Supplemental Table 2: Psychometric properties of the different versions of PID-5, according to the analyzed studies (N=64)

Author(year) Language/ PID-5 version	Objective	Reability α/T.R	Validity Construct	Validity Criterion
20.Bo et al. (2015) danish/SRF	to assess reliability of PID-5-SRF and investigate if the five-factor structure and hierarchical model can be replicated in a danish sample	facets: **α** = 0.75-0.95	**EFA (CF-Equamax oblique rotation):** hierarchical model: replicated (majority of facets loading >0.40) 5 factors: replicated	
21.Crego et al. (2015) english/SRF	to assess convergent validity of PID-5-SRF with others personality instruments		**convergent**: - PID-5-SRF facets x NEO PI-R domains (anticipated alignments: more expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): anxiousness x NEU (r=0.65) withdrawal x EXT (r=-0.55) callousness x AGR (r=-0.56) distractibility x CONS (r=-0.58) eccentricity X CONS (r=-0.38), perceptual dysregulation x CONS (r=-0.38), perceptual dysregulation x NEU (r=0.34) - PID-5-SRF facets x IPC domains (more expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): anxiousness x negative emotionality (r=0.60) withdrawal x positive emotionality (r=-0.69) callousness x agreeableness (r=-0.56) irresponsibility x dependability (r=-0.65) eccentricity x conventionality (r=-0.54) - PID-5-SRF facets x 5DTP domains (more expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): anxiousness x neuroticism (r=0.65) withdrawal x extraversion (r=-0.52) deceitfulness x insensitivity (r=0.54) rigid perfectionism x orderliness (r=0.39), irresponsibility x insensitivity (r=0.43) perceptual dysregulation x absorption (r=0.44) - PID-5-SRF facets x HEXACO PI-R domains (more expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): hostility x agreeableness (r=0.74) withdrawal x extraversion (r=-0.74), anhedonia X extraversion (r=-0.74) callousness x altruism (r=-0.67) distractibility x conscientiousness (r=-0.59) eccentricity x conscientiousness (r=-0.33), eccentricity x openness (r=0.33) - PID-5-SRF facets x IPIP-NEO domains(anticipated alignments: more expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): anxiousness x NEU (r=0.77) withdrawal x EXT (r=-0.67) callousness x AGR (r=-0.74) irresponsibility x CONS (r=-0.69) eccentricity x NEU (r=0.43), eccentricity x OPEN (r=0.21)	

22.Morey et al (2015) english/SRF	to assess the empirical relationships between the DSM-5 section III pathological traits and DSM-IV/DSM-5 section II personality disorder diagnoses		**convergent:** <u>- PID-5-SRF domains x PDQ-4 disorders (all significant correlations):</u> NA x ASPD (r=0.12), NA x AVPD (r=0.27), NA x BPD (r=0.58), NA x NPD (r=0.11), NA x DPD (r=0.28), NA x HPD (r=0.16), NA x PPD (r=0.29), NA x SZPD (r=0.12) DET x ASPD (r=-0.17), DET x AVPD (r=0.48), DET x NPD (r=-0.12), DET x OCPD (r=0.24), DET x SZPD (r=0.37), DET x DPD (r=0.16), DET x HPD (r=-0.17), DET x PPD (r=0.13), DET x SZPD (r=0.58) ANT x ASPD (r=0.49), ANT x AVPD (r=-0.16), ANT x BPD (r=0.36), ANT x NPD (r=0.47), ANT x SPD (r=0.11), ANT x HPD (r=0.29), ANT x PPD (r=0.45) DIS x ASPD (r=0.64), DIS x AVPD (r=-0.23), DIS x BPD (r=0.52), DIS x NPD (r=0.39), DIS x OCPD (r=-0.11), DIS x HPD (r=0.47), DIS x PPD (r=0.29) PSY x ASPD (r=-0.14), PSY x BPD (r=0.13), PSY x SPD (r=0.62), PSY x PPD (r=0.31), PSY x SZPD (r=0.22) <u>- PID-5-SRF facets x PDQ-4 disorders (the most expressive correlations):</u> irresponsibility x ASPD (r=0.73) withdrawal x AVPD (0.49) emotional lability x BPD (r=0.75) grandiosity x NPD (r=0.77) rigid perfectionism x OCPD (r=0.66) unusual beliefs and experiences x SZPD (r=0.67) separation insecurity x DPD (r=0.56) attention seeking x HPD (r=0.68) suspiciousness x PPD (r=0.66) withdrawal x SPD (r=0.62)	**preditive:** <u>PID-5-SRF specific facets for PD'S → DSM- IV PD's (PDQ-4)</u> ASPD PID-5 facets →ASPD (R^2=0.67) AVPD PID-5 facets → AVPD (R^2=0.38) BPD PID-5 facets → BPD (R^2=0.66) NPD PID-5 facets → NPD (R^2=0.62) OCPD PID-5 facets → OCPD (R^2=0.46) SZPD PID-5 facets →SZPD (R^2=0.60)
23.Roskam et al. (2015) french/SRF	to asses unidimensionality of the 25 facets and the five domain scales, five-factor model and hierarchical model	domains: **α** = 0.75-0.82 facets: **α** = 0.68-0.95	**EFA:** <u>5 factors:</u> X^2=3567.27 (p<0.01); CFI=0.89; GFI=0.99; RMR=0.03 <u>unidimensionality domains/facets</u> **=** replicated	
24.Ashton et al. (2016) dutch/SF/IRF	to investigate the contributions of trait and source variance to the facet level scales of PID-5-SRF/PID-5-IRF and HEXACO-PI-R	<u>PID-5-SRF facets:</u> **α=**0.66-0.89 <u>PID-5-SF facets:</u> **α**=0.52-0.91	**convergent**: <u>-PID-5-SF x PID-5-IRF:</u> domains: NA (r=0.76); DET (r=0.76); ANT (r=0.66); DIS (r=0.74); PSY (r=0.59) facets: submissiveness (r=0.31 – min) – depressivity (r=0.58 max) <u>-PID-5-SF domains x HEXACO-PI-R domains (anticipated alignments):</u> NA x Emotionality (r=0.65) DET x Extraversion (r=-0.62) ANT x Agreeableness (r=-0.33) DIS x CONS (r=-0.52) PSY x OPEN (r=0.04)(NS) <u>-PID-5-IRF domains x HEXACO-PI-R domains (anticipated alignments):</u> NA x Emotionality (r=0.52) DET x Extraversion (r=-0.57) ANT x Agreeableness (r=-0.24) DIS x CONS (r=-0.53) PSY x Honesty-humility (r=-0.40) PSY x OPEN (r=0.08)(NS) <u>PID-5-SF source components x acquiescence index (r=0.65)</u> <u>PID-5-SF source components x HEXACO-PI-R source components (r=-0.30)</u>	
25. Bach et al. (2016) danish/SRF/SF/BF	to assess the psychometric qualities of all three PID-5 forms (reliability and validity)	<u>PID-5-SRF domains:</u> **α=** 0.91-0.96 <u>PID-5-SF domains:</u> **α=** 0.63-0.93	**EFA:** <u>5 factors:</u> PID-5: RMSEA=0.080; CFI=0.914 PID-5-SF: RMSEA=0.062; CFI=0.956	

PID-5-BF domains: **α=** 0.74-0.81	PID-5-BF: RMSEA=0.041; CFI=0.984 **convergent:** -PID-5-SRF domains x PID-5-SF domains (r=0.98) -PID-5-SRF domains x PID-5-BF domains (r=0.90) -PID-5-SF domains x PID-5-BF domains (r=0.89) -PID-5-SRF domains x SCID-II disorders (all significant correlations): NA x PPD (r=0.43); NA x ASPD (r=-0.23); NA x BPD (r=0.56); NA x HPD (r=0.33); NA x AVPD (r=0.49); NA x DPD (r=0.47), NA x ASPD (r=-0.23); NA x OCPD (r=0.24) DET x PPD (r=0.29)DET x SPD (r=0.32); DET x SZPD (r=0.23); DET x BPD (r=0.23); DET x AVPD (r=0.38); DET x DPD (r=0.21) ANT x PPD (r=0.33); ANT x SPD (r=0.20); ANT x SZPD (r=0.19); ANT x ASPD (r=0.53); ANT x BPD (r=0.24), ANT x HPD (r=0.36); ANT x NPD (r=0.74), ANT x AVPD (r=-0.21); ANT x OCPD (r=0.18) DIS x PPD (r=0.34); DIS x SZPD (r=0.25) DIS x ASPD (r=0.31); DIS x BPD (r=0.53); DIS x HPD (r=0.38); DIS x NPD (r=0.27); DIS x DPD (r=0.35) PSY x PPD (r=0.37); PSY x SZPD (r=0.55); PSY x ASPD (r=0.20); PSY x BPD (r=0.43); PSY x BPD (r=0.24); PSY x NPD (r=0.33);PSY x DPD (r=0.25) PSY x OCPD(r=0.26) -PID-5-SF domains x SCID-II disorders (all significant correlations): NA x PPD (r=0.44); NA x SZPD (r=0.20); NA x SZPD (r=-0.22); NA x BPD (0.55); NA x HPD (r=0.34); NA x AVPD (0.49); NA x DPD (0.46); NA x OCPD (0.23) DET x PPD (r=0.25); DET x SPD (0.31), DET x SZPD (r=0.22); DET x BPD (r=0.24); DET x AVPD (r=0.30); DET x DPD (r=0.17) ANT x PPD (0.33); ANT x SPD (r=0.21); ANT x SZPD (r=0.18); ANT x ASPD (r=0.54); ANT x BPD (r=0.24); ANT x HPD (0.37); ANT x NPD (0.73) DIS x PPD (0.31); DIS x SZPD (r=0.24); DIS x ASPD (r=0.27); DIS x BPD (r=0.49); DIS x HPD (0.37); DIS x NPD (r=0.25); DIS x AVPD (0.17); DIS x DPD (r=0.35) PSY x PDD (r=0.33); PSY x SZPD (r=0.57); PSY x ASPD (r=0.21); PSY x BPD (r=0.37); PSY x HPD (r=0.17); PSY x NPD (r=0.32); PSY x DPD (r=0.22); PSY x OCPD (r=0.22) -PID-5-BF domains x SCID-II disorders (all significant correlations): NA x PPD (r=0.40); NA x SPD (r=-0.19); NA x SZPD (r=0.17); NA x ASPD (r=-0.18); NA x BPD (r=0.50); NA x HPD (r=0.36); NA x AVPD (r=0.47); NA x DPD (r=0.45); NA x OCPD (r=0.21) DET x PPD (r=0.30); DET x SPD (r=0.32); DET x SZPD (r=0.21); DET x BPD (r=0.25); DET x AVPD (r=0.28); NA x DPD (r=0.19) ANT x PPD (r=0.36); ANT x SPD (r=0.19), ANT x ASPD (r=0.56); ANT x BPD (r=0.33); ANT x HPD (r=0.33); ANT x NPD (r=0.66) DIS x PPD (r=0.36); DIS x SZPD (r=0.23), DIS x ASPD (r=0.41); DIS x BPD (r=0.43); DIS x HPD (r=0.27); DIS x NPD (r=0.33); DIS x DPD (r=0.26) PSY x PPD (r=0.34); PSY x SZPD (r=0.47); PSY x ASPD (r=0.18), PSY x BPD (r=0.44); PSY x HPD (r=0.24); PSY x NPD (r=0.26); PSY x DPD (r=0.26); PSY x OCPD (r=0.23) **discriminative:** PID-5-SRF,PID-5-SF and PID-5-BF: clinical > community (all domains)

