

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Cornelissen, Katri, Bester, Andre, Cairns, Paul, Tovée, Martin and Cornelissen, Piers (2015) The influence of personal BMI on body size estimations and sensitivity to body size change in anorexia spectrum disorders. *Body Image*, 13. pp. 75-85. ISSN 1873-6807

Published by: Elsevier

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2015.01.001>
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2015.01.001>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/21521/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



UniversityLibrary



Northumbria
University
NEWCASTLE

The influence of personal BMI on body size estimations and sensitivity to body size change in anorexia spectrum disorders

Katri K. Cornelissen¹, Andre Bester², Paul Cairns³, Martin J. Tovée^{4*} & Piers L. Cornelissen¹

¹ Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, UK.

² Bester Labs, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.

³ Department of Computer Science, University of York, UK.

⁴ Institute of Neuroscience, Newcastle University, UK.

*Corresponding Author: Dr Tovée, Institute of Neuroscience, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, NE2 4HH. Email: m.j.tovee@ncl.ac.uk

Running Head: BODY SIZE ESTIMATION IN ANOREXIA SPECTRUM DISORDERS

Abstract

In this cross-sectional study, we investigated the influence of personal BMI on body size estimation in 42 women who have symptoms of anorexia (referred to henceforth as anorexia spectrum disorders, ANSD), and 100 healthy controls. Low BMI control participants over-estimate their size and high BMI controls under-estimate, a pattern which is predicted by a perceptual phenomenon called contraction bias. In addition, control participants' sensitivity to size change declines as their BMI increases as predicted by Weber's law. The responses of women with ANSD are very different. Low BMI participants who have ANSD are extremely accurate at estimating body size and are very sensitive to changes in body size in this BMI range. However, as BMI rises in the ANSD participant group, there is a rapid increase in over-estimation concurrent with a rapid decline in sensitivity to size change. We discuss the results in the context of signal detection theory.

Keywords: Anorexia Nervosa, Anorexia Spectrum Disorders, Body Size Over-estimation, Signal Detection Theory.

Anorexia nervosa (AN) is a serious psychological and physiological condition, which occurs predominantly in the female population. Current therapeutic regimes have only a limited success in treating this condition (Treasure, Claudino, & Zucker 2010), where the long-term mortality rate has been estimated to be as high as 10% (Berkman, Lohr, & Bulik, 2007). To be able to treat this condition more effectively, we need a better understanding of its central features. Diagnostic criteria for AN include a distorted evaluation of personal body size (DSM-V, 2013), and this is also a key element of psychological models of the disorder (Cash & Deagle, 1997; Fairburn, Cooper, & Shafran, 2003). Body image distortion has been shown to be one of the most persistent of all the eating disorder symptoms, the severity of which seems to predict the long term outcome for patients (Fairburn, Cooper, & Shafran, 2003; Pike, 1998). Furthermore, persistence of body image distortion has been shown to predict the rate of relapse (Channon & DeSilva, 1985; Slade & Russell, 1973) which has been estimated to be as high as 35% (Casper, Halmi, Goldberg, Eckert, & Davis, 1979). While there is evidence to suggest that women with AN under-estimate their body size (Meerman, 1983), or even show performance in size estimation tasks equivalent to non eating-disordered controls (Fernández, Probst, Meerman, & Vandereycken, 1994; Meermann, 1983), most studies have found that patients with AN overestimate their body size (Gardner & Bokenkamp, 1996; Probst, Vandereycken, Van Coppenolle, & Pieters, 1998; Slade & Russell, 1973; Tovée, Benson, Emery, Mason, & Cohen-Tovée, 2003). The disturbance in body size estimation is thought to comprise two components; a perceptual/sensory component and an attitudinal/cognitive component (Cash & Deagle, 1997). The perceptual component is described as an inability to accurately estimate body size. The attitudinal component of body image disturbance consists of dissatisfaction with body shape combined with negative attitudes to weight and shape. Moreover, there is evidence that these effects

1
2
3
4 may be specific to judgements about bodies, and do not generalize to other objects such as
5
6
7 vases (McCabe, Ricciardelli, & Ridge, 2006; Slade & Russell, 1973).
8

9
10 Classical psychophysics has been used to try and separate the contributions to body
11 size estimation made by perceptual ‘sensory’ factors (in this case, the smallest change in
12 body shape that the participant can detect, indexed by the difference limen, DL) and
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Classical psychophysics has been used to try and separate the contributions to body size estimation made by perceptual ‘sensory’ factors (in this case, the smallest change in body shape that the participant can detect, indexed by the difference limen, DL) and attitudinal ‘non-sensory factors’ (the subjective body size criterion, or bias, adopted by the participant, indexed by the point of subjective equality, PSE). For example, using the method of constant stimuli, in combination with the video distorting technique, Gardner and Bokenkamp (1996) reported that women with AN were more likely to over-estimate their size than non-eating disordered controls, as indexed by a higher PSE on average. On the other hand, analyses of the same data showed that the smallest difference in stimulus size (DL) that anorexic participants could reliably detect was no different from controls (i.e., both female controls and women with AN were equally sensitive at discriminating between different sized versions of their bodies). Because of this dissociation between PSE and DL, Gardner and Bokenkamp (1996) suggested that body size over-estimation is entirely due to attitudinal, non-sensory factors (see also: Gardner & Moncrieff, 1988; Mussap, McCabe, & Ricciardelli, 2008).

Recently, however, Cornelissen et al. (2013) came to a different conclusion. They re-analysed a previous study in which women with AN and controls were asked to estimate their own body size by manipulating an image of themselves using a body morphing program (Tovée, Benson, Emery, Mason, & Cohen-Tovée, 2003). The software allowed participants to match their perception of the size of their individual body parts with what they saw on screen by manipulating slider controls. These had the effect of changing the width and shape of those body parts. It is possible to calculate the BMI of these self-manipulated bodies from their perimeter area ratios (Cornelissen, Johns, & Tovée, 2013). As a result, Cornelissen et al.

1
2
3
4 could compare directly the participants' estimates of their own BMIs with their actual BMIs.
5
6 They found that the inaccuracies in body size estimation could largely be explained by a
7
8 known perceptual error in magnitude estimation called contraction bias (Poulton, 1989).
9
10 Critically, as shown in Fig. 1A, the relationship between estimated BMI and actual BMI
11
12 appeared to be exactly the same for participants with anorexia and controls; there were no
13
14 differences in the pattern of contraction bias between the two groups. This figure is a
15
16 schematic representation of the results from Cornelissen et al. (2013) in which women with
17
18 AN and controls used an interactive software program to estimate body size. The line of
19
20 equality (i.e., perfect accuracy) is shown by the dotted black line. The control participants
21
22 (whose response distribution is indicated by the cross-hatched region) varied in BMI between
23
24 14.7 and 36.8 and the women with AN (indicated by the gray region) varied in BMI between
25
26 11.5 and 18.4. The solid black line represents the regression of estimated BMI on actual BMI
27
28 and has the same slope and intercept for women with AN and controls.
29
30
31
32
33

34 Contraction bias arises when one uses a standard reference or template for a
35
36 particular kind of object against which to estimate the size of other examples of that object.
37
38 The estimate is most accurate when estimating the size of an object of a similar size to the
39
40 reference, but becomes increasingly inaccurate as the magnitude of the difference between
41
42 the reference and the object increases. When this happens, the observer estimates that the
43
44 object is closer in size to the reference than it actually is. As a result an object smaller in size
45
46 than the reference will be over-estimated and an object larger will be under-estimated. Thus,
47
48 if we use a “reference body” based on an average of all the bodies we have seen in our life to
49
50 make our judgements of body size (Winkler & Rhodes, 2005), individuals with very thin
51
52 bodies will over-estimate their own body size, and individuals with very large bodies will
53
54 under-estimate their body size (illustrated in Fig 1A). An earlier study by Kuskowska-Wolk
55
56 and Rössner (1989) reported results on self-estimation of body size that is also consistent with
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 a contraction bias explanation. In addition, Cornelissen et al. (2013) also found an
5
6 independent, modulating effect of psychological factors, as illustrated in Fig. 1A. The thick
7
8 dashed black line represents the increase in intercept for the regression of estimated BMI on
9
10 actual BMI as psychological concern about body shape and weight increase (i.e., the
11
12 regression line moves up the Y-axis as concerns increase). The contraction bias explanation
13
14 predicts that for both controls and women with AN, the accuracy of their body size estimation
15
16 will be driven by the BMI of the participants. Cornelissen et al. report that this is the case, but
17
18 the BMI values of the women with AN in the study by Tovée et al. (2003) all actually fell
19
20 within a relatively narrow range 6.9 BMI units (11.5 to 18.4). Most of the variation in BMI in
21
22 this study is based on the responses of the control participants who ranged in BMI between
23
24 14.7 and 36.8 (22.1 BMI units). Cornelissen et al.'s (2013) assumption is that with a wider
25
26 BMI range (including recovering patients to expand the range), the responses of the women
27
28 with AN should follow the same pattern as the control participants. This is illustrated in
29
30 Figure 1B, where the white arrow shows how the regression of estimated BMI on actual BMI
31
32 in these women should track up along the same regression line as in Fig. 1A when BMI
33
34 increases. In short, this model predicts that as BMI increases in women with AN, so body
35
36 size over-estimation should *decrease*.

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Alternatively, it is entirely possible that psychological factors represent a stronger
45
46 driving force behind body size over-estimation in women with AN than they do for controls.
47
48 If so, this could lead to a different outcome. Consistent with this possibility, an individual's
49
50 body size (as indexed by BMI) is known to be strongly correlated with body dissatisfaction
51
52 (Gardner, Brown, & Boice, 2012; Stice & Shaw, 2002; Striegel-Moore et al., 2004). Women
53
54 with AN who have achieved a very low BMI might be expected to have relatively low body
55
56 size concerns, but during the recovery process as their weight increases, their body size
57
58 concerns would rise in parallel. Therefore, an alternative outcome for women with AN is that
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 as their weight increases, there is a rapid *rise* in the degree of body size over-estimation
5
6 reflecting their accelerating concerns about body shape and weight. This is illustrated in Fig.
7
8 1C, where the white arrow shows how the regression of estimated BMI on BMI for women
9
10 with AN should follow the trajectory of the thick dashed black line.

11
12
13
14 To determine which outcome predicts the accuracy of body size estimations for
15
16 women with AN, we have recruited a group of women who have all had a diagnosis of AN,
17
18 but who now show significant variation in their BMI and psychological concerns. These
19
20 women should more correctly be referred to as suffering from anorexia spectrum disorders
21
22 (ANSD). By deliberately taking advantage of individual differences in this way, we can
23
24 determine whether the accuracy of body size estimation increases or decreases as the BMI of
25
26 ANSD participants varies and therefore determine the relative importance of psychological
27
28 factors and perceptual bias as illustrated in Fig. 1B and C.
29
30
31
32

33 **Method**

34
35
36 The experimental procedures and methods for participant recruitment for this study
37
38 were approved by: the local ethics committee at Northumbria University; the Beating Eating
39
40 Disorders Organisation (BEAT) and the Northern Initiative on Women and Eating (NIWE)
41
42 Organisation.
43
44

45 **Participants**

46
47
48 We recruited 42 participants into the study all of whom who have had a formal
49
50 diagnosis of anorexia nervosa ($n=34$) according to DSM-IV-R or DSM-5 (American
51
52 Psychiatric Association, 2002, 2013) or bulimia nervosa followed by the onset of anorexia
53
54 ($n=8$) - it is not uncommon for patients to move between diagnostic categories (Fairburn &
55
56 Harrison, 2003). Table 1 shows the details of the participants divided into 3 subgroups:
57
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 ANSD1: women with a diagnosis of AN who were being treated at the time of testing; ANSD
5
6 2: women with a diagnosis of AN who were no longer being treated; AN 3: women with a
7
8 diagnosis of either atypical AN ($n=3$) or Bulimia that switched to AN ($n=8$), 4 of whom were
9
10 being treated at the time of testing. The right hand columns of Table 1 show the output of
11
12 pairwise comparisons of the three subgroup means, adjusted for multiple comparisons, using
13
14 the permutation method in PROC MULTEST (SAS v9.3). We acknowledge that this design
15
16 is deliberately intended to look at the effect of individual differences within the anorexia
17
18 spectrum, as opposed to a design in which we might compare directly between distinct eating
19
20 disordered subgroups defined a priori.
21
22
23
24

25
26 In addition, 100 participants were recruited from the population of undergraduate
27
28 students at Newcastle and Northumbria Universities and from the general population in and
29
30 around the Newcastle upon Tyne area, all of whom consented to take part in the study as non-
31
32 eating disordered controls. No control participants had a history of eating disorders. The
33
34 participants displayed variation in body mass index (BMI), attitudes to eating, body shape
35
36 and size, levels of depression and anxiety. For the characteristics of the control participants
37
38 see Table 2.
39
40
41

42 **Measures**

43 **Psychometric measurements**

44
45
46 To assess participants' attitudes towards body shape, weight and eating we used: (1)
47
48 The Eating Disorders Examination Questionnaire (EDEQ), which is a self-report version of
49
50 the Eating Disorder Examination (EDE) structured interview (Fairburn & Beglin, 1994). This
51
52 is commonly used as a screening questionnaire for eating disordered behaviour and has been
53
54 normed for young women (Mond, Hay, Rodgers, & Owen, 2006). The questionnaire contains
55
56 four subscales reflecting the severity of aspects of the psychopathology of eating disorders;
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the Restraint Scale investigates the restrictive nature of the eating; the Eating Concern scale
5
6 to the preoccupation with food and social eating; the Shape Concern subscale investigates
7
8 dissatisfaction with body shape and the Weight Concern subscale assesses dissatisfaction
9
10 with body weight. The EDE-Q (range 0-6) also measures overall disordered eating behaviour.
11
12 Furthermore, it provides frequency data on key behavioural features of eating disorders; (2)
13
14 The Eating Attitudes Test (EAT, range 0-78; Garner & Garfinkel, 1979) which investigates
15
16 eating habits and dissatisfaction with own body weight and shape. It is a subjective index of
17
18 the symptoms displayed by individuals with eating disorders and the test is used as a
19
20 screening questionnaire for eating disorders; (3) the 16-item Body Shape Questionnaire
21
22 (BSQ, range 0-96; Evans & Dolan, 1993) which indexes the degree of preoccupation and
23
24 negative attitude toward body weight and body shape. The participants' level of depression
25
26 was measured using the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI, range 0-63; Beck et al., 1961).
27
28 Their self-esteem was indexed using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE, range 0-30;
29
30 Rosenberg, 1965).
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Anthropometric measurements**

38
39
40 The participants' body mass index (BMI) was measured with a set of calibrated scales
41
42 and a stadiometer. The participants' waist, hip, under-bust and bust circumferences were
43
44 measured using measuring tapes. Participants' percentage body fat was measured from
45
46 skinfold thickness obtained with Harpenden Callipers. The skinfold measurements were
47
48 obtained from eight sites, allowing the percentage of body fat to be calculated (Durnin &
49
50 Womersley, 1974). The skinfold measurements were made by an ISAK (International Society
51
52 for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry) trained and experienced investigator.
53
54
55
56

57 **Psychophysical measurements**

1
2
3
4 In this study we apply classical psychophysical methods (cf Gardner, 1996) to
5
6 measure two components of the participants' judgements of body size: (i) the point of
7
8 subjective equality (PSE) and (ii) the difference limen (DL). The PSE is the participant's
9
10 estimate of their body size. The DL is an estimate of how sensitive a participant is to changes
11
12 in body size and equates to the smallest difference in body size that she can detect. To obtain
13
14 these measurements, we use the method of constant stimuli in a two alternative forced choice
15
16 paradigm. On every trial of the task, the participants are presented with an image of a woman
17
18 and they have to respond by button press whether they believe the image to be smaller or
19
20 larger than themselves. The BMI of the body varies on each presentation from smaller than to
21
22 larger than the actual BMI of the participant. For each participant, we then plotted the
23
24 proportion of 'larger' responses (y-axis) as a function of the BMI of the stimulus (x-axis), and
25
26 fitted a cumulative Gaussian (sigmoid) curve to the data, as illustrated in Fig. 3 D. The PSE is
27
28 then defined from this curve as the BMI at which participants would respond 'larger' 50% of
29
30 the time. Therefore, the PSE corresponds to the midpoint of the curve where, effectively,
31
32 participants would be equally like to respond 'smaller' or 'larger' because a stimulus with
33
34 this BMI has the same size as they believe themselves to have. The value of BMI at the PSE
35
36 may be smaller (i.e., an underestimation), the same as or larger (an over-estimation) than a
37
38 participant's actual BMI. The DL is the difference in the BMI of the stimuli falling between
39
40 the 25% and 75% 'larger' response points (see Gescheider, 1997). This range captures the
41
42 steepness of the psychometric curve. Participants who are very sensitive to small changes in
43
44 body size will have a steeper psychometric function with a correspondingly small DL. It is
45
46 important to emphasize that there is no necessary correlation between PSE and DL.
47
48 Participants who over-estimate or under-estimate their body size may be equally likely to be
49
50 sensitive (small DL) or insensitive (large DL) to changes in body size.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 **Stimulus image preparation**

1
2
3
4 Creating stimulus images which correctly represent how body shape changes as a
5
6 function of changing BMI is difficult, because these changes are highly non-linear. One
7
8 method that has been used previously is the video-distortion technique (VDT) (see e.g.,
9
10 Gardner and Bokenkamp, 1996; Probst, Vandereycken, & Van Coppenolle, 1997) in which
11
12 2D images of people are stretched or compressed in the horizontal dimension. However, this
13
14 linear method is problematic as it creates shape changes particularly in the shoulder and hip
15
16 regions which tend to be unrealistic (see below). Alternative methodologies can be used, such
17
18 as morphing between images of high and low BMI bodies. While this is an improvement on
19
20 the VDT in principle, because it is a non-linear method, it is nevertheless extremely difficult
21
22 to maintain the combination of high feature definition and stable identity of the person in the
23
24 morphed images across a wide range of BMI values. Inevitably, some form of averaging or
25
26 smoothing is required which reduces the realism in the resultant images. For these reasons,
27
28 we instead used film industry computer-generated imagery (CGI) methods to create graded
29
30 3D images of individuals.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Figure 2 illustrates the comparison between the VDT and CGI methods. The top row
38
39 shows three CGI images from our database of stimuli. From left to right, they represent
40
41 approximately BMIs 13, 17 and 21 respectively. The second row shows the body shape
42
43 changes produced by applying the video distortion technique (VDT) to the central image in
44
45 the first row. The horizontal compression (left image) and expansion (right image) for the
46
47 images on the second row were made so that waist widths corresponded to the BMI 13 and
48
49 21 images from the top row, respectively. The third row shows the difference between the
50
51 two methods of image manipulation. The grey shaded outline represents the CGI image and
52
53 the dotted line the VDT image for BMI 13 (left) and BMI 21 (right). Row three shows how
54
55 for thinner images, the VDT compresses the width of the hips and shoulders more than the
56
57 CGI technique. In comparison, for larger images, the VDT exaggerates the width of the hips
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

and shoulders relative to the CGI method. In addition, the width of the gap between the thighs changes in opposite directions: consistent with reality, the CGI method shows a reduction in this gap with increasing BMI, whereas the VDT shows an increase.

Particular advantages of the CGI method are: i) the identity of the person in the image is clearly maintained over a wide BMI range; ii) the body shape changes at different BMI levels are extremely realistic and iii) the 3D rendered stimulus images are high definition and photorealistic. Another critical feature is that the stimuli are calibrated for BMI. We used the Health Survey for England (HSE 2003 & 2008) datasets to create calibration curves between waist and hip circumferences and height derived from ~5000 females in the UK, aged between 18 and 45. Because our CGI models exist in an appropriately scaled 3D world, having set the height of our models (1.6m) we can therefore measure their waist and hip circumferences, and compare these with our HSE calibration curves in order to compute their BMI (Cornelissen, Toveé, & Bateson, 2009). Finally, we carried out two further qualitative checks of the plausibility of the overall body shape changes that we created in the modelling environment. First, we compared the 3D volumes and shapes from our CGI modelled bodies to a 3D statistical model of the relationship between BMI and shape changes in 114 real bodies (Hasler, Stoll, Sunkel, Rosenhahn, & Seidel, 2009). Secondly, we compared our images against a library of digital photographs of 220 women in a standard pose who varied in BMI from 11 (emaciated) to 45 (obese) (Tovéé, Benson, Emery, Mason, & Cohen-Tovéé, 2003).

Procedure

For the presentation of stimuli, we used a Python program written by one of the authors to implement the two alternative forced choice task. Stimuli were presented on an 18" flat panel LCD screen (1280w x 1024h pixel native resolution, 32-bit colour depth) for as

long as it took participants to make a decision. At the standard viewing distance of ~60cm, the CGI model subtended ~26° vertically and ~8° degrees horizontally. Each participant first judged 7 images covering the whole BMI range (from 12.5 to 44.5 in equal BMI steps) presented in 2 separate blocks. Each stimulus image appeared 10 times in each block, and the order of presentation was randomized. Based on the responses from each block, the participants' point of subjective equality or PSE (the BMI they believe themselves to be) was calculated automatically by fitting a cumulative normal distribution. These two values were then averaged to give an initial estimate of the participant's PSE. On the basis of this initial estimate, the program presented a further set of 21 images (spread over a range of 5 BMI units centered on the participant's initial PSE, at a spacing of 0.25 units per image) for the participants to judge. Each image was presented 10 times in randomized order. This final set of judgements allowed us to calculate a definitive estimate of PSE as well as the difference limen or DL (that is how sensitive participants are to changes in BMI).

Results

Task reliability

The responses to the questionnaires across the sample showed good internal reliability scores. For RSE, BDI, BSQ, EAT and EDEQ, Cronbach's alpha was: .89, .93, .96, .92 and .96 respectively. For the PSE scores from the 2AFC task, we estimated reliability in two ways. First, for the entire sample, we divided the last block of body size estimation trials into a first and a second half (i.e., in time), in order to estimate split-half reliability. We carried out separate probit analyses on each half of the data to obtain a PSE estimate from each half. The correlation between the two sets of PSE scores ($r=.92$, $p<.0001$) suggests good reliability. In addition, we asked 17 participants to return to the laboratory to re-run the body size judgement task. The shortest interval for these test retest measurements was ~ 1 month.

The Pearson correlation between PSE estimates was $r=.93$ ($p<.0001$) and a dependent samples t-test comparison of the means was not significantly different from zero ($M = 0.48$, $p=.333$).

ANSD participants

As Table 1 shows, there are significant differences between the three subgroups of ANSD participants on some psychometric measures. For example, consistent with previous studies (e.g., Tovée et al. 2000, 2003), the group who are currently under treatment (i.e., ANSD1) have significantly lower BMIs, lower self-esteem, higher tendency towards depression and the most disturbed attitudes to eating compared to the other two groups (ANSD2 and ANSD3). This raises the question whether the relationships between PSE, DL and BMI in the three ANSD subgroups might be different. If so, then the distinction between the three groups should be maintained when comparing them statistically to healthy controls. Alternatively, if, for example, there are no statistically significant differences in the relationships between PSE and BMI for these three subgroups, we would gain statistical power in our analyses by treating all participants with a history of AN as one group. Therefore, we used PROC MIXED (SAS v9.3) to test whether there is a main effect of ANSD grouping on the regressions of PSE on BMI, and separately, DL on BMI. Since the distribution of raw DL scores was non-normal (Shapiro-Wilk's $W=.62$, $p < .001$) we applied a logarithmic transformation to these data. For PSE, the mixed linear model explained 71% of its variance. The Type III test of the fixed effect of BMI was significant at the specified .05 level, $F(1,37) = 67.36$, $p < .001$, but the tests for ANSD group, $F(2,37) = 0.55$, $p = .580$, and the interaction between BMI and ANSD group, $F(2,37) = 0.54$, $p = .587$, were not. For DL, the mixed linear model explained 15.8% of its variance. The Type III test of the fixed effect of BMI was significant at the specified .05 level, $F(1,37) = 7.11$, $p = .011$, but the tests for

1
2
3
4 ANSD group, $F(2,37) = 1.09, p = .347$, and the interaction between BMI and ANSD group,
5
6 $F(2,37) = 1.07, p = .354$, were not. Since we could find no statistically robust effects of the
7
8 subgroups in these preliminary analyses, henceforth we treat all participants with ANSD as
9
10 one group.
11

12 13 14 **Univariate statistics**

15
16
17 Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations (SD) for the participant
18
19 characteristics, separated according to whether they belong to the anorexia spectrum
20
21 disorders (ANSD) or the non eating-disordered control group. The right most column of
22
23 Table 2 shows the output of pairwise comparisons of these group means, adjusted for
24
25 multiple comparisons, using the permutation method in PROC MULTTEST (SAS v9.3). For
26
27 The Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire, a global eating disorder score was compiled
28
29 across the subtests which combines the evaluation of restrictive eating behaviour, participant
30
31 psychological concerns about eating, concerns about their own weight and concerns about
32
33 their own body shape. Consistent with previous literature we found that when compared to
34
35 non-eating disordered controls, the ANSD participants had statistically significantly lower
36
37 BMIs and percentage body fat, elevated concerns about body shape, eating behaviour and
38
39 body weight (EAT, BSQ, EDEQ), greater tendency towards depression, reduced self-esteem
40
41 and significantly greater over-estimation of body size (OE). The relatively high mean BMI
42
43 for the ANSD participants reflects that fact that an adequate test of our hypotheses *requires*
44
45 this participant group to have a wide BMI range. Finally, we found no statistically significant
46
47 differences between the group means for the sensitivity measure for body size estimation
48
49 (DL) or chronological age.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 **Multivariate statistics**

We used PROC MIXED (SAS v9.3) to build a mixed linear model with estimated BMI (i.e., PSE) as the outcome variable, and actual BMI and GROUP (i.e., ANSD versus healthy controls) as predictor variables. In addition, we wanted to control for any influence of AGE and the psychometric variables (RSE, BDI, BSQ, EAT and EDEQ). In order to avoid the possibility of introducing substantial variance inflation, we first checked for evidence of co-linearity amongst the psychometric variables. Across the sample of 142 participants the Pearson correlations between RSE and BDI, RSE and BSQ, RSE and EAT, RSE and EDEQ, BDI and BSQ, BDI and EAT, BDI and EDEQ, BSQ and EAT, BSQ and EDEQ, and EAT and EDEQ were: -.75, -.61, -.62, -.57, .60, .66, .56, .72, .84 and .79 respectively. All correlations were statistically significant at $p < .001$. Given these substantial correlations, we therefore used PROC FACTOR in SAS v9.3 (SAS Institute, North Carolina, US) to carry out an iterated principal factor analysis with rotation in order to identify the significant latent variable(s) in the psychometric data. We then used the factor scores from these latent variable(s) in our statistical models. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (*KMO*) measure of sampling adequacy (which indicates the degree of diffusion in the pattern of correlations) was .81 suggesting an acceptable sample. One factor had an Eigen value greater than Kaiser's criterion of 1 (i.e., 3.39) which explained 98% of the variance. The scree plot showed an inflexion, i.e., Cattell's criterion which also justified retaining just the one factor. The residuals were all small, and the overall root mean square off-diagonal residual was 0.081, indicating that the factor structure explained most of the correlations. The factor loadings for RSE, BDI, BSQ, EAT and EDEQ were: -.76, .76, .86, .86, .86 respectively. This latent variable, referred to henceforth as PSYCH, represents a combination of the attitudes thought to contribute to body size disturbance: disturbed attitudes to eating, weight, and shape, and low self-esteem and depression.

PSE

The mixed linear model for PSE explained 71% of its variance. Both ANSD and control participants showed a positive, linear relationship between actual BMI and PSE, $F(1,137) = 207.72, p < .001, 95\% CI [0.68, 0.90]$. Critically, however, the pattern of estimation by women with ANSD is statistically different from that of the controls because we found a significant main effect of GROUP, $F(1,137) = 14.90, p < .001, 95\% CI [-19.08, -6.16]$ as well as an interaction between GROUP and BMI, $F(1,137) = 15.33, p < .001, 95\% CI [.29, .89]$.

Figure 3A illustrates the outcome from the mixed linear modelling for PSE. White dots with solid white regression line and gray triangles with solid black regression line represent participants with ANSD and non eating-disordered controls respectively. The dotted black diagonal line in Fig. 3 A shows the line of equality (i.e., perfect estimation) between actual BMI (x-axis) and estimated BMI (y-axis) as indexed by PSE. Data points above this line represent over-estimation, while data points below it represent under-estimation. Fig. 3A therefore shows that low BMI control participants tend to over-estimate body size; control participants whose BMI was in the mid-range were reasonably accurate, and high BMI control participants tended to under-estimate body size. The regression slope for this relationship was significantly *less* than 1, $\beta = 0.82, F(1,97) = 9.96, p < .005$, and is therefore consistent with contraction bias in the controls. Participants with ANSD, however, showed a very different pattern of results. Low BMI participants with ANSD were the most accurate at body size estimation. Thereafter, in participants with higher BMI, individuals with ANSD systematically over-estimated body size, and the magnitude of this over-estimation increased in direct proportion to increasing BMI. The regression slope for PSE on BMI in ANSD participants was significantly *greater* than 1, $\beta = 1.39, F(1,39) = 5.86, p < .05$. Clearly, this is not consistent with contraction bias, and therefore these results do not support

1
2
3
4 hypothesis one as outlined in Fig. 1 A, but do support hypothesis 2. Finally, we found a
5
6 significant Type III test of the fixed effect of PSYCH, $F(1,137) = 17.23, p < .001, 95\% CI$
7
8 $[0.59, 1.66]$ on PSE. However, we found no evidence for any two- or three-way interactions
9
10 involving PSYCH. This result is illustrated in Fig. 3 B. White and black regression lines
11
12 represent participants with ANSD and non eating-disordered controls respectively. Dashed
13
14 and solid lines represent ‘high’ (+1 SD) and ‘low’ (- 1 SD) effects of PSYCH respectively.
15
16 This result suggests that any participant with a greater tendency towards depressive
17
18 symptoms, shape and weight concern, *irrespective of group*, was more likely to over-estimate
19
20 their body size. Therefore, while the significant interaction between GROUP and BMI
21
22 supports hypothesis 2, it is unlikely that this can be attributed to psychological factors alone,
23
24 because any influence of PSYCH on PSE was essentially the same for ANSD and healthy
25
26 controls.
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 How robust is this result? To address this question, we knocked