed this four-dimensional model outperformed others. High reliability and strong factor
61 saturation were observed for all four factors.

62 O-LIFE's EGA revealed a complex structure, refined to four factors removing items with low fitting indices
63 from the scale. Confirmatory analysis validated a final model with robust reliability and well-defined factor
64 structures across the new "Cognitive and Behavioural Disorganization", "Introversion", "Unusual
65 Experiences", and "Environmental Pressure" factors.

66 **Conclusions:** This study improves the understanding of schizotypy by proposing new MSS and O-LIFE factor
67 structures via EGA. Both scales uniquely contribute to schizotypy assessment in healthy populations,
68 warranting further research to validate and refine these new domains across diverse populations.

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94 **1. Introduction**

95

96 Schizophrenia spectrum disorders (SSD) are among the most severe mental illnesses globally, characterized
97 by a high burden of disease and a significant negative effect on the individual's occupational, educational,
98 social, and economic life (Crespo-Facorro et al., 2021). These disorders are broadly defined by altered and
99 abnormal mental states over certain periods of time, characterised by symptom clusters including delusions
100 and hallucinations, disorganised thinking and motor behaviour, negative symptoms such as apathy, anhedonia
101 and blunted affect. The presentation of these symptoms varies from person to person and often co-occurs with
102 other disorders, hindering a prompt and precise diagnosis (Tandon et al., 2013; Schultze-Lutter et al., 2019;
103 Sarraf et al., 2022).

104

105 The notion of schizotypy, distinct from clinical SSD, has garnered significant attention in psychiatric research.
106 Both schizotypy and SSD share traits and symptoms across the same domains — positive, negative, and
107 disorganized. Unlike the episodic nature of SSD symptoms, these dimensions represent enduring
108 characteristics in individuals' personal lives (Grant et al., 2018; Kwapil, Gross, Burgin, et al., 2018; Nelson et
109 al., 2013).

110 Due to its combination of behavioural personality traits that can manifest also as pathological, it has been
111 proposed as a potential endophenotype or "schizophrenia liability" (Grant, 2015; Lenzenweger, 2006, 2015)
112 and has provided valuable insights into various schizophrenia-spectrum disorders and their underlying
113 aetiologies (Barrantes-Vidal et al., 2015). By studying individuals expressing high schizotypy without clinical
114 SSD, researchers have been able to identify both risk and resilience factors. This research has contributed to
115 an enhanced understanding of SSD and the development of more effective intervention strategies (Barrantes-
116 Vidal et al., 2015; Grant & Hennig, 2020).

117 However, debates surrounding the nature of Schizotypy persist; some argue for a taxonomic model that sees
118 schizotypy as one end of the psychosis spectrum and therefore inherently pathological (Morton et al., 2017),
119 while others propose a broader dimensional model that suggests that schizotypy is not necessarily associated
120 with pathology (Grant et al., 2018). Claridge's fully dimensional model, for instance, proposes that schizotypy
121 traits can be adaptive or maladaptive, implying a continuum between schizotypy as a personality trait having
122 no psychopathological value up to a pathological manifestation of the symptoms (Mohr & Claridge, 2015).
123 This view has paved the way for the inclusion of non-clinical populations in schizotypy research, shedding
124 light on the dynamic nature of these traits (Debbané & Barrantes-Vidal, 2015).

125

126 Despite these challenges and differences, schizotypy research continues to provide invaluable insights into the
127 complex interplay between personality and psychopathology. In addition, the current clinical classification
128 systems of DSM-5 and ICD-11 have some major limitations because they fail to integrate new models of
129 psychopathology with advanced research methodologies (Kendell & Jablensky, 2003; Wright et al., 2013;

130 Cohen et al., 2018; Hengartner & Lehmann, 2017; Kotov et al., 2018) leaving the definition of these disorders
131 obsolete or often misdiagnosed as schizophrenia (Schultze-Lutter et al., 2019).

132 To validly measure schizotypy as a stable, non-pathologic personality structure, psychometric instruments are
133 preferred; in particular self-reports that are cost-effective and non-invasive (Barrantes-Vidal et al., 2015; O. J.
134 Mason, 2015, p. 2).

135 However, the theoretical framework behind these instruments significantly influences their content and the
136 validity of their assessments (Fonseca-Pedrero et al., 2021; Grant et al., 2018; Kwapil, Gross, Burgin, et al.,
137 2018): some instruments target clinical populations with a focus on pathological aspects, while others aim to
138 measure schizotypy as a broader, dimensional construct.

139

140 For instance, the Wisconsin Schizotypy Scales, based on Meehl's taxonomic framework, consists of four scales
141 (J. P. Chapman et al., 1995; L. J. Chapman et al., 1976, 1978, 1980; Eckblad & Chapman, 1983). While it
142 targets clinical populations, it may not fully cover the disorganized dimension or negative aspects schizotypy,
143 such as alogia or avolition.

144 Similarly, the Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire developed by Adrian Raine (1991) (Raine, 1991) and
145 measures aspects of SPD through nine subscales but inadequately addresses the disorganized dimension.

146 Two further scales, the Multidimensional Schizotypy scale (MSS) and the Oxford-Liverpool inventory for
147 feelings and experiences (O-LIFE), offer comprehensive coverage of the three established dimensions of
148 Schizotypy and demonstrate robust psychometric properties (Grant et al., 2013; Oezgen & Grant, 2018;
149 Christensen et al., 2019; Kemp et al., 2020; Polner et al., 2021). These scales offer researchers comprehensive
150 tools to explore the nuanced interplay between personality traits and psychopathology.

151 The MSS, aligned with the taxonomic view of schizotypy, explores experiences akin to symptoms of SSD but
152 in milder form (Kwapil, Gross, Silvia, et al., 2018). In contrast, the O-LIFE adopts a personality-oriented
153 approach, where high manifestations of Schizotypy extend beyond the clinical spectrum (O. Mason &
154 Claridge, 2006).

155 These instruments thus provide diverse viewpoints on schizotypy, offering new insights into its dimensional
156 structure and potentially shedding light on SSD (Grant et al., 2018).

157 Given that cultural influences can significantly impact schizotypal traits and experiences, it is crucial to assess
158 the structural equivalence of these measures across diverse populations. This enhances our understanding of
159 the universal aspects of Schizotypy (Fonseca-Pedrero et al., 2014; Cohen et al., 2015; Fonseca-Pedrero et al.,
160 2015; Barron, 2017). Authors emphasize the importance of replicating the factorial structure of these
161 instruments across different cultural and linguistic contexts, using both clinical and non-clinical samples
162 (Kwapil, Gross, Silvia, et al., 2018; Kwapil, Gross, Burgin, et al., 2018). Issues related to translation may alter
163 the interpretation of questionnaire items, potentially affecting response patterns and the reliability of the
164 instrument (Grant et al., 2013). Moreover, as psychopathologies and personality are non-crystallised constructs
165 that evolve with the passage of time and the ability to adapt to an increasingly complex environment, there is

166 a constant need to incorporate new statistical methodologies that better capture this fluidity (Achterhof et al.,
167 2022; Onchev, 2021).

168

169 Network psychometrics is a swiftly advancing field applied to various psychopathological constructs,
170 including Schizotypy (Christensen et al., 2018; Fonseca-Pedrero et al., 2018). This approach views
171 psychopathological constructs as complex systems arising from interactions between their constituent elements
172 (symptoms, internal and external factors) (Borsboom & Cramer, 2013; Schmittmann et al., 2013).

173 The network theory of psychopathology proposes that symptoms can reinforce each other, can be influenced
174 by factors such as biological, environmental, and social mechanisms, and can lead to self-sustaining states that
175 are difficult to modify (Borsboom, 2017). This theory supports current views on Schizotypy as a latent liability
176 for schizophrenia spectrum disorders, where interactions with several factors may facilitate the disorder
177 transition (A. Isvoranu et al., 2016; A.-M. Isvoranu et al., 2017; Lenzenweger, 2018).

178 In the field Network analysis and modelling, the Exploratory Graph Analysis (EGA) offers a novel approach
179 to uncovering dimensions within psychometric instruments (van Borkulo et al., 2014; Borsboom, 2017; H. F.
180 Golino & Epskamp, 2017). EGA employs a Gaussian Graphical Model, computed using the graphical least
181 absolute shrinkage and selection operator (lasso) (Friedman et al., 2008; Strobl et al., 2012; Epskamp et al.,
182 2018). The walktrap community detection algorithm then identifies network dimensions by performing
183 "random walks" from one node to another, forming communities based on densely connected edges (Pons &
184 Latapy, 2005). Because of the implementation of this algorithm, EGA's dimensions are determined without
185 researcher bias, offering an advantage over other exploratory dimension reduction methods by providing
186 immediately interpretable content and dimensions without needing to interpret component loadings. EGA has
187 shown comparable or superior accuracy in identifying dimensions compared to other methods such as principal
188 component analysis and factor analysis (H. Golino et al., 2020; H. F. Golino & Demetriou, 2017; H. F. Golino
189 & Epskamp, 2017) and has effectively replicated factor analytic findings and discovered new construct
190 dimensions(Bell & O'Driscoll, 2018) .

191 To our knowledge, no study has yet conducted an Exploratory Graph Analysis (EGA) comparing the factorial
192 structures of two schizotypal instruments within the same sample, contrasting their similarities and differences
193 with the original models. This represents critical area for further research.

194 Therefore, the main objective of this study is to validate the factorial structures of the Multidimensional
195 Schizotypy Scale (MSS) and the Oxford-Liverpool Inventory of Feelings and Experiences (O-LIFE) in a large
196 German-speaking non-clinical sample. We aim to compare this structure with those identified by Exploratory
197 Factor Analysis (EFA).

198 Furthermore, through interpreting these resulting models, our study will facilitate a qualitative comparison of
199 how each questionnaire conceptualizes schizotypy and the unique insights each instrument offers.

200

201

202

203 2. Methods

204

205 2.1 Participants

206 The participants were recruited via an online survey aimed at identifying potential candidates for a
207 comprehensive study at the University Hospital of Psychiatry Zurich (PUK). For further details on the study,
208 please visit the VELAS website (<https://homanlab.github.io/velas/>). The survey included questions about
209 demographics, MRI safety, the German versions of the MSS and O-LIFE, and the German version of the
210 Childhood Trauma Questionnaire(Wingenfeld et al., 2010; [*The German version of the Childhood Trauma*
211 *Questionnaire (CTQ): preliminary psychometric properties*] - PubMed, s.d.). Completing the survey took
212 approximately 20 to 30 minutes. The current study analysis focused exclusively on the MSS and O-LIFE
213 results.

214 Due to the main study's specific research requirements, participants had to meet several criteria to be
215 considered eligible:

- 216 - they needed to be healthy without any psychiatric or neurological conditions,
- 217 - aged between 18 and 40 years,
- 218 - right-handed,
- 219 - proficient in German.

220 The online survey was widely distributed across various platforms, including Swiss university and college
221 marketplaces, public forums like RonOrp, the "PSYCH-Pool" of the University of Zurich (server with
222 registered persons who want to participate in studies), the psychology students' association (FAPS) mailing
223 list, tweets from the research team, and direct outreach to various educational institutions. This approach aimed
224 to attract individuals with diverse educational and social backgrounds.

225 Participants who were selected and participated in the main study received a compensation of 150 Swiss francs,
226 while those not selected after completing the survey received no compensation.

227 A total of 1059 participants completed the entire questionnaire between April 2021 and March 2024. The
228 questionnaire was converted into an online format using the Enterprise Feedback Suite and since the
229 demographic, MSS, and O-LIFE items were programmed as forced-choice questions, no missing values were
230 present in the dataset. The consent of the healthy subjects to the data processing was provided at the beginning
231 of the compilation of the test battery. They had to read the protocol and subsequently tick the items of
232 understanding the study and analysing the collected data.

233 Without this, the questionnaires could not be accessed.

234 Participants were instructed before each instrument (MSS or O-LIFE) that the following statements or
235 questions cover a broad range of attitudes, thoughts, experiences, preferences, and beliefs, and they should
236 respond as honestly as possible. They were also informed that there were no right or wrong answers and that
237 they should answer in a way that best reflects themselves.

238

239

240 **2.2 Materials**

241

242 The MSS and O-LIFE were used in their German versions, translated by bilingual researchers from the
243 International Consortium of Schizotypy Research (ICSR) (<https://srconsortium.org>), and have been utilized in
244 other studies(Grant et al., 2013; Nenadić et al., 2021).

245 The MSS consists of 77 Yes-or-No items, divided into subscales: 26 items in both the “Negative” and
246 “Positive” subscales, and 25 items in the “Disorganised” subscale. Previous studies with larger samples have
247 shown the internal consistency of these subscales to be good to excellent, with binary adjusted alpha
248 coefficients ranging from 0.87 to 0.95 in English-speaking samples, and from 0.78 to 0.89 in German-speaking
249 samples (Kwapil, Gross, Burgin, et al., 2018; Kwapil, Gross, Silvia, et al., 2018; Nenadić et al., 2021).

250 The O-LIFE comprises 104 Yes-or-No items, with 30 items in the “Unusual Experiences” (UnEx) subscale
251 describing perceptual aberrations, magical thinking, and hallucinations, 27 in the “Introvertive Anhedonia”
252 (IntA), a subscale that describe a lack of enjoyment from social and physical sources of pleasure, as well as
253 avoidance of intimacy, 24 in the “Cognitive Dysregulation” (CogDis) subscale that taps aspects of poor
254 attention, concentration, social anxiety and poor decision-making, and 23 in the “Impulsive nonconformity”
255 (ImpNon) subscale which contains items describing anti-social, eccentric and impulsive forms of behaviour,
256 often suggesting a lack of self-control .

257 Alpha coefficients for these subscales were found to be between 0.77 and 0.89 in studies by Mason and
258 Claridge (2006) (O. Mason & Claridge, 2006), and between 0.68 and 0.88 in a German-speaking sample by
259 Grant et al. (2013)(Grant et al., 2013).

260 Notably, the lowest alpha coefficient was in the ImpNon subscale, whereas the other three subscales (UnEx,
261 IntA, CogDis) had coefficients above 0.8, indicating good to excellent internal consistency.

262

263

264 **2.3 Statistical Analysis**

265 The data were analysed quantitatively to extrapolate descriptive information from the sample using mean,
266 standard deviation and percentages.

267

268 In order to choose the best correlation method for constructing the matrices then used for the Exploratory
269 Graph Analysis, we conducted the Jenrich’s Test (Atiany & Sharif, 2018) comparing the Fiml (Full information
270 Maximum Likelihood) correlations used in the article by Christensen et al. 2019 (Christensen et al., 2019),
271 Spearman's correlations, since these of the MSS and O-LIFE are categorical variables and, finally, the Phi
272 (mean square contingency coefficient) coefficients used in the specific case in which the variables are
273 categorical and dichotomous. The latter is interpreted as a Pearson's 'p'.

274 We utilised the EGA package(H. F. Golino & Epskamp, 2017) in R to perform the Exploratory Graph Analysis,
275 employing first the qgraph to apply the glasso algorithm (Epskamp et al., 2012) and then igraph(Csardi &
276 Nepusz, 2005) to compute the walktrap clustering methods (Pons & Latapy, 2005). The glasso method was

277 estimated using a penalised maximum likelihood solution based on the Extended Bayesian Information
278 Criterion – EBIC (Chen & Chen, 2008; Epskamp et al., 2018).

279

280 The representation of the networks was done using the 'qgraph' package and analyses were also carried out to
281 calculate the centrality indices. Betweenness centrality was used as a value for the size of the individual
282 nodes(Bringmann et al., 2019).

283

284 If the number of factors found was excessively large or if issues emerged in the correlations of individual items
285 from the representation, an Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted. First, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test
286 (Kaiser, 1974) and Bartlett's test of sphericity(Bartlett, 1950) were performed. Then, if items had inadequate
287 values of Measure of Sample Adequacy (MSA), the EGA would be conducted again without those items.

288

289 A Confirmatory Factor Analysis was then conducted to compare the resulting models with the original ones.
290 The correlation matrices of the individual factors of each model were estimated using the WLSMV (diagonally
291 weighted least squares estimator)(Muthén, 1984). Each model was fitted using the 'lavaan' package(Rosseel,
292 2012) in R.

293 The fitting of the models obtained were compared to each other using the Satorra-Bentler chi-square
294 test(Satorra & Bentler, 2010) and qualitatively using: comparative fit index (CFI), standardised root mean
295 residual (SRMR), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI).

296 Based on the results, the best model was chosen, and the individual factors were taken and reliability measures
297 such as McDonalds' Omega(McDonald, 1999) and Cronbach's Alpha(Cronbach, 1951) were calculated.

298

299 **2.4 R code and materials sharing**

300 All the R code with results and graph is available as Supplementary Material.

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314 **3. Results**

315

316 The demographic information concerning the sample of 1059 healthy subjects who participated in the study is
317 in Table 1. Frequencies, means, standard deviations and percentages are indicated.

318

Demographic table	Total		Males		Females		Others	
	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%	n°	%
N sample	1059	100	300	28.33	757	71.48	2	0.19
Age: mean and sd	24.78 ± 4.48		25.52 ± 4.59		24.46 ± 4.37		25.44 ± 4.83	
Education								
No grade	3	0.28	1	0.33	2	2.80	0	0.00
Secondary School	40	3.78	13	4.33	26	36.37	1	50.00
Apprenticeship	224	21.15	71	23.67	153	214.05	0	0.00
Technical School	20	1.89	5	1.67	15	20.98	0	0.00
Matura	362	34.18	99	33.00	263	367.94	0	0.00
Higher Technical Institute	43	4.06	9	3.00	34	47.57	0	0.00
University of applied sciences	74	6.99	28	9.33	46	64.35	0	0.00
University	289	27.29	72	24.00	216	302.18	1	50.00
Other	4	0.38	2	0.67	2	2.80	0	0.00

319 **Table 1:** demographic variables of the population. The breakdown of the variable Education was made according to the
320 Swiss educational system.

321 Information on it can be found at <https://www.berufsberatung.ch/dyn/show/2800>. We also specify that some categories
322 include more than one type of studies: secondary school (type A, B, C); Apprenticeship (Federal Vocational Certificate
323 (EBA), Federal Certificate of Competence (EFZ) with/without matura, HPF); Technical school (with/without Matura);
324 Matura (grammar school, adult matura, passerelle); both types of University include Bachelor, Master, Promotion).

325

326 For both questionnaires, the correlation matrices used for the EGA contained Spearman correlations. Jennrich's
327 tests were not significant, so there no difference can be assumed between the correlation matrices using Phi,
328 Spearman or Fiml. Spearman was preferred as the resulting matrix provided one more significant digit.

329

330 **3.1 MSS model**

331

332 EGA analyses revealed a three-dimensional structure in the sample reflecting the division of positive, negative
333 and disorganisation symptoms. The positive and disorganisation dimensions have a higher density of
334 connections between them than the negative domain. Of all the items, eight of them were wrongly included in

335 the positive domain by the EGA: seven of them were part of the disorganisation factor and one of the negative
336 factor. The specific items are listed below:

- 337 - NEG1: I have always preferred to be disconnected from the world
- 338 - DIS06: When people ask me a question, I often do not understand what they are asking
- 339 - DIS30: I often find that when I talk to people, I do not make any sense to them
- 340 - DIS42: I often feel so disconnected from the world that I am not able to do things
- 341 - DIS45: I am very often confused about what is going on around me
- 342 - DIS51: People find my conversations to be confusing or hard to follow
- 343 - DIS69: I have trouble following conversations with others
- 344 - DIS75: It is usually easy for me to follow conversations

345

346 All these items share a common theme related to "disconnection" from the world or difficulties in
347 understanding or being understood by others. In Figure 1, these items are visually separated from the others,
348 forming a distinct fourth domain we named "Disconnection". The size of each node in the figure also reflects
349 its "Betweenness" centrality value. This index indicates the importance of these nodes as "gatekeepers" within
350 the network, as they frequently lie on the shortest paths between other nodes.

351

352 Subsequently, a CFA analysis was conducted to evaluate the fit of several models, the original scale model, the
353 three-factor model identified by the EGA, and a third model that includes a separate factor for the items
354 classified as misfits. The indices of interest are shown below:

- 355 - Original model: Chi-square: 4899.17; df: 2846; SRMR: 0.123; CFI: 0.979; RMSEA: 0.026; TLI: 0.978
- 356 - EGA model with 3 dimensions: Chi-square: 5082.16; df: 2846; SRMR: 0.124; CFI: 0.977; RMSEA:
357 0.027; TLI: 0.976
- 358 - EGA model with 4 dimensions: Chi-square: 4680.91; df: 2843; SRMR: 0.120; CFI: 0.981; RMSEA:
359 0.025; TLI: 0.981

360

361 The Satorra-Bentler tests performed between the original, three-dimensional EGA model (with misclassified
362 items) and the four-dimensional EGA model were not significant, indicating that there is no difference between
363 the three results.

364

365 However, the four-dimensional model obtains better fitting values than the other two; furthermore: the
366 Negative factor exhibits high internal consistency ($\text{Alpha} = 0.85$) and strong general factor saturation (Omega
367 $\text{Total} = 0.87$). Similar to the negative factor, the Positive factor shows high reliability ($\text{Alpha} = 0.85$) and strong
368 general factor saturation ($\text{Omega Total} = 0.87$).

369 The Disorganised factor demonstrates excellent reliability ($\text{Alpha} = 0.92$) and a strong general factor saturation
370 ($\text{Omega Total} = 0.93$).

371 Finally, the Disconnected factor exhibits good reliability ($\text{Alpha} = 0.74$), a lower general factor saturation
372 ($\text{Omega Total} = 0.81$) than the others but still considered good as a substantial portion of the variance is due to
373 common factors, suggesting good internal consistency.

374

375 **Figure 1:** MSS network representing the three factors identified by the EGA and the green group/factor
376 “Disconnection”, called such following the analysis of the individual items. The size of the nodes reflects the
377 Betweenness Centrality value. The green edges represent positive Spearman correlations.

378

379 **3.2 O-LIFE model**

380

381 The first EGA analysis on the O-LIFE questionnaire showed a 13-factor structure whose representation, using
382 the four subscales of the test (Figure 2), revealed multiple nodes that were either uncorrelated or connected
383 two by two. Moreover, the factor 'Impulsive Nonconformity' is the one that least maintains a unitary and
384 separate structure, spreading out among the others.

385 For possible confounding effects and to reduce the number of factors, an Exploratory Factor Analysis was
386 conducted.

387 The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test, although giving an Overall MSA of 0.9, revealed that seven items had values
388 below 0.7 and ten others between 0.7 and 0.8.

389 The Parallel Analysis performed with tetrachoric correlations identified four main factors. Looking at the
390 individual loadings several items had high positive and/or negative correlations with more than one factor at
391 the same time.

392

393 **Figure 2:** O-LIFE network identified by the EGA separating the nodes with the four subscales proposed by
394 the model of Mason and Claridge (2006).

395

396 Thus, items with a Measure of Sampling Adequacy of less than 0.7 (middling) were first removed from the
397 dataset, resulting in a reduction in the number of factors from 13 to 9, and then also those with a value between
398 0.7 and 0.8 (middling), resulting in a total of 4 factors. The resulting network can be observed in Figure 3.

399 Confirmatory Factor Analysis was performed for the three models: original model with all items, model
400 obtained with Exploratory Factor Analysis and the 4-dimensional model with 87 items (after removing those
401 with low MSA).

402 The results of the fitting of each model are shown in Table 2. The model obtained after removing 17 items
403 (final model) from the questionnaire turns out to be the one with better indices. Furthermore, the Satorra-
404 Bentler test was significant when crossing the final model with the other two in both cases:

405 - EGA model vs. Original: Chi-squared difference = 2637; Df difference: 1496; $p = 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$

406 - EGA model vs. EFA model: Chi-squared difference = 2454; Df difference: 1598; $p = 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$

407 After analysing the new item groups, two remained stable and similar to the original model (Introverted
408 Anhedonia, now Introversion, and Unusual Experiences) while the other two were renamed to (Cognitive and
409 Behavioural Disorganization and Environmental Pressure).

410

411 The reliability analysis for the four variables — Cognitive and Behavioural Disorganization, Introversion,
412 Unusual Experiences, and Environmental Pressure — indicates robust internal consistency and well-defined
413 factor structures. The first one shows high reliability with an alpha of 0.88 and an omega total of 0.89, alongside
414 significant contributions from both general and group factors. Introversion is also reliable, evidenced by an
415 alpha of 0.82 and an omega total of 0.83, with the general factor explaining a substantial portion of the variance.
416 Unusual Experiences has strong reliability, with an alpha of 0.86 and an omega total of 0.87, indicating that
417 both the general factor and group factors are important. Environmental Pressure, while slightly lower in
418 reliability, still demonstrates good consistency with an alpha of 0.70 and an omega total of 0.75, dominated by
419 the general factor. The model fits, as indicated by RMSEA values below 0.05 for all variables, suggest that the
420 models are appropriate and explain a considerable amount of the variance. Correlations of scores with factors
421 and multiple R square values are high for the general factor, confirming the adequacy of the factor score
422 estimates. Despite some negative values in the minimum correlations for group factors, the overall reliability
423 and factor structures are solid, ensuring the scales are reliable and effectively capture the intended constructs.

424

425 **Figure 3:** O-LIFE network representing the three factors identified by the EGA. The size of the nodes reflects
426 the Betweenness Centrality value. The green edges represent positive Spearman correlations, red edges are
427 negative.

428

Measure	Chi-squared	df	SRMR	CFI	RMSEA	TLI
Original model	11486.318	5144	0.098	0.934	0.034	0.933
EFA model	11543.169	5246	0.097	0.936	0.034	0.935
EGA model	6789.411	3648	0.089	0.965	0.029	0.965

429 **Table 2:** This summarizes the fit measures for each model evaluated (Original, Exploratory Factor Analysis, and EGA
430 done with 87 items), including chi-square, degrees of freedom (df), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR),
431 comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI).

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441 **4. Discussion**

442

443 This study was the first to test the validity of the three- and four-factor structures, respectively, in the German
444 versions of the MSS and O-LIFE, using a single sample of healthy subjects and applying EGA. The resulting
445 models were compared with the original calibrations, and our results demonstrate that EGA, in addition to
446 providing more information on the relationships between individual items, offers fittings that provide new
447 insights into the structure of schizotypy.

448

449 Regarding the Multidimensional Schizotypy Scale, the EGA results revealed a three-dimensional structure
450 (positive, negative, and disorganized schizotypy), consistent with the theoretical dimensions. Eight items were
451 misclassified into the positive dimension. An analysis of these individual items indicated that they referred to
452 aspects related to the person's disconnection from the world and/or difficulty in understanding conversations
453 with others or not being understood during conversations, as well as confusion about what is happening around
454 them. These items, identified in the new domain "disconnection," reflect symptoms of
455 derealization/depersonalization, often found in schizotypy and/or the early stages of schizophrenia (Hamilton
456 & Simeon, 2019). Interestingly, these items/nodes are located exactly between the Positive and Disorganized
457 domains and, with their Betweenness values, serve a "mediating" function between the two (DIS06: 0.46;
458 DIS30: 0.7; DIS42: 0.64; DIS69: 0.52). The separation of these items into a new domain did not lead to a
459 decrease in the validity of the other three domains, which maintained excellent Alpha and Omega values;
460 instead, it provided a new index to consider, which in turn can be expanded.

461 As found in previous studies (Christensen et al., 2018), the positive and negative domains are more distinct,
462 with the disorganized domain acting as a link between the two. In addition, we did not observe any subdivision
463 within the negative domain or the positive whereas in the study by Christensen et al., 2019, the 'Negative'
464 domain was divided by Exploratory Graph Analysis into two distinct groups that were identified as affective
465 anhedonia and social anhedonia (Christensen et al., 2019).

466 Although statistically there are no differences between the three models analysed for the MSS, the four-
467 dimension model shows better indices and provides more detailed insights into a symptom that may serve as
468 an early behavioural warning sign for schizotypal disorder and schizophrenia.

469

470 The Oxford-Liverpool Inventory of Feelings and Experiences required adjustments primarily due to its larger
471 number of items and the lesser stability of certain factors already observed in the calibration of the German
472 version. Notably, Figure 2 shows that Impulsive Nonconformity is an extremely disseminated domain, which
473 is reflected in its unacceptable internal validity found in other studies (Grant et al., 2013).

474 The re-analysis of the individual MSAs of each item made it possible to exclude those that could lead to greater
475 problems in modelling and play a role as confounding variables.

476 The final questionnaire comprised 87 items compared to the original 104, and the 4-factor model, made explicit
477 in the analyses, was significantly better than both the original theoretical model and that identified by means
478 of Exploratory Factor Analysis.

479 The domains "Unusual Experiences" and "Introvertive Anhedonia", now renamed "Introversion", correspond
480 to those of the theoretical model. Two new domains were identified: one defined as "Cognitive and behavioural
481 disorganisation", which was created by merging the items of "Impulsive nonconformity" and "Cognitive
482 disorganisation", showing that rather than divided they can be considered in a symbiotic relationship.

483 The main point identified thanks to the Exploratory Graph Analysis is the domain of what we have called
484 "Environmental pressure" which, although it remains graphically at a marginal point in the network, its nodes
485 all have high Betweenness centrality values.

486

487 These items (six from the Cognitive disorganisation scale and one from the Impulsive nonconformity scale),
488 all refer to the fear of being judged/wounded by others for the decisions or actions made. It clearly emerges
489 how the environment and the opinion/judgment of others has an effect and acts as a conduit between
490 Introversion and Disorganisation.

491 Carrying out a proper assessment of environmental aspects such as relationships and the degree of pressure
492 felt by the person on his or her behaviour, can make it possible to discriminate whether such thinking/tracking
493 may also be due to a misinterpretation by the individual, highlighting emotional deficits in the schizotypal
494 personality (Martin et al., 2019).

495

496 Both tests demonstrated a stable four-factor structure and, while some domains can be compared with each
497 other, they provide two different interpretations of schizotypy. The MSS clearly shows the dimensionality of
498 the construct since the Positive and Negative domains remain well-separated, and Disorganization is more
499 correlated with Positivity through the newly identified domain called Disconnection. Furthermore, this test
500 presents a more robust and differentiated factor structure compared to the O-LIFE. The latter, referring to a
501 "full-dimensional" model of Schizotypy(Goulding, 2004; O. Mason & Claridge, 2006; Pfarr et al., 2023) and
502 aiming to include many more characteristics, like behavioural ones, is more complex and more easily
503 influenced by demographic and cultural aspects. This characteristic must be considered in possible future
504 calibrations of the questionnaire in other populations and cultures.

505

506 This study suffers from some limitations that should be mentioned. First, all the model analysed in this article
507 presented out of range SRMR while all the other measures are considered good or optimal. Since the goodness
508 of a model should not be based on a single fitting index, the models were presented as valid while considering
509 the presence of some residuals responsible for an SRMR value greater than 0.8.

510 Secondly, it is conceivable that due to the extensive number of items in both instruments, participants could
511 experience content overload, leading to decreased attention and potentially random responses. Finally, because
512 this is a self-report assessment, certain inherent issues cannot be anticipated or prevented. For instance, it is

513 uncertain whether subjects respond truthfully to all items. Additionally, some responses may be influenced by
514 social desirability bias, where subjects answer in a way they believe aligns with societal expectations.

515

516 **5. Conclusion**

517

518 This study advances the understanding of schizotypy by proposing possible new factor structures of the MSS
519 and O-LIFE using Exploratory Graph Analysis. MSS's clear dimensionality and the addition of the
520 disconnection domain offer a precise framework for identifying schizotypal traits. O-LIFE's revised model,
521 with its focus on environmental influences, provides a comprehensive, though complex, interpretation of
522 schizotypal characteristics. Both scales contribute uniquely to the assessment and understanding of schizotypy
523 in healthy populations.

524

525 Future research should explore more in depth and rearrange the number of items of the new domains to assess
526 and increase validity and stability of the new ones considering the possible differences in language and culture.

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550 **Acknowledgements**

551 This research was supported by grants from the Brain & Behavior Research Foundation and the OPO
552 Foundation. We gratefully acknowledge their financial assistance, which made this work possible.

553

554 **Financial support**

555 This work was supported by grants from the Brain & Behavior Research Foundation (Grant No. 28997) and
556 the OPO Research Foundation (Grant No. 2020-0075) to Werner Surbeck.

557

558 **Ethical standards**

559 The authors assert that the protocol was approved by the local ethics committee (KEK-ZH 2020/01049) and
560 that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and
561 institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in
562 2008.

563

564 **Competing Interests**

565 The authors declare no competing interests

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587 6. References

588

589 Achterhof, R., Kirtley, O. J., Schneider, M., Hagemann, N., Hermans, K. S. F. M., Hiekkaranta, A. P., Lecei,
590 A., Decoster, J., Derom, C., De Hert, M., Gülöksüz, S., Jacobs, N., Menne-Lothmann, C., Rutten, B.
591 P. F., Thiery, E., van Os, J., van Winkel, R., Wichers, M., & Myin-Germeys, I. (2022). General
592 psychopathology and its social correlates in the daily lives of youth. *Journal of Affective Disorders*,
593 309, 428–436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.04.147>

594 Atiany, D.-T., & Sharif, S. (2018). *New Statistical Test for Testing Several Correlation Matrices*.

595 Barrantes-Vidal, N., Grant, P., & Kwapil, T. R. (2015). The Role of Schizotypy in the Study of the Etiology of
596 Schizophrenia Spectrum Disorders. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 41(suppl_2), S408–S416.
597 <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu191>

598 Barron, D. (2017). *Schizotypy: A Multi-Country Study of Psychometrics, Socio-Cultural Influences, Cognitive*
599 *Processes, and Electrophysiological Markers*.
600 [https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Schizotypy%3A-A-Multi-Country-Study-of-](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Schizotypy%3A-A-Multi-Country-Study-of-Psychometrics%2C-Barron/91c1519943c949579a351060abe302eb77c0116f)
601 [Psychometrics%2C-Barron/91c1519943c949579a351060abe302eb77c0116f](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Schizotypy%3A-A-Multi-Country-Study-of-Psychometrics%2C-Barron/91c1519943c949579a351060abe302eb77c0116f)

602 Bartlett, M. S. (1950). Tests of Significance in Factor Analysis. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 3(2),
603 77–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1950.tb00285.x>

604 Bell, V., & O’Driscoll, C. (2018). The network structure of paranoia in the general population. *Social*
605 *Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 53(7), 737–744. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-018-1487-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-018-1487-0)
606 0

607 Borsboom, D. (2017). A network theory of mental disorders. *World Psychiatry*, 16(1), 5–13.
608 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20375>

609 Borsboom, D., & Cramer, A. O. J. (2013). Network Analysis: An Integrative Approach to the Structure of
610 Psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 9(Volume 9, 2013), 91–121.
611 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185608>

612 Bringmann, L. F., Elmer, T., Epskamp, S., Krause, R. W., Schoch, D., Wichers, M., Wigman, J. T. W., & Snippe,
613 E. (2019). What do centrality measures measure in psychological networks? *Journal of Abnormal*
614 *Psychology*, 128(8), 892–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000446>

615 Chapman, J. P., Chapman, L. J., & Kwapil, T. R. (1995). Scales for the measurement of schizotypy. In A. Raine,
616 S. A. Mednick, & T. Lencz (A c. Di), *Schizotypal Personality* (pp. 79–106). Cambridge University
617 Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511759031.006>

618 Chapman, L. J., Chapman, J. P., & Raulin, M. L. (1976). Scales for physical and social anhedonia. *Journal of*
619 *Abnormal Psychology*, 85(4), 374–382. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.85.4.374>

620 Chapman, L. J., Chapman, J. P., & Raulin, M. L. (1978). Body-image aberration in schizophrenia. *Journal of*
621 *Abnormal Psychology*, 87(4), 399–407. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.87.4.399>

622 Chapman, L. J., Edell, W. S., & Chapman, J. P. (1980). Physical Anhedonia, Perceptual Aberration, and
623 Psychosis Proneness. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 6(4), 639–653. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/6.4.639>

- 624 Chen, J., & Chen, Z. (2008). Extended Bayesian information criteria for model selection with large model
625 spaces. *Biometrika*, *95*(3), 759–771. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asn034>
- 626 Christensen, A. P., Gross, G. M., Golino, H. F., Silvia, P. J., & Kwapil, T. R. (2019). Exploratory Graph
627 Analysis of the Multidimensional Schizotypy Scale. *Schizophrenia Research*, *206*, 43–51.
628 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2018.12.018>
- 629 Christensen, A. P., Kenett, Y. N., Aste, T., Silvia, P. J., & Kwapil, T. R. (2018). Network structure of the
630 Wisconsin Schizotypy Scales–Short Forms: Examining psychometric network filtering approaches.
631 *Behavior Research Methods*, *50*(6), 2531–2550. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-1032-9>
- 632 Cohen, A. S., Chan, R. C. K., & Debbané, M. (2018). Crossing Boundaries in Schizotypy Research: An
633 Introduction to the Special Supplement. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *44*(suppl_2), S457–S459.
634 <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sby089>
- 635 Cohen, A. S., Mohr, C., Ettinger, U., Chan, R. C. K., & Park, S. (2015). Schizotypy as An Organizing
636 Framework for Social and Affective Sciences. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *41*(suppl_2), S427–S435.
637 <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu195>
- 638 Crespo-Facorro, B., Such, P., Nylander, A.-G., Madera, J., Resemann, H. K., Worthington, E., O’Connor, M.,
639 Drane, E., Steeves, S., & Newton, R. (2021). The burden of disease in early schizophrenia – a
640 systematic literature review. *Current Medical Research and Opinion*, *37*(1), 109–121.
641 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2020.1841618>
- 642 Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297–334.
643 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
- 644 Csardi, G., & Nepusz, T. (2005). The Igraph Software Package for Complex Network Research. *InterJournal*,
645 *Complex Systems*, 1695.
- 646 Debbané, M., & Barrantes-Vidal, N. (2015). Schizotypy From a Developmental Perspective. *Schizophrenia*
647 *Bulletin*, *41*(suppl_2), S386–S395. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu175>
- 648 Eckblad, M., & Chapman, L. J. (1983). Magical ideation as an indicator of schizotypy. *Journal of Consulting*
649 *and Clinical Psychology*, *51*(2), 215–225. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.51.2.215>
- 650 Epskamp, S., Cramer, A. O. J., Waldorp, L. J., Schmittmann, V. D., & Borsboom, D. (2012). qgraph: Network
651 Visualizations of Relationships in Psychometric Data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*, 1–18.
652 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i04>
- 653 Epskamp, S., Waldorp, L. J., Möttus, R., & Borsboom, D. (2018). The Gaussian Graphical Model in Cross-
654 Sectional and Time-Series Data. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *53*(4), 453–480.
655 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2018.1454823>
- 656 Fonseca-Pedrero, E., Compton, M. T., Tone, E. B., Ortuño-Sierra, J., Paino, M., Fumero, A., & Lemos-
657 Giráldez, S. (2014). Cross-cultural invariance of the factor structure of the Schizotypal Personality
658 Questionnaire across Spanish and American college students. *Psychiatry Research*, *220*(3), 1071–
659 1076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2014.06.050>


- 660 Fonseca-Pedrero, E., Debbané, M., Rodríguez-Testal, J. F., Cohen, A. S., Docherty, A. R., & Ortuño-Sierra, J.
661 (2021). Schizotypy: The Way Ahead. *Psicothema*, 33(1), 16–27.
662 <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2019.285>
- 663 Fonseca-Pedrero, E., Ortuño, J., Debbané, M., Chan, R. C. K., Cicero, D., Zhang, L. C., Brenner, C., Barkus,
664 E., Linscott, R. J., Kwapil, T., Barrantes-Vidal, N., Cohen, A., Raine, A., Compton, M. T., Tone, E. B.,
665 Suhr, J., Inchausti, F., Bobes, J., Fumero, A., ... Fried, E. I. (2018). The Network Structure of
666 Schizotypal Personality Traits. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 44(suppl_2), S468–S479.
667 <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sby044>
- 668 Fonseca-Pedrero, E., Ortuño-Sierra, J., Sierro, G., Daniel, C., Cella, M., Preti, A., Mohr, C., & Mason, O. J.
669 (2015). The Measurement Invariance of Schizotypy in Europe. *European Psychiatry*, 30(7), 837–844.
670 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2015.07.005>
- 671 Friedman, J., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2008). Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso.
672 *Biostatistics*, 9(3), 432–441. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxm045>
- 673 Golino, H. F., & Demetriou, A. (2017). Estimating the dimensionality of intelligence like data using
674 Exploratory Graph Analysis. *Intelligence*, 62, 54–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2017.02.007>
- 675 Golino, H. F., & Epskamp, S. (2017). Exploratory graph analysis: A new approach for estimating the number
676 of dimensions in psychological research. *PLOS ONE*, 12(6), e0174035.
677 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174035>
- 678 Golino, H., Shi, D., Christensen, A. P., Garrido, L. E., Nieto, M. D., Sadana, R., Thiyagarajan, J. A., &
679 Martinez-Molina, A. (2020). Investigating the performance of exploratory graph analysis and
680 traditional techniques to identify the number of latent factors: A simulation and tutorial. *Psychological*
681 *Methods*, 25(3), 292–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000255>
- 682 Goulding, A. (2004). Schizotypy models in relation to subjective health and paranormal beliefs and
683 experiences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 157–167.
684 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2003.08.008>
- 685 Grant, P. (2015). Is Schizotypy per se a Suitable Endophenotype of Schizophrenia? – Do Not Forget to
686 Distinguish Positive from Negative Facets. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 6.
687 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2015.00143>
- 688 Grant, P., Green, M. J., & Mason, O. J. (2018). Models of Schizotypy: The Importance of Conceptual Clarity.
689 *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 44(suppl_2), S556–S563. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sby012>
- 690 Grant, P., & Hennig, J. (2020). Schizotypy, social stress and the emergence of psychotic-like states—A case
691 for benign schizotypy? *Schizophrenia Research*, 216, 435–442.
692 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.10.052>
- 693 Grant, P., Kuepper, Y., Mueller, E., Wielpuetz, C., Mason, O., & Hennig, J. (2013). Dopaminergic foundations
694 of schizotypy as measured by the German version of the Oxford-Liverpool Inventory of Feelings and
695 Experiences (O-LIFE)—A suitable endophenotype of schizophrenia. *Frontiers in Human*
696 *Neuroscience*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00001>

- 697 Hamilton, H. K., & Simeon, D. (2019). Depersonalization/derealization disorder and schizotypal personality
698 disorder. In *Psychosis, trauma and dissociation: Evolving perspectives on severe psychopathology*,
699 *2nd ed* (pp. 241–256). Wiley Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118585948.ch15>
- 700 Hengartner, M. P., & Lehmann, S. N. (2017). Why Psychiatric Research Must Abandon Traditional Diagnostic
701 Classification and Adopt a Fully Dimensional Scope: Two Solutions to a Persistent Problem. *Frontiers*
702 *in Psychiatry*, *8*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2017.00101>
- 703 Isvoranu, A., Borsboom, D., van Os, J., & Guloksuz, S. (2016). A Network Approach to Environmental Impact
704 in Psychotic Disorder: Brief Theoretical Framework. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *42*, sbw049.
705 <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbw049>
- 706 Isvoranu, A.-M., van Borkulo, C. D., Boyette, L.-L., Wigman, J. T. W., Vinkers, C. H., Borsboom, D., & Group
707 Investigators. (2017). A Network Approach to Psychosis: Pathways Between Childhood Trauma and
708 Psychotic Symptoms. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *43*(1), 187–196. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbw055>
- 709 Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, *39*(1), 31–36.
710 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>
- 711 Kemp, K. C., Gross, G. M., & Kwapil, T. R. (2020). Psychometric Properties of the Multidimensional
712 Schizotypy Scale and Multidimensional Schizotypy Scale–Brief: Item and Scale Test–Retest
713 Reliability and Concordance of Original and Brief Forms. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *102*(4),
714 508–515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2019.1591425>
- 715 Kendell, R., & Jablensky, A. (2003). Distinguishing Between the Validity and Utility of Psychiatric Diagnoses.
716 *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *160*(1), 4–12. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.160.1.4>
- 717 Kotov, R., Krueger, R. F., & Watson, D. (2018). A paradigm shift in psychiatric classification: The Hierarchical
718 Taxonomy Of Psychopathology (HiTOP). *World Psychiatry*, *17*(1), 24–25.
719 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20478>
- 720 Kwapil, T. R., Gross, G. M., Burgin, C. J., Raulin, M. L., Silvia, P. J., & Barrantes-Vidal, N. (2018). Validity
721 of the Multidimensional Schizotypy Scale: Associations with schizotypal traits and normal personality.
722 *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *9*(5), 458–466.
723 <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000288>
- 724 Kwapil, T. R., Gross, G. M., Silvia, P. J., Raulin, M. L., & Barrantes-Vidal, N. (2018). Development and
725 psychometric properties of the Multidimensional Schizotypy Scale: A new measure for assessing
726 positive, negative, and disorganized schizotypy. *Schizophrenia Research*, *193*, 209–217.
727 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2017.07.001>
- 728 Lenzenweger, M. F. (2006). Schizotypy: An Organizing Framework for Schizophrenia Research. *Current*
729 *Directions in Psychological Science*, *15*(4), 162–166. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00428.x)
730 [8721.2006.00428.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00428.x)
- 731 Lenzenweger, M. F. (2015). Thinking Clearly About Schizotypy: Hewing to the Schizophrenia Liability Core,
732 Considering Interesting Tangents, and Avoiding Conceptual Quicksand. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*,
733 *41*(suppl_2), S483–S491. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu184>

- 734 Lenzenweger, M. F. (2018). Schizotypy, schizotypic psychopathology and schizophrenia. *World Psychiatry*,
735 17(1), 25–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20479>
- 736 Martin, E. A., Hua, J. P. Y., Straub, K. T., & Kerns, J. G. (2019). Explicit and implicit affect and judgment in
737 schizotypy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01491>
- 738 Mason, O., & Claridge, G. (2006). The Oxford-Liverpool Inventory of Feelings and Experiences (O-LIFE):
739 Further description and extended norms. *Schizophrenia Research*, 82(2), 203–211.
740 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2005.12.845>
- 741 Mason, O. J. (2015). The Assessment of Schizotypy and Its Clinical Relevance. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*,
742 41(suppl_2), S374–S385. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu194>
- 743 McDonald, R. P. (1999). *Test Theory: A Unified Treatment*. Psychology Press.
744 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410601087>
- 745 Mohr, C., & Claridge, G. (2015). Schizotypy—Do not worry, it is not all worrisome. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*,
746 41 Suppl 2(Suppl 2), S436–443. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu185>
- 747 Morton, S. E., O’Hare, K. J. M., Maha, J. L. K., Nicolson, M. P., Machado, L., Topless, R., Merriman, T. R.,
748 & Linscott, R. J. (2017). Testing the Validity of Taxonic Schizotypy Using Genetic and Environmental
749 Risk Variables. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 43(3), 633–643. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbw108>
- 750 Muthén, B. (1984). A general structural equation model with dichotomous, ordered categorical, and continuous
751 latent variable indicators. *Psychometrika*, 49(1), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02294210>
- 752 Nelson, M. T., Seal, M. L., Pantelis, C., & Phillips, L. J. (2013). Evidence of a dimensional relationship
753 between schizotypy and schizophrenia: A systematic review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*,
754 37(3), 317–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.01.004>
- 755 Nenadić, I., Meller, T., Evermann, U., Schmitt, S., Pfarr, J.-K., Abu-Akel, A., & Grezellschak, S. (2021).
756 Subclinical schizotypal vs. Autistic traits show overlapping and diametrically opposed facets in a non-
757 clinical population. *Schizophrenia Research*, 231, 32–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2021.02.018>
- 758 Oezgen, M., & Grant, P. (2018). Odd and disorganized—Comparing the factor structure of the three major
759 schizotypy inventories. *Psychiatry Research*, 267, 289–295.
760 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.06.009>
- 761 Onchev, G. (2021). Changes in Psychopathology and Mental Health Resilience. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12,
762 676492. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.676492>
- 763 Pfarr, J.-K., Meller, T., Evermann, U., Sahakyan, L., Kwapil, T. R., & Nenadić, I. (2023). Trait schizotypy and
764 the psychosis prodrome: Current standard assessment of extended psychosis spectrum phenotypes.
765 *Schizophrenia Research*, 254, 208–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2023.03.004>
- 766 Polner, B., Faiola, E., Urquijo, M. F., Meyhöfer, I., Steffens, M., Rónai, L., Koutsouleris, N., & Ettinger, U.
767 (2021). The network structure of schizotypy in the general population. *European Archives of*
768 *Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, 271(4), 635–645. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-019-01078-x>


- 769 Pons, P., & Latapy, M. (2005). Computing Communities in Large Networks Using Random Walks. In pInar
770 Yolum, T. Güngör, F. Gürgen, & C. Özturan (A c. Di), *Computer and Information Sciences—ISCIS*
771 *2005* (pp. 284–293). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/11569596_31
- 772 Raine, A. (1991). The SPQ: A Scale for the Assessment of Schizotypal Personality Based on DSM-III-R
773 Criteria. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *17*(4), 555–564. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/17.4.555>
- 774 Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*,
775 *48*, 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02>
- 776 Sarraf, L., Lepage, M., & Sauvé, G. (2022). The clinical and psychosocial correlates of self-stigma among
777 people with schizophrenia spectrum disorders across cultures: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
778 *Schizophrenia Research*, *248*, 64–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2022.08.001>
- 779 Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (2010). Ensuring Positiveness of the Scaled Difference Chi-square Test Statistic.
780 *Psychometrika*, *75*(2), 243–248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-009-9135-y>
- 781 Schmittmann, V. D., Cramer, A. O. J., Waldorp, L. J., Epskamp, S., Kievit, R. A., & Borsboom, D. (2013).
782 Deconstructing the construct: A network perspective on psychological phenomena. *New Ideas in*
783 *Psychology*, *31*(1), 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2011.02.007>
- 784 Schultze-Lutter, F., Nenadic, I., & Grant, P. (2019). Psychosis and Schizophrenia-Spectrum Personality
785 Disorders Require Early Detection on Different Symptom Dimensions. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *10*.
786 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00476>
- 787 Strobl, R., Grill, E., & Mansmann, U. (2012). Graphical modeling of binary data using the LASSO: A
788 simulation study. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *12*, 16. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-12-16)
789 [12-16](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-12-16)
- 790 Tandon, R., Gaebel, W., Barch, D. M., Bustillo, J., Gur, R. E., Heckers, S., Malaspina, D., Owen, M. J., Schultz,
791 S., Tsuang, M., Van Os, J., & Carpenter, W. (2013). Definition and description of schizophrenia in the
792 DSM-5. *Schizophrenia Research*, *150*(1), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2013.05.028>
- 793 *[The German version of the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ): Preliminary psychometric properties]*—
794 *PubMed*. (s.d.). Recuperato 18 giugno 2024, da <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20200804/>
- 795 van Borkulo, C. D., Borsboom, D., Epskamp, S., Blanken, T. F., Boschloo, L., Schoevers, R. A., & Waldorp,
796 L. J. (2014). A new method for constructing networks from binary data. *Scientific Reports*, *4*(1), 5918.
797 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep05918>
- 798 Wingefeld, K., Spitzer, C., Mensebach, C., Grabe, H. J., Hill, A., Gast, U., Schlosser, N., Höpp, H., Beblo,
799 T., & Driessen, M. (2010). Die deutsche Version des Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ): Erste
800 Befunde zu den psychometrischen Kennwerten. *PPmP - Psychotherapie · Psychosomatik ·*
801 *Medizinische Psychologie*, *60*, 442–450. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0030-1247564>
- 802 Wright, A. G. C., Krueger, R. F., Hobbs, M. J., Markon, K. E., Eaton, N. R., & Slade, T. (2013). The structure
803 of psychopathology: Toward an expanded quantitative empirical model. *Journal of Abnormal*
804 *Psychology*, *122*(1), 281–294. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030133>

EGA model of the MSS – 4 FACTORS + Betweenness centrality




- Disconnection
- Disorganised
- Negative
- Positive

EGA model of the O-LIFE highlighting 4 factors (original model)



- Cognitive disorganisation
- Impulsive Nonconformity
- Introverted Anhedonia
- Unusual Experiences

EGA model of the O-LIFE – new 4 factors



- Cognitive and behavioural disorganization
- Environmental pressure
- Introversion
- Unusual experiences