26.Bastiens et al. (2016a) dutch/SRF	to assess the factor structure and reliability by means of exploratory structural equation modeling and alpha coefficients; to investigate the predictive ability of section III personality traits in relations to section II (DSM-5)	facets: **α =** 0.53-0.94	**ESEM:** 5 factors: CFI=0.91; SRMR<0.06 **CFA:** facet unidimensionality: all facets: CFI>0.94; SRMR<0.07 (except risk taking) **convergent:** - PID-5-SRF domains x ADP-IV disorders (all significant correlations): NA x PPD (r=0.38), NA x SPD (r=0.18), NA x SZPD (r=0.29) NA x BPD (r=0.46), NA x NPD (r=0.23),NA x HPD (r=0.42), NA x AVPD (r=0.39), NA x OCPD (r=0.48), NA x DPD (r=0.55) DET x PPD (r=0.34), DET x SPD (r=0.59), DET x SZPD (r=0.37), DET x BPD (r=0.25), DET x ASPD (r=0.27), DET x NPD (r=0.26), DET x HPD (r=0.14), DET x AVPD (r=0.54), DET x OCPD (r=0.32), DET x DPD (r=0.29) ANT x PPD (r=0.25), ANT x SZPD (r=0.20), ANT x BPD (r=0.19), ANT x ASPD (r=0.38), ANT x NPD (r=0.46), ANT x HPD (r=0.27), ANT x OCPD (r=0.18), ANT x DPD (r=0.09) DIS x PPD(r=0.34), DIS x SPD (r=0.13), DIS x SZPD (r=0.27), DIS x BPD (r=0.42), DIS x ASPD(r=0.50), DIS x NPD (r=0.28), DIS x HPD (r=0.42), DIS x ASPD (r=0.25), DIS x OCPD (r=0.11), DIS x DPD (r=0.28) PSY x PPD (r=0.45), PSY x SPD(r=0.32), PSY x SZPD (r=0.59), PSY x BPD (r=0.48), PSY x ASPD (r=0.40), PSY x NPD (r=0.48), PSY x HPD (r=0.49), PSY x AVPD (r=0.32), PSY x OCPD (r=0.42), PSY x DPD (r=0.39)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF specific facets → DSM-IV PD's (ADP-IV) each personality disorder was predicted by its theoretically associated PID-5 facet scales (r^2=0.35-0.50) additional facets → DSM-IV PD's (ADP-IV) depressivity/withdrawal → PPD (R^2=0.52) suspiciousness → SPD (R^2=0.40) depressivity → SZPD (R^2=0.49) cognitive and perceptual dysregulation/deceitfulness→ BPD (R^2=0.52) cognitive and perceptual dysregulation/eccentricity→ ASPD (R^2=0.45) cognitive and perceptual dysregulation/deceitfulness/depressivity/suspiciousness→ NPD (R^2=0.47) cognitive and perceptual dysregulation/depressiveness/deceitfulness/submissiviness→ HPD (R^2=0.49) submissiveness/depressivity/distractibility→ AVPD (R^2=0.53) depressivity/submissiveness/withdrawal→ OCPD (R^2=0.45) depressivity/ cognitive and perceptual dysregulation/perseveration→ DPD (R^2=0.50)
27.Bastiens et al. (2016b) dutch/SRF	to assess the factor structure differences in PID-5-SRF higher order domain according to gender, age and educational level, and explored convergent and discriminant validity		**ESEM:** 5 factors: CFI=0.86; SRMR=0.04 Item-facet fit: CFI>0.90; SRMR <0.10 (except emotional lability and hostility) **convergent:** - PID-5-SRF domains x DAPP-BQ domains (all significant correlations): NA x emotional dysregulation (r=0.72), NA x compulsivity (r=0.17) DET x inhibitedness (r=0.74), DET x emotional dysregulation (r=0.23) ANT x dissocial (r=0.72) DIS x dissocial (r=0.56), DIS x emotional dysregulation (r=0.49), DIS x compulsivity (r-0.30) PSY x emotional dysregulation (r=0.55), PSY x dissocial (r=0.45), PSY x inhibitedness (r=0.25) **discriminative:** NA, ANT, DIS: PD>other disorders NA, DIS: woman>men; ANT: men> woman ANT x age (r=-0.15), DIS x age (r=-0.28), PSY x age (r=-0.12) ANT x years of education (r=-0.22)	
28.Calvo et al (2016) spanish/SRF	to analyze the utility of the personality traits presented in Section III of the DSM-5 for BPD diagnosis.		**convergent**: -PID-5-SRF domains x BPD total symptom counts (SCID-II): NA x BPD total symptom counts (r=0.45) DET x BPD total symptom counts (r=0.46) ANT x BPD total symptom counts (r=0.32) DIS x BPD total symptom counts (r=0.49) PSY x BPD total symptom counts (r=0.43) **discriminative:** domains: BPD>Non BPD cohen's d = 0.78 (ANT) -1.44 (DIS) facets: BPD>Non BPD cohen's d = 0.26 (submissiveness) -1.68 (emotional lability)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF specific domains and facets → BPD DSM-IV – (SCID-II) NA: (OR=1.06) DIS: (OR=1.10) emotional lability: (OR=1.09) lack of restricted affectivity (OR=1.03) impulsivity: (OR=1.04)
29.Crego & Widiger (2016)	to assess the convergent and discriminant validity of 3 measures of maladaptive	facets: **α=** 0.78-0.96	**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF facets x CAT-PD-SF facets (anticipated alignments: r=0.56-0.89) (more expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains):	

english/SRF	personality traits (PID-5-SRF, CAT-PD-SF and FFMPD)		anxiety x anxiety (r=0.86) anhedonia x anhedonia (r=0.89) deceitfulness x manipulativeness (r=0.86) distractibility x nonperseverance (r=0.84) eccentricity x peculiarity (r=0.85) - PID-5 facets x FFMPD facets (anticipated alignments: r=0.56-0.87) (more expressive correlations): anxiousness x anxious uncertainty (r=0.86) depressivity x despondency (r=0.82) attention-seeking x attention-seeking (r=0.85) risk-taking x thrill-seeking (0.84) eccentricity x odd-eccentric (0.87)	
30.Combaluzier et al (2016) french/BF	to assess validity of the French version of PID-5-BF	domains **α** = 0.68-0.73	**EFA:** 5 factors: replicated **convergent:** - PID-5-BF domains x BFI-10 domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.48) DET x EXT (r=0.23) DIS x CONS (r=0.05) (NS) ANT x AGR (r=-0.07) (NS) PSY x OPEN (r=0.16) PSY x NEU (r=0.08) (NS) - PID-5-BF x SAPAS (r=0.34) - PID-5-BF x SCL-10 (r=0.55)	
31.Creswell et al., (2016) english/SRF	to assess personality pathology relates to alcohol problems		**convergent:** -PID-5-SRF domains x AUDIT total score (correlated construct = alcohol problems) NA (r=0.16) DET (r=0.07) (NS) ANT (r=0.30) DIS (r=0.25) PSY (r=0.25) -PID-5-SRF facets x AUDIT total score (the most expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): hostility (r=0.19) depressivity (r=0.12) deceitfulness (r=0.31) irresponsibility (r=0.28) perceptual dysregulation (r=0.27) **discriminative:** NA, DIS, ANT, PSY > hazardous drinkers than non-hazardous drinkers	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF domains → AUDIT scores ANT (RR=1.70) DIS (RR=1.66)
32.Deyoung et al (2016) english/SRF	to test how well the 25 facets could be integrated with the 10-factor structure of traits within the Big Five Model (operationalized by Big Five Aspect Scales)	sample 1 facets**: α=** 0.71-0.95 sample 2 facets: **α=**0.79-0.96	**EFA:** 25 PID-5-SRF facets can be integrated to 10 BFAS scales (factor loading: 0.42-0.91)	
33.Fossati et al. (2016a) italian/SRF	to assess the associations between PID-5-SRF and categorically diagnosed NPD and BPD		**discriminative:** PID-5-SRF domains: NA: BPD > no PD; NPD> no PD DET: BPD > no PD; NPD> no PD ANT: BPD > no PD; NPD> no PD; NPD> any PD	

			DIS: BPD > no PD; NPD> no PD; BPD>NPD PSY: BPD > no PD; BPD> any PD <u>25 PID-5-SRF facets (anticipated alignments):</u> emotional lability: BPD> no PBD separation insecurity: BPD> no PD; BPD>NPD depressivity: BPD>no PD impulsivity: BPD>no PD; BPD>any PD; BPD>NPD distractibility: BPD> no PD; BPD>NPD; NPD>no PD perceptual dysregulation: BPD> no PD; BPD>any PD; BPD>NPD	
34.Fossati et al. (2016b) italian/SRF	to assess if PID-4-SRF domains and facet scale scores performed adequately in predicting interview-based scores of general personality pathology	domains: **α=** 0.87-0.94 facets: **α=** 0.72-0.94	**convergent:** <u>-PID-5-SRF domains x IPDS total</u> NA (r=0.58) DET (r=0.52) ANT (r=0.36) DIS (r=0.52) PSY (r=0.48) <u>-PID-5-SRF facets x IPDS total (the most expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains):</u> hostility (r=0.54) depressivity (r=0.49) callousness (r=0.39) distractibility (r=0.43) cognitive and perceptual dysregulation (r=0.51)	**preditive:** <u>-PID-5-SRF domains → IPDS total</u> median adjusted (R^2=0.38) <u>- PID-5-SRF facets → IPDS total</u> median adjusted (R^2= 0.45) <u>- PID-5-SRF domains → PDQ-4+ axis II PD scales</u> median adjusted (R^2= 0.38) min adjusted (OCPD: R^2= 0.27) max adjusted (BPD: R^2= 0.57) <u>- PID-5-SRF facets → PDQ-4+ axis II PD scales</u> median adjusted (R^2= 0.46) min adjusted (SPD: R^2 = 0.40) max adjusted (BPD: R^2= 0.61)
35.Fowler et al. (2016) english/SRF	to predict symptom severity and functional impairment	domains: **α=**0.91-0.95 facets: **α=**0.78-0.95	**convergent**: <u>- PID-5-SRF x burden of illness (correlated construct: r=-0.10 - 0.31)</u> <u>(the most expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains):</u> NA x gender (r= - 0.18) DET x age (r= - 0.14) ANT x age (r = - 0.27) DIS x age (r= - 0.31) PSY x age (r= - 0.31) <u>- PID-5-SRF domains x BFI domains (anticipated alignments):</u> NA x NEU (r= 0.56) DET x EXT (r= - 0.52) ANT x AGR (r=-0.38) DIS x CONS (r= -0.12) PSY x OPEN (r= 0.18)	**preditive:** NA, DET, PSY demonstrated incremental validity above and beyond burden of illness, Five Factor Model traits and traditional SCID-II criteria counts, accounted for considerable variance in predicting depression, anxiety, somatization, emotion dysregulation and functional disability severity
36.McGee et al. (2016) english/SRF	to explore the effect of response bias on the PID-5-SRF	sample 1 facets: **α=**0.62-0.95 sample 2 facets **α=**0.74-0.96	**discriminative (response bias):** sample 1: <u>domains:</u> overreporting>credible reporting (mean effect sizes=1.21±0.35) credible reporting>underreporting (mean effect sizes=0.66±0.39) <u>facets:</u> over-reporting>credible reporting, except rigid perfectionism and risk taking (mean effect sizes=0.70±0.41) credible reporting<underreporting, except intimacy avoidance and rigid perfectionism(mean effect sizes=0.43±0.20) sample 2: <u>domains:</u> overreporting>credible reporting (mean effect sizes=1.18±0.53) credible reporting>underreporting (mean effect sizes=0.64±0.24) <u>facets:</u> overreporting>credible reporting except rigid perfectionism(mean effect sizes=0.94±0.54) credible reporting<underreporting except intimacy avoidance and rigid perfectionism(mean effect sizes=0.44±0.22)	

37.Somma et al. (2016) italian/SRF	to assess internal consistency, reliability and clinical usefulness of the PID-5-SRF scales	domains**: α=** 0.91-0.96 facets: **α=** 0.67-0.96	**convergent:** <u>-PID-5-SRF facets x SCID II PD's (all significant correlations):</u> depressivity x BPD (r=0.40), anxiousness x BPD (r=0.39), hostility x BPD (r=0.37), separation insecurity x BPD (r=0.32), suspiciousness x BPD (r=0.29) impulsivity x BPD (r=0.43), rigid perfeccionism x BPD (r=0.26), risk taking x BPD (r=0.33), perceptual dysregulation x BPD (r=0.27) attention seeking x NPD (r=0.29), grandiosity x NPD (r=0.28), manipulativeness x NPD (r=0.24), rigid perfectionism (r=0.24) anxiousness x AVPD (r=0.23), anhedonia x AVPD (r=0.31), manipulativeness x AVPD (r=-0.23), withdrawal x AVPD (r=0.40) depressivity x OCPD (r-0.23), impulsivity x OCPD (r=-0.24), rigid perfectionism x OCPD (r=0.24), risk taking (r=-0.24), irresponsibility (r=-0.22), perceptual dysregulation (r=-0.25), unusual beliefs x OCPD (r=-0.29) suspiciousness x SZPD (r=0.24), withdrawal x SZPD (r=0.23) **discriminative:** suicide attempt > without suicide attempt = depressivity, anhedonia, submissiveness, anxiousness, unusual beliefs, withdrawal
38.Thimm et al. (2016a) norwegian/SRF	to assess reliability, hierarchical structure, congruency with international findings, and cross-cultural measurement invariance with a matched U.S sample	facets: **α=** 0.72-0.95	**EFA:** <u>hierarchical model:</u> replicated **EFA:** <u>5 factors:</u> $X^2(185)=766.50$ ($p<0,0001$) RMSEA=0.08; CFI=0.91; TLI=0.85 <u>transcultural invariance</u> across norwegian and matched U.S sample: (factor means, item uniqueness and factor variances) = confirmed
39.Thimm et al. (2016b) norwegian/SF	to assess the score reliability and structure of the Norwegian PID-5-SF.	<u>PID-5-SF derived PID-5-SRF</u> domains: **α**=0.85-0.98 facets: **α**=0.60-0.90 <u>PID-5-SF standalone</u> domains:**α=**0.85-0.89 facets: **α=**0.59-0.90	**EFA:** <u>5 factors:</u> sample 1: $X^2=543.83$($p<0.001$); RMSEA=0.06; CFI=0.92; SRMR=0.03 sample 2: $X^2=365.72$($p<0.001$); RMSEA=0.09; CFI=0.86; SRMR=0.04 **convergent:** <u>- PID-5-SRF domains x BFI domains (anticipated alignments):</u> NA x NEU (r=0.77) DET x EXT (r=-0.69) ANT x AGR(r=-0.48)) DIS x CONS(r=-0.72) PSY x OPEN (r=0.26) PSY x NEU (r=0.35) <u>- PID-5-SF domains x BFI domains (anticipated alignments):</u> NA x NEU (r=0.76) DET x EXT (r=-0.54) ANT x AGR (r=-0.36) DIS x CONS (r=-0.78) PSY x OPEN (r=0.35) PSY x NEU (r=0.32) <u>- PID-5-SF domains x PBQ-SF PD's (all significant correlations):</u> NA x PPD (r=0.50), NA x SPD (r=0.24), NA x ASPD (r=0.36), NA x BPD (r=0.74), NA x HPD (r=0.57), NA x NPD (r=0.34), NA x AVPD(r=0.68), NA x DPD(r=0.76), NA x OCPD (r=0.56) DET x PPD (r=0.51), DET x SPD (r=0.71), DET x ASPD (r=0.30), DET x BPD (r=0.56), DET x NPD (r=0.20), DET x AVPD (r=0.56), DET x DPD (r=0.39), DET x OCPD (r=0.25) ANT x PPD (r=0.51), ANT x SPD (r=0.38), ANT x ASPD (r=0.63), ANT x BPD(r=0.48), ANT x HPD (r=0.54), ANT x NPD (r=0.68), ANT x AVPD (r=0.40), ANT x DPD (r=0.43), ANT x OCPD (r=0.40)

			DIS x PPD (r=0.49), DIS x SPD (r=0.32), DIS x ASPD (r=0.47), DIS x BPD(r=0.61), DIS x HPD (r=0.44), DIS x NPD (r=0.38), DIS x AVPD (r=0.54), DIS x DPD (r=0.54), DIS x OCPD (r=0.24) PSY x PPD (r=0.44), PSY x SPD (r=0.56), PSY x ASPD (r=0.34), PSY x BPD (r=0.43), PSY x HPD (r=0.28), PSY x NPD (r=0.36), PSY x AVPD (r=0.36) PSY x DPD (r=0.34), PSY x OCPD (r=0.38)	
40.Williams & Simms (2016) english/SRF	to assess the interpersonal coverage of PID-5-SRF	domains: **α** = 0.92-0.96 facets: **α** = 0.75-0.96	**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF domains x NEO-PI-3FH domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.78) DET x EXT (r=-0.73) ANT x AGR (r=-0.67) DIS x CONS (r=-0.73) PSY x OPEN (r=0.11) PSY x NEU (r=0.40) - PID-5-SRF domains x IIP-SC domains (r=0.24-0.74) (the most expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): NA x vindictive (r=0.49) DET x cold (r=0.74) ANT x domineering (r=0.48) DIS x domineering (r=0.52) PSY x domineering (r=0.50)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF → interpersonal problems (IIP-SC) PID-5 domains (R^2= 0.88) PID-5 facets (R^2= 0.83)
41.Wygant et al (2016) english/SRF	to compare the Section III alternative model's traited bases conception of ASPD with the categorical model from the main diagnostic codes section of DSM–5		**convergent:** PID-5-SRF all facets ASPD x SCID-II ASPD (r=0.27-0.41) PID-5 SRF all facets ASPD x PCL-R (r=0.21-0.37) PID-5-SRF additional facets x SCID-II ASPD (all significant correlations): restricted affectivity (r=0.25) grandiosity (r=0.19) distractibility (r=0.25) PID-5 additional facets x PCL-R (all significant correlations): restricted affectivity (r=0.22) grandiosity (r=0.31)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF specific facets ASPD → ASPD section II DSM-IV (SCID II) (R^2=0.24) PID-5-SRF specific facets ASPD → PCL-R Total (R^2=0.18) PID-5-SRF specific facets ASPD → TriPM Total (R^2=0.52)
42.Yalch & Hopwood (2016) english/SRF	to assess the convergent and discriminant validity of PID-5-SRF and CAT-PD facets		**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF facets x CAT-PD facets (anticipated alignments: r= 0.58 -0.81) (more expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): anxiousness x anxiousness (r=0.79) anhedonia x anhedonia (r=0.81) attention seeking x exhibitionism; callousness x callousness (r=0.81) distractibility x non perseverance (r=0.79) eccentricity x peculiarity (r=0.79)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF facets → Clinically Relevant Behavior (R^2=0.14-0.48) all facets → suicide risk (R^2=0.48) all facets → autocratic behavior (R^2=0.45) all facets → behavioral rigidity (R^2=0.46) all facets → dissociative symptoms (R^2=0.40) all facets → cognitive dysfunction (R^2=0.47)
43.Al-Attiyah et al. (2017) arabic/SRF	to assess factorial structure, inter-correlations, reliability, and criterion validity of PID-5-SRF	domains: **α**=0.92-0.96 facets: **α**=0.70-0.95	**CFA:** 5 factors: CFI=0.97; SRMR=0.07; RMSEA=0.05 **convergent:** -PID-5-SRF domains x NEO-FFI domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.66) DET x EXT(r=-0.34) ANT x AGR (r=-0.54) DIS x CONS (r=-0.51) PSY x NEU (r=0.47)	
44.Bach et al. (2017a) danish/SRF	to assess whether the DSM–5 Section III facet-profiles would be associated with their respective Section II		**convergent:** PID-5-SRF domains x SCID-II (DSM–IV) (all significant correlations): NA x PPD (r=0.43), NA x ASPD (r=-0.23), NA x BPD (r=0.56), NA x HPD (r=0.33), NA x AVPD (r=0.49) NA x DPD (r=0.47), NA x OCPD (r=0.24) DET x PPD (r=0.29), DET x SPD (r=0.32), DET x SZPD (r=0.23), DET x BPD	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF specific facets → DSM-5 PD's section II (SCID-II) p<0.001 for all diagnoses additional preditive facets: callousness → SPD (p=0.02)

	counterparts, as well as determining whether additional facets could augment the prediction of the Section II disorders		(r=0.23) DET x AVPD(r=0.38), DET x DPD (r=0.21) ANT x PPD (r=0.33), ANT x SPD (r=0.20), ANT X SZPD (r=0.19), ANT x ASPD (r=0.54), ANT x BPD (r=0.24), ANT x HPD (r=0.36), ANT x NPD (r=0.74), ANT x AVPD (r=-0.21), ANT x OCPD (r=0.18) DIS x PPD (r=0.35), DIS x SZPD (r=0.25), DIS x ASPD (r=0.31), DIS x BPD (r=0.53), DIS x HPD (r=0.38), DIS x NPD (r=0.27), DIS x DPD (r=0.35) PSY x PPD (r=0.37), PSY x SZPD (r=0.56), PSY x ASPD (r=0.20), PSY x BPD (r=0.43), PSY x HPD (r=0.24), PSY x NPD (r=0.33), PSY x DPD (r=0.25), PSY x OCPD (r=0.26)	submissiveness → ASPD (p=0.001) callousness → NPD (p=0.035) depressivity → AVPD (p=0.043) risk taking → AVPD (p=0.001)
45.Bach et al (2017b) danish/SRF	to assess the measurement invariance, five-factor structure, and factor correlations of PID-5-SRF across clinical and nonclinical samples.	**sample 1** domains: **α=**0.91-0.94 facets: **α=**0.72-0.93 **sample 2** domains: **α=**0.91-0.95 facets: **α=**0.69-0.95	**ESEM:** 5 factors: sample 1: X^2= 988.67 (p < 0.0001); CFI= 0.89; RMSEA=0.085; SRMR= 0.031 sample 2: X^2= 760.32 (p < 0.0001); CFI= 0.93; RMSEA=0.072; SRMR= 0.026 invariance across clinical x non clinical domains = confirmed	
46.Bach et al. (2017c) danish/SRF	to assess associations of ICD-11 and DSM-5 trait domains (PID-5-SRF), simultaneously, with categorical personality disorders (using SCID-II)		**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF domains x ICD-11 domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NA (r=0.90) DET x DET (r=0.90) ANT x Dissociality (r=0.91) DIS x DIS (r=0.95) PSY x Anankastia (r=0.58) - PID-5-SRF domains x SCID-II PD's: (all significant correlations): NA x PPD (r=0.43), NA x SZPD (r=0.23), NA x BPD(r=0.46), NA x HPD (r=0.34), NA x AVPD (r=0.49), NA x DPD (r=0.48), NA x OCPD (r=0.23) DET x PPD(r=0.43), DET x SPD (r=0.40), DET x SZPD (r=0.39), DET x BPB (r=0.41), DET x AVPD (r=0.46), DET x DPD (r=0.28), DET x OCPD (r=0.19) ANT x PPD (r=0.38), ANT X SPD (r=0.24), ANT x SZPD (r=0.29), ANT x ASPD (r=0.50), ANT x BPD (r=0.33), ANT x HPD (r=0.35), ANT x NPD (r=0.67), ANT x OCPD (r=0.23) DIS x PPD (r=0.49), DIS x SPD (r=0.24), DIS x SZPD (r=0.43), DIS x ASPD (r=0.36), DIS x BPD (r=0.60), DIS x HPD(r=0.43), DIS x NPD (r=0.36), DIS x AVPD (r=0.31), DIS x DPD (r=0.42) PSY x PPD (r=0.51), PSY x SPD (r=0.28), PSY x SZPD (r=0.63), PSY x ASPD (r=0.31), PSY x BPD (r=0.57), PSY x HPD (r=0.33), PSY x NPD (r=0.43), PSY x AVPD (r=0.22), PSY x DPD (r=0.34), PSY x OCPD (r=0.28)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF domains and ICD-11 → PD's (SCID-II) (OR=0.35-92.6) (most expressive associations) PSY stronger predictor → SZPD (OR=60.7) ANT stronger predictor → NPD (OR=92.6)
47.Bastiens et al. (2017) dutch/SRF	to examine the relationship between PID-5-SRF and psychosis		**discriminative:** DET, NA, DIS: psychotic < non psychotic PSY: psychotic > non psychotic PSY: psychotic with remission criteria < psychotic without remission criteria accuracy diagnosis =70.1% (77.5% for psychotic disorder patients, 62.4% for other patients)	
48.Chmielewski et al. (2017) english/SRF	to assess the reliability and functioning impairment	domains **α=**0.91-0.96 facets: **α=** 0.71-0.97 **T/R:** 2 weeks (N=382) domains **r=**0.86-0.91 facets **r=**0.76-0.89	**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF domains x WHODAS domains: all domains PID-5 and all domains WHODAS show correlation ANT x WHODAS total (r=0.20 min) – DIS x WHODAS total (r=0.53 max)	**preditive** PID-5-SRF domains → WHODAS domains: (R^2=0.12-0.37)

49.Debast et al. (2017) dutch/SRF/BF	to assess the construct validity of the PID-5 BF by comparing its structural model and nomological network with the original PID-5 in terms of relations with domains of personality functioning	PID-5-SRF domains: **α=** 0.88-0.94 facets: **α=** 0.29-0.90 PID-5-BF domains: **α=**0.56-0.74 facets: **α=**0.66-0.90	**CFA:** 5 factors - PID-5-SRF: 1 factor: RMSEA=0.012; CFI=0.74; SRMR=0.081 2 factor: RMSEA=0.010; CFI=0.84; SRMR=0.056 3 factor: RMSEA=0.08; CFI=0.90; SRMR=0.041 4 factor: RMSEA=0.07; CFI=0.94; SRMR=0.031 5 factor: RMSEA=0.06; CFI=0.96; SRMR=0.027 5 factors - PID-5-BF 1 factor: RMSEA=0.06; CFI=0.91; SRMR=0.09 2 factor: RMSEA=0.05; CFI=0.94; SRMR=0.07 3 factor: RMSEA=0.04; CFI=0.96; SRMR=0.06 4 factor: RMSEA=0.03; CFI=0.97; SRMR=0.05 5 factor: RMSEA=0.02; CFI=0.99; SRMR=0.04 **CFA:** facet unidimensionality - PID-5-SRF: CFI>0.94; RMSEA<0.06 except anhedonia, separation insecurity and risk taking **CFA:** facet unidimensionality - PID-5-BF: CFI > 0.94; RMSEA < 0.05; SRMR<0.05 **convergent:** -PID-5-SRF x PID-5-BF NA (r=0.86) DET (r=0.84) ANT (r=0.86) DIS (r=0.81) PSY (r=0.87) -PID-5-SRF domains x SIPP-SF domains: ANT x Identity integration (r = -0.24 min) – NA x self control (r = 0.69 max) - PID-5-BF domains x SIPP-SF domains: all PID-5-BF show correlations with SIPP-SP domains, except ANT x Identity integration ANT x self control (r=-0.24 min) – NA x self control (r= -0.66 max) - PID-5-SRF and PID-5-BF domains x GPS all PID-5 and PID-5-BF domains show correlations with GPS ANT x GPS (r=0.29 min) - NA x GPS (r=0.67 max)
50.Díaz-Batenero et al. (2017) spanish/SF	to provide evidence of the psychometric properties of the PID-5-SF (spanish version)	domains: **α=**0.80-0.86 facets: **α=**0.59-0.89 **T/R:** 2 weeks **r=** 0.57-0.83	**EFA:** hierarchical model : 1 factor: CFI=0.920; NNFI=0.901; AIC=17.94; SRMR=0.067; RMSEA=0.066 2 factors: CFI=0.898; NNFI=0.854; AIC=34.40; SRMR=0.076; RMSEA=0.07 **convergent:** -PID-5-SF facets x WHODAS (correlated construct) (the most expressive correlations for each WHODAS domains): depressivity x getting around, self-care, getting along with people, life activities (r=0.35-0.47) eccentricity x participation in society (r= 0.23-0.51) distractibility x understanding and communicating (r=0.56)
51.Dhillon et al. (2017) english/SRF	to examine if manipulated response style alter various PID-5-SRF scores and if such response styles affect the construct validity of PID-5-SRF		**discriminative (response bias):** PID-5-SRF all domains overreporting > standard > underreporting (cohen's d =0.61-1.77) correlations PID-5 x NEO: standard > underreporting or overreporting PID-5 x PSY - scales MMPI standard > underreporting or overreporting

52.Dunne et al. (2017) english/SRF	to explore associations between aggression and the PID-5-SRF	domains: **α=** 0.46-0.85 facets: **α=**0.61-0.94	**convergent:** PID-5-SRF domains (APA three factors) x LHA-S-A total: NA (r=0.16 min) - DIS (r=0.25 max) no significant association was found between ANT x LHA-S-A PID-5-SRF domains (Krueger et al. scoring) x LHA-S-A total: ANT(r=0.16 min) – NA (r=0.25 max) PID-5-SRF facets x LHA-S-A: 14 of 25 show correlations (r=0.15-0.48) (more expressive correlations): impulsivity x LHA-S-A (r=0.30) callousness x LHA-S-A (r=0.32) risk taking x LHA-S-A (r=0.32) hostility x LHA-S-A (r=0.48)	
53.Fossati et al. (2017a) italian/SRF	to assess the relationships between DSM–5 Section III maladaptive personality traits and personality dysfunction		**convergent:** -PID-5-SRF domains x MDPF (non-coping): NA (r=0.48) DET (r=0.42) ANT (r=0.17) DIS (r=0.58) PSY (r=0.45) -PID-5-SRF x MDPF(non-cooperativeness): NA (r=0.31) DET (r=0.36) ANT (r=0.43) DIS (r=0.32) PSY (r= 0.11) (NS)	
54.Fossati et al. (2017b) italian/BF	to assess the reliability and construct validity of the PID-5-BF among adolescents	domains **α=**0.59-0.77 **T/R:** 2 months **r=** 0.78-0.87	**ESEM:** 5 factors: WLSMV X^2 = 419.13 p<0.001; RMSEA=0.041; TLI=0.92; CFI=0.95 **convergent:** - PID-5 BF x MDPF non-coping (r=0.53) - PID-5 BF x MDPF non-cooperativeness (r=0.26)	**preditive:** PID-5-BF → MDPF- non-coping scale (R^2=0.32) PID-5-BF → MDPF- non-cooperativeness scale (R^2=0.15)
55.Fowler et al. (2017) english/SRF	to explore the relative clinical utility of alternative models of personality in screening for borderline personality disorder (BPD)	**α=** 0.98	**discriminative:** PID-5-SRF BPD algorithm: nota de corte≥11 AUC=0.87, specifity=0.76, sensibility=0.81	
56.Gongóra & Solano (2017) spanish/BF	to assess the psychometric properties of the PID-5-BF, established its relationship with the Five Factor Model normal personality traits, and examined the association of pathological traits with mental and physical maladaptiveness assessed through the level of mental health and World Health Organization health risk factors.		**EFA:** 5 factors = 59.5% of variance **convergent:** - PID-5-BF domains x BFI domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.54) DET x EXT (r=-0.30), DET x AGR(r=-0.35) ANT x AGR (r=-0.39) DIS x CONS (r=-0.45) PSY x OPEN (r=0.10) PSY x NEU (r=0.34) - PID-5-BF domains x WHO health risk factors total (r=0.25)	
57.Gutierrez et al. (2017) spanish/SRF	to assess psychometric properties of spanish PID-5-SRF	sample 1 domains: **α=**0.92-0.95 facets: **α=**0.76-0.95 sample 2 domains **α=**0.88-0.93	**ESEM:** hierarchical model: confirmed unidimensionality model sample 1: X^2=299.50 (p<0.001); TLI=0.623; PGFI=0.406; RMSEA=0.215 sample 2: X^2=739.34 (p<0.001); TLI=0.531; PGFI=0.399; RMSEA=0.224	

		facets **α=**0.65-0.93	**discriminative:** all domains and facets: clinical > community (mean standardized difference of z=0.81)
58.Helle et al. (2017) english/SRF	to assess the relationship of the PID-5-SRF with an interview measure of the Five Factor Model		**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF domains x NEO PI-R domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.74) DET x EXT (r=-0.71) ANT x AGR (r=-0.71) DIS x CONS (r=-0.73) PSY x OPEN (r=0.43) PSY x NEU (r=0.34) - PID-5-SRF domains x SIFFM domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.55) DET x EXT (r=-0.66) ANT x AGR (r=-0.50) DIS x CONS (r=-0.55) PSY x OPEN (r=0.42) PSY x NEU (r=0.38) - PID-5-SRF facets x NEO PI-R domains (the most expressive correlations for each PID-5 SRF domain): anxiousness x NEU (r=0.70) withdrawal x EXT (r=-0.69) deceitfulness x AGR (r=-0.63) distractibility x CONS (r=-0.70) cog/percept dysreg x NEU (r=0.51) - PID-5-SRF facets x SIFFM domains (the most expressive correlation for each PID-5 SRF domain): anxiousness x NEU (r=0.55) withdrawal x EXT (r=-0.71) deceitfulness x AGR (r=-0.45) distractibility x CONS (r=-0.43) eccentricity x OPEN (r=0.43)
59.Kajonius (2017) swedish/SF	to investigate if PID-5-SF together with a well-established common short version of Five Factor Model, can serve as an empirical and theoretical foundation for clinical psychology	domains **α=**0.62-0.75	**CFA:** All 5 maladaptative traits shared a conjoint high order organization with all 5 common traits through the higher order factor of positive and negative emotion and internalizing and externalizing behaviours (X^2=40.91, p=0.01. CFI=0.97, RMSEA=0.05). The connection via general factors of personality and psychopathology was mediocre(X^2=289.746, p<0.01.;CFI=0.61;RMSEA=0.16) **convergent:** PID-5-SF domains x mini-IPIP domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.53) DET x EXT (r=-0.38) ANT x AGR (r=-0.07)(NS) DIS x CONS (r=-0.30) PSY x OPEN (r=0.07)(NS) PSY x NEU (0.32)
60.Katz et al (2017) english/SRF	to investigate familial associations of PID-5-SRF domains and facets scores		**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF x familial aggregation (correlated construct) intergenerationality (between parent and offspring) (all significant correlations): domains: PSY (r=0.30) facets: deceitfulness (r=0.26)

			withdrawal (r=0.26) irresponsibility (r=0.32) perseveration (r=0.28) submissiveness (r=0.43) cognitive/perceptual dysregulation (r=0.27) unusual beliefs and experiences (r=0.26) <u>PID-5-SRF x intragenerationally (between siblings) (all significant correlations):</u> domains: DET (r=0.28) facets: deceitfulness(r=0.20) attention seeking (r=0.26) manipulativeness (r=0.19) anhedonia (r=0.22) depressivity (r=0.37) intimal avoidance (r=0.29) withdrawal (r=0.22) distractibility (r=0.20) irresponsibility (r=0.19) perseveration (r=0.22) submissiveness (r=0.20) eccentricity (r=0.27)	
61.Ligget et al (2017) english/SRF	to examine the extent to which the trait-based operationalization of OCPD in Section III of the DSM-5 describes the same construct as the one described in Section II.		**convergent:** <u>- PID-5-SRF OCPD specific facets x PDQ-4 OCPD facets and SCID-II-PQ:</u> all PID-5-SRF OCPD specific facets show correlations with PDQ-4+ facets and SCID II(r=0.26-0.54)	**preditive:** <u>PID-5-SRF OCPD specific facets (rigid perfectionism, perseveration, intimacy avoidance, restricted affectivity) → OCPD diagnosis section II DSM-IV:</u> PID-5-SRF OCPD facets = 53% of variance PID-5-SRF OCPD facets + additional facets (anxiousness, impulsivity, hostility, irresponsibility) = 56% of variance
62.Pires et al (2017) portuguese/SRF	to assess the internal consistency, the test retest reliability and the criterion validity of PID-5-SRF	domains: **α=** 0.89-0.94 facets: **α=**0.70-0.95 **<u>T/R=</u>**<u>4 weeks:</u> domains: **r=** 0.79-0.92 facets: **r=** 0.56-0.90	**convergent:** <u>-PID-5-SRF domains x NEO-FFI domains (anticipated alignments):</u> NA x NEU (r=0.76) DET x EXT (r=-0.59) ANT x AGR (r=-0.46) DIS x CONS (r=-0.64) PSY x OPEN (NS) PSY x NEU (r=0.58) <u>- PID-5-SRF domains x BSI domains:</u> all PID-5-SRF domains show correlations with all BSI domains (except ANT x Somatization and ANT x Positive Symptom Total) DET x Somatization (r=0.23 min)- DIS x Global severity Index (r=0.73 max)	

63.Quilty et al (2017) english/SRF/IRF	to evaluate PID-5-SRF and PID-5-IRF scale score elevations across participants exhibiting signs of overreporting or underreporting	PID-5-SRF domains **α=** 0.80-0.88 PID-5 IRF domains **α=**0.79-0.90	**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF domains x PID-IRF domains: NA: (r=0.45) DET: (r=0.42) ANT: (r=0.32) DIS: (r=0.58) PSY: (r=0.24) **discriminative (response bias)** – PID-5-SRF: all domains: underreporting <. no underreporting all facets except risk taking: under-reporting < no underreporting all domains and facets: over-reported: >no overreported **discriminative (response bias)** – PID-5-IRF: all domains and facets: underreporting < no underreporting all domains and facets: overreported: >no overreported PID-5 SRF is most impacted response bias than PID-5-IRF	
64.Rojas & Widiger (2017) english/SRF	to test relationship of PID-5-SRF facets with specified diagnosis criteria		**convergent:** PID-5-SRF specific facets x diagnostic criterion (PDQ-4+ and CATI and MAPP) (all significant correlations): PID-5-SRF ASPD scales x ASPD diagnostic criterion (r=0.19-0.82) PID-5-SRF BPD scales x BPD diagnostic criterion (r=0.13-0.82) PID-5-SRF DPD scales x DPD diagnostic criterion (r=0.19-0.75) PID-5-SRF AVPD scales x AVPD diagnostic criterion (r=0.12-0.65) PID-5-SRF NPD scales x NPD diagnostic criterion (r=0.14-0.62) PID-5-SRF OCPD scales x OCPD diagnostic criterion (r=0.11-0.69)	
65. Sleep et al. (2017) english/SRF	to compare the relations found between PID-5 and a measure of the Five Factor Model in relation to externalizing and internalizing symptoms		**convergent:** -PID-5-SRF domains x IPIP-60 domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.58) DET x EXT (r=-0.54) ANT x AGR (r=-0.41) DIS x CONS (r=-0.59) PSY x OPEN (r=0.14) PSY x NEU (r=0.26) - PID-5-SRF domains x externalizing symptons (all significant correlations): NA x total aggression (r=0.34) DET x total aggression (r=0.31) ANT x total aggression (r=0.44), ANT x alcohol misuse (r=0.32), ANT x substance abuse (r=0.25), ANT x antisocial behavior (r=0.29) DIS x total aggression (r=0.47), DIS x alcohol misuse (r=0.32), DIS x substance abuse (r=0.18), DIS x antisocial behavior (r=0.20) PSY x total aggression (r=0.44), PSY x alcohol misuse (r=0.24), PSY x substance abuse (r=0.14), PSY x antisocial behavior (r=0.20) - PID-5-SRF domains x internalizing symptons (all significant correlations): NA x anxiety (r=0.51), NA x depression (r=0.50) DET x anxiety (r=0.34), DET x depression (r=0.51) ANT X x depression (r=0.25) DIS x anxiety (r=0.27), DIS x depression (r=0.39) PSY x anxiety (r=0.32), PSY x depression (r=0.43)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF domains → externalizing and internalizing symptoms PID-5 domains → externalizing symptoms (10-28% of variance) PID-5 domains →internalizing symptoms (28-36% of variance)

66.Somma et al. (2017) italian/SRF	to assess the reliability, factorial validity, and criterion validity of the PID-5-SRF among adolescents	**ω=** 0.67-0.94 woman domains **α** = 0.90-0.95 facets **α** = 0.65-0.95 men domains **α** = 0.87-.0.95 facets **α** = 0.63-0.93	**ESEM:** 5 factors 1 factor: RMSEA= 0.140; CFI=0.56; TLI=0.52; SRMR=0.12 2 factor: RMSEA= 0.116; CFI=0.72; TLI=0.66; SRMR=0.08 3 factor: RMSEA= 0.093; CFI=0.84; TLI=0.79; SRMR=0.05 4 factor: RMSEA= 0.082; CFI=0.88; TLI=0.83; SRMR=0.04 5 factor: RMSEA= 0.073; CFI=0.92; TLI=0.87; SRMR=0.03 **discriminative:** ANT, attention seeking, callousness, deceitfulness, grandiosity, manipulativeness, risk taking, irresponsibility = ♂>♀ NA, anxiousness, emotional lability, hostility, separation insecurity, depressivity, cognitive dysregulation = ♀>♂	
67.Suzuki et al. (2017) english/SRF	to assess the relations of the PID-5-SRF with relevant criterion variables	domains: **α=** 0.91-0.95 facets: **α=** 0.69-0.95 **T/R:** 2 weeks: domains: **r=** 0.81-0.83 facets: **r=** 0.66-0.86	**convergent:** - PID-5-SRF domains x BRF facets (more expressive correlations for each PID-5-SRF domains): NA x physical attractiveness (r=-0.27) DET x physical attractiveness (r=-0.32), DET x Fast driven (r=-0.32) PSY x last year grade (r=-0.23) ANT x religiosity (r=-0.23), ANT x honesty (r=-0.23) DIS x last year grade (r=-0.29)	
68.Zimmermamn et al. (2017) german/SRF	to assess issues of temporal stability and situational influences on test scores of PID-5-SRF three times, with time intervals of 2 months	**T/R=** 2 months and 4 months: Multistate-multitrait model. average confiability=0.87 average consist=0.79 average occasion specifiality =0.77		
69.Anderson et al. (2018) english/BF	to assess the reliability, factor structure, and construct validity of PID-5-BF	sample 1 domains: **α=**0.68-0.78 sample 2 domains: **α=**0.69-0.76 sample 3 domains: **α=**0.70-0.75	**CFA:** 5 factors: sample 1: CFI = 0.94; TLI = 0.93; RMSEA = 0.06 sample 2 and 3: CFI = 0.93; TLI = 0.92; RMSEA = 0.06 **convergent:** - PID-5-BF domains x PDQ-4 PD's (all significant correlations): sample 1: NA x AVPD (r=0.50), NA x BPD (r=0.58), NA x OCPD (r=0.46), NA x SZPD (r=0.35) DET x AVPD (r=0.45), DET x BPD (r=0.40), DET x SZPD (r=0.45) ANT x ASPD (r=0.31), ANT x BPD(r=0.30), ANT x NPD (r=0.47) DIS x ASPD (r=0.56) PSY x AVPD (r=0.39), PSY x BPD (r=0.49), PSY x NPD (r=0.33), PSY x OCPD (r=0.42), PSY x SZPD (r=0.58) PID-5-BF domains x PSY-5 domains (anticipated alignments): sample 1 and 2: NA x Negative Emotionality/Dysfunctional Negative Emotions; (r=0.60) DET x Introversion/Low Positive Emotions (r=0.47) ANT x Aggressiveness (r=0.38) DIS x Disconstraint (r=0.51) PSY x Psychoticism (r=0.47) sample 3: NA x Negative Emotionality/Dysfunctional Negative Emotions (r=0.61)	**preditive:** PID-5-BF→ DSM-IV PD's (PDQ-4) NA → AVPD (p<0.001) NA → BPD (p<0.001) NA → OCPD (p=0.015) DET → AVPD (p=0.030) ANT → NPD (p=0.001) DIS → ASPD (p=0.004) PSY → SZPD (p=0.007) PID-5-BF→ external criteria PID-5-BF → externalizing symptoms (ESI): R^2=0.36 PID-5-BF → depressivity (IDAS-2): R^2=0.39 PID-5-BF → dysphoria (IDAS-2): R^2=0.41

			ANT x Aggressiveness (r=0.34) DIS x Disconstraint (r=0.55) PSY x Psychoticism (r=0.48) PID-5-BF domains x ESI total: NA(r=0.22), DET (r=0.17), ANT(r=0.44), DIS (r=0.53), PSY (r=0.30) PID-5-BF domains x IDAS-2 general depression: NA (r=0.57), DET (r=0.40), ANT (r=0.24), DIS (r=0.22), PSY (r=0.38) PID-5-BF domains x IDAS-2 dysphoria NA (r=0.59), DET(r=0.42), ANT (r=0.22), DIS (r=0.22), PSY(r=0.38)	
70.Boland et al (2018) english/SRF	to investigate dimensional personality trait associations with impairment		**convergent:** PID-5-SRF Section III PD's x functional impairment all section III disorders specific facets (except to NPD) show correlations to impairment MDPF (r=0.11-0.60) SQF (r=0.09-0.67) WHO-DAS-2 (r=0.11-0.60)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF → functional impairment section III PD's added predictive validity beyond section II PD's in predicting functional impairment, (except NPD): 6-22% of additional variance
71.Bottesi et al (2018) italian/SRF/IRF	to explore self-other agreement in personality through the PID-5-SRF and the PID-5-IRF.		**convergent:** PID-5-SRF domains x PID-5-IRF domains NA: (r=0.44) DET: (r=0.45) ANT: (r=0.32) DIS: (r=0.37) PSY: (r=0.40) PID-5-SRF facets x PID-5-IRF facets submissiveness (r=0.16 min) - risk taking (r=0.54) PID-5-SRF domains x PID-5-IRF: type of informant NA (r=0.65) – family member DET (r=0.67) – spouse/life partner ANT (r=0.54) – friend DIS (r=0.58) – dating partner PSY (r=0.71) – spouse/life partner	
72.Caluwé et al. (2018) dutch/SRF	to examine its structure, validity and reliability of PID-5-SRF in psychiatric-referred late adolescents and emerging adults	facets: **α**=0.75-0.94	**EFA** 5 factors: 3 factors: CFI=0.75; SRMR=0.07; RMSEA=0.09 4 factors: CFI=0.83; SRMR=0.05; RMSEA=0.10 5 factors: CFI=0.89; SRMR=0.04; RMSEA=0.09 **convergent:** PID-5-SRF domains x Kindscreen-27 domains (correlated construct = quality of life) (r=-0.71 to -0.22) (the most expressive correlations for each domain): NA x Psychological (r=-0.43) DET x Psychological (r=-0.71) ANT x School (r=-0.29) DIS x School (r=-0.43) PSY x Autonomy/parents (r=-0.26) **discriminative:** all domains and facets: (except impulsivity) clinical> non clinical (effect size n^2p=0.46-0.81)	

73.Debast et al (2017b) Dutch/BF	to assess age-neutrality of the PID-5-BF	PID-5-BF domains **α** =0.32-0.78	**convergent:** PID-5-BF domains x SIPP-SF domains (significant correlations): sample 1 DET x self-control (r=0.27), DET x Identity integration (r=0.45), DET x relational capacities (r=0.52), DET x social concordance (r=0.40) ANT x self-control (r=0.28), ANT x social concordance (r=0.32) DIS x self-control (r=0.35), PSY x self-control (r=0.36), PSY x Identity integration (r=0.20), PSY x relational capacities (r=0.23), PSY x social concordance (r=0.23) sample 2/3 NA x self-control (r=0.50), NA x Identity integration (r=0.50), NA x relational capacities (r=0.37), NA x social concordance (r=0.50) DET x self-control (r=0.41), DET x Identity integration (r=0.51), DET x relational capacities (r=0.48), DET x social concordance (r=0.44) ANT x self-control (r=0.51), ANT x Identity integration (r=0.46), ANT x relational capacities (r=0.34), ANT x social concordance (r=0.50) DIS x self-control (r=0.59), DIS x Identity integration (r=0.49), DIS x relational capacities (r=0.32), DIS x social concordance (r=0.45) PSY x self-control (r=0.56), PSY x Identity integration (r=0.55), PSY x relational capacities (r=0.39), PSY x social concordance (r=0.51) PID-5-BF x GPS total(significant correlations): NA x GPS total (r=0.48) DIS x GPS total (r=0.53) PSY x GPS total (r=0.45) **discriminative**: age neutrality = 75% of items	
74.Evans & Simms (2018) english/SRF	to compare Section III BPD facets to Section II BPD criteria and evaluate the incremental predictive power of the Section III facets		**convergent:** PID-5-SRF BPD facets x CAT-PD (the most expressive correlations PID-5 SRF BPD facets): anxiousness x unstable affect (r=0.44) depressivity x emptiness (r=0.54) emotional lability x unstable affect (r=0.59) hostility x anger (r=0.58) impulsivity x recklessness (r=0.53) risk taking x recklessness (r=0.31) separation insecurity x abandonment avoidance (r=0.45)	**preditive:** BPD specific facets → BPD Section II (SCID-II) BPD facets predicted all nine BPD criteria (R^2=0.15-0.33)
75.Ligett et al (2018) english/SF/IRF	to examine the extent to which self-report and informant data correspond; to investigate of these versions can predict traditional OCPD diagnosis		**convergent:** -PID-5-SF OCPD facets + additional facets x PID-5-IRF OCPD facets + additional facets: rigid perfectionism (r=0.42) perseveration (r=0.17) intimacy avoidance (r=0.48) restricted affectivity (r=0.42) anxiousness (r=0.33) hostility (r=0.38) submissiveness (r=0.27) suspiciousness (r=0.25) impulsivity (r=0.37) -PID-5-SF OCPD facets + additional facets x OCPD Section II (aggregate score of PDQ-4+ and SCID-II): rigid perfectionism (r=0.58) perserveration (r=0.36)	**preditive:** PID-5-SF specific facets → OCPD section II DSM-IV (SCID-II) rigid perfectionism (R^2=0.51) perseveration (R^2=0.19) intimacy avoidance (R^2=0.12) PID-5-IRF specific facets → OCPD section II DSM-IV (SCID-II) rigid perfectionism (R^2=0.55) PID-5-IRF additional facets → OCPD section II DSM-IV (SCID-II) hostility (R^2=0.23)

			intimacy avoidance (r=0.19) restricted affectivity (r=0.04)(NS) anxiousness (r=0.45) hostility (r=0.28) submissiveness (r=0.28) suspiciousness (r=0.28) impulsivity (r=0.33) <u>-PID-5-IRF OCPD facets + additional facets x SCID-II-PQ:</u> rigid perfectionism (r=0.59) perseveration (r=0.35) intimacy avoidance (r=0.21) restricted affectivity (r=0.16) anxiousness (r=0.37) hostility (r=0.43) submissiveness (r=0.05)(NS) suspiciousness (r=0.34) impulsivity (r=0.17)
76.Lim et al (2018) english/SRF/IRF	to investigate convergent and divergent validity between PID-5-SRF and PID-R-IRF and examine associations with dysfunctionality		**EFA:** <u>5 factors:</u> confirmed 53.65% a 58.14% of variance **convergent:** <u>PID-5-SRF x PID-5-IRF</u> NA: (r=0.28) DET: (r=0.40) ANT: (r=0.35) DIS: (r=0.27) PSY: (r=0.24) <u>PID-5-SRF x Functioning measures (r=0.10-0.78) (the most expressive correlations):</u> NA x SIPP Identity Integration (r=0.67) DIS x SIPP Responsibility (r=-0.78) PSY x Rosenberg Self-Esteem (r=-0.27) <u>PID-5-IRF x Functioning measures (r=0.10-0.35) (the most expressive correlations):</u> NA x SIPP Identity Integration (r=0.24) DET x SIPP Relational Capacity (r=-0.35)
77.Lofti et al. (2018) farsi/SRF	to evaluate the structural validity of PD trait domains in the DSM-5 Section III	facets: **α=**0.52-0.90	**ESEM:** <u>hierarchical model:</u> confirmed **ESEM:** <u>5 factors:</u> 1 factor: RMSEA = 0.129; CFI = 0.64; TLI = 0.60; SRMR = 0.010 2 factor: RMSEA = 0.115; CFI = 0.74; TLI = 0.69; SRMR = 0.078 3 factor: RMSEA = 0.095; CFI = 0.84; TLI = 0.79; SRMR = 0.055 4 factor: RMSEA = 0.078; CFI = 0.90; TLI = 0.85; SRMR = 0.034 5 factor: RMSEA = 0.071; CFI = 0.93; TLI = 0.88; SRMR = 0.029
78.Moraleda-Barreno et al (2018) spanish/SRF	to analyze the relationship between the different personality facets and domains evaluated by the PID-5-SRF and impulsivity		**convergent:** <u>PID-5-SRF domains x UPPS-P Impulsive Behavior Scale domains (r=-0.22 – 0.48) (more expressive correlations):</u> NA x negative urgency (r=0.47) ANT x negative urgency (r=0.43) ANT x positive urgency (r=0.43) DIS x negative urgency (r=0.69)

79.Orbons et al (2018) dutch/SRF	to assess associations between the DSM–5 Section III pathological trait facets and Section II PDs	domains: **α=** 0.90-0.93 facets: **α=** 0.75-0.93	**convergent:** PID-5-SRF specific facets x SCID-II PD's (DSM-IV) (the most expressive correlations): callousness x ASPD (r=0.36) anhedonia x AVPD (r=0.35), anxiousness x AVPD(r=0.35) impulsivity x BDP (r=0.57) attention seeking x NPD (r=0.41), grandiosity x NPD (r=0.41) rigid perfectionism x OCPD (r=0.47) unusual beliefs and experience x SZPD (r=0.42)	**preditive:** PID-5-SRF domains → DSM-IV PD's (SCID-II) (significant associations): ANT → NPD (e^b=1.7) DIS → ASPD (e^b=1.7) NA → ASPD (e^b=1.2) NA → BPD (e^b=1.2) DIS → BPD (e^b=1.3) PSY → SZPD (e^b=1.3) PID-5-SRF specific facets → DSM-IV PD's SCID-II (significant associations): callousness → ASPD (e^b=7.2) emotional lability → BDP (e^b=1.5) impulsivity → BPD (e^b=1.8) attention seeking → NPD (e^b=2.1) grandiosity → NPD (e^b=2.3) rigid perfectionism → OCPD (e^b=1.6) suspiciousness → SZPD (e^b=1.9) unusual beliefs and experiences → SZPD (e^b=1.9) withdrawal → SZPD (e^b=1.7)
80.Pocnet et al. (2018) french/SRF	to compare the alternative dimensional model (PID-5-SRF) in regards to both personality disorder categories and normal personality dimensions		**convergent**: - PID-5-SRF domains x IPDE PD's (all significant correlations): NA x PPD (r=0.28), NA x SPD (r=0.09), NA x SZPD (r=0.43), NA x BPD (r=0.16), NA x ASPD (r=0.54), NA x HPD (r=0.27), NA x NPD (r=0.28), NA x AVPD (r=0.49), NA x DPD (r=0.52), NA x OCPD (r=0.48) DET x PPD (r=.38), DET x SPD (r=0.30), DET x SZPD (r=0.49), DET x BPD (r=0.14), DET x ASPD (r=0.45), DET x AVPD (r=0.43), DET x DPD (r=0.26), DET x OCPD (r=0.34) ANT x PPD (r=0.28), ANT x SZPD (r=0.25), ANT X BPD (r=0.35), ANT x ASPD (r=0.33), ANT x HPD (r=0.37), ANT x NPD (r=0.56), ANT x AVPD (r=0.13), ANT x DPD (r=0.26), ANT x OCPD (r=0.25) DIS x PPD (r=0.25), DIS x SZPD (r=0.34), DIS x BPD (r=0.45), DIS x ASPD (r=0.49), DIS x HPD (r=0.37), DIS x NPD (r=0.23), DIS x AVPD (r=0.13), DIS x DPD (r=0.32), DIS x OCPD (r=0.25) PSY x PPD (r=0.35), PSY x SZPD (r=0.48), PSY x BPD (r=0.31), PSY x ASPD (r=0.44), PSY x HPD (r=0.28), PSY x NPD (r=0.15), PSY x AVPD (r=0.18), PSY x DPD (r=0.30), PSY x OCPD (r=0.23) -PID-5-SRF domains x NEO-FFI-R domains (anticipated alignments): NA x NEU (r=0.68) DET x EXT (r=-0.47) ANT x AGR (r=-0.57) DIS x CONS (r=-0.31) PSY x OPEN (r=0.22) PSY x NEU (r=0.42)	
81.Riegel et al (2018) czech/SRF/SF	to evaluate the hypothesized unidimensional factor structure of the lower-order personality trait facets, as well as the validity of the higher-order domains	sample 1**:** facets **α=**0.81 sample 2: facets **α=**0.80	**CFA:** PID-5-SRF: average CFI = 0.96, average RMSEA=0.08 (30 of 50 RMSEA indices outside the 0.08 cut off) unidimensionality facets: not confirmed PID-5-SF: average CFI = 0.99; RMSEA>0.08 in vast majority of facets unidimensionality facets: not confirmed 160 item version = unidimensionality: replicated sample 1: $X^2(185)$ 346.024 p<0.001; CFI=0.905; RMSEA=0.078; SRMR=0.040 sample 2: $X^2(185)$ 556.457 p<0.001; CFI=0.918; RMSEA=0.076; SRMR=0.030	

82.Suzuki et al (2018) english/SRF	to examine sex measurement invariance of the DSM–5 trait model		**EFA:** 5 factors $X^2(185)=9340.44$ p<0.001; RMSEA=0.088; TLI=0.85; CFI=0.91; SRMR=0.03 measurement invariance across sex: NA: woman>man DET, ANT, DIS, PSY: men>woman	
83.Somma et al (2018) italian/SRF/SF	to assess the psychometric properties of the Italian translation of the PID-5-SF (reliability, factor structure)	sample 1 PID-5-SRF facets **α=**0.66-0.96 PID-5 SF facets **α=** 0.73-0.90 sample 2 PID-5-SRF facets **α**=0.77-0.96 PID-5 SF facets **α**=0.70-0.91	**ESEM:** 5 factors sample 1: PID-5-SRF $X^2(185)=1805.10$ p<0.001; RMSEA=0.068; TLI=0.90; CFI=0.94; SRMSR=0.03 PID-5-SF $X^2(185)=2047.01$ p<0.001; RMSEA=0.073; TLI=0.90; CFI=0.94; SRMSR=0.02 sample 2: PID-5-SRF $X^2(185)=1000.32$ p<0.001; RMSEA=0.079; TLI=0.90; CFI=0.93; SRMSR=0.03 PID-5-SF $X^2(185)=702.29$ p<0.001; RMSEA=0.063; TLI=0.91; CFI=0.94; SRMSR=0.03	PID-5-SRF specific facets → DSM-IV PD's (PDQ-4+) specific facets → ASPD (R^2=0.56) specific facets → AVPD (R^2=0.47) specific facets →BPD (R^2=0.65) specific facets →NPD (R^2=0.42) specific facets →OCPD (R^2=0.39) specific facets →SZPD (R^2=0.61) PID-5-SF specific facets → DSM-IV+ PD's (PDQ-4+) specific facets → ASPD (R^2=0.57) specific facets → AVPD (R^2=0.45) specific facets →BPD (R^2=0.63) specific facets →NPD (R^2=0.39) specific facets →OCPD (R^2=0.35) specific facets →SZPD (R^2=0.58)

Note. ADP-IV = The Assessment of DSM-IV Personality Disorders; AGR = Agreeableness; AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; ANT = Antagonism; APA = American Psychiatric Association; ASPD = Antisocial Personality Disorder; AUC = Area Under the Curve; AUDIT = The Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test; AVPD = Avoidant Personality Disorder; BF = Brief form; BFAS = Big Five Aspect Scales; BFI = Big Five Inventory; BFI-10 = Big Five Inventory – 10 items; BPD = Borderline Personality Disorder; BRF = Behavioral Rating Form; BSI = Brief Symptom Inventory; CATI = Coolidge Axis II Inventory; CAT-PD= Computerized Adaptive Test-Personality Disorder; CAT-PD-SF = Computerized Adaptive Test-Personality Disorder Static Form; CFA = Confirmatory Factor Analysis; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; CONS = Conscientiousness; DAPP-BQ = Dimensional Assessment of Personality Pathology–Basic Questionnaire; DET = Detachment; DIS = Disinhibition; DPD = Dependent Personality Disorder; DSM = Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders; e^b = Incidence Ratio; EFA = Exploratory Factor Analysis; ES = Elementary School; ESEM = Exploratory Structural Equation Model; ESI = Externalizing Spectrum Inventory; EXT = Extraversion; FFM = Five Factor Model; FFMPD = Five factor model personality disorder; GAD = Generalized Anxiety Disorder; GFI = Goodness of Fit Index; GPS = Gerontological Personality Disorders Scale; HEXACO-PI-R = The HEXACO Personality Inventory - Revised; HS = High School; HPD = Histrionic Personality Disorder; ICC = Intraclass correlation; IDAS-2 = Inventory for Depression and Anxiety Symptoms–2; IIP-SC = Inventory of Interpersonal Problems-Short Circumplex; IN = Inpatients; IPC = Inventory of Personal Characteristics; IPDE = International Personality Disorder Examination; IPDS = Iowa Personality Disorder Screen; IPIP-NEO = International Personality Item Pool-NEO; IPIP-60 = International Personality Item Pool; LHA-S-A = Life History of Aggression - Self-Report - Aggression Scale; MAPP = Multi-Source Assessment of Personality Pathology; MDPF = Measure of Disordered Personality Functioning; mini-IPIP = International Personality Item Pool; MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory; NA = Negative Affect; NEU = Neuroticism; NEO-FFI = NEO Five-Factor Inventory; NEO-FFI-R = NEO Five-Factor Inventory, revised; NEO PI-R = Revised NEO Personality Inventory; NEO-PI-3FH = NEO Personality Inventory 3-First Half; NI = Not informed; NNFI = Non-Normed Fit Index; NPD = Narcisist Personality Disorder; NS = Not Significant; OCPD = Obsessive Compulsive Personality Disorder; OR = Odds Ratio; OUT = Outpatients; PBS = Personality Beliefs scales; PD's = Personality Disorders; PCL-R = Psychopathy Checklist-Revised; PDQ-4+ = Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire - Version 4; PGFI = Parsimonious Goodness of Fit index; PHQ = Patient Health Questionnaire; PID-5-BF = Personality Inventory for DSM-5 – Brief Form; PID-5-IRF = Personality Inventory for DSM-5 - Informant Report Form; PID-5-SF = Personality Inventory for DSM-5 – Shot Form; PID-5-SRF = Personality Inventory for DSM-5 – Self Reported Form; PPD = Paranoid Personality Disorder; PPI-R = Psychopathy Personality Inventory - Revised; PSY = Psychoticism; PSY-5 = The Personality Psychopathology Five; PTRF = DSM–5 Clinicians' Personality Trait Rating Form; r = Correlation Coefficient; R^2= Determination Coefficient; RMR = Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; RR = Rate Ratio; SAPAS = Standardized Assessment of Personality – Abbreviated Scale; SCID-II = Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis II Personality Disorders, version 2.0; SCID-II-PQ = Structured Clinical Interview for the DSM-IV Axis II Disorders–Personality Questionnaire; SCL-10 = Symptom Check-list 10 items; SFQ= Social Functioning Questionnaire; SIPP-SF = The Severity Indices of Personality Problems–Short Form; SIFFM = Structured Interview for the Five-Factor Model of Personality; SPD = Schizoid Personality Disorder; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; SZPD = Schizotypal Personality Disorder; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; T/R = Test Retest; TriPM = Triarchic Psychopathy Measure; UN = College students; WHO = World Health Organization; WHODAS = World Health Organization Functional Impairment Assessment Schedule; WHO-DAS-2 = World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule- 2; WHOQOL-BREF = World Health Organization Quality of Life- BREF; WLSMV = Weighted least squares; X^2 = Chi Square; 5DPT = 5 Dimensional Personality Test; α = Cronbach's alpha; ♀= Woman; ♂= Men; ω = McDonald's Omega Coefficient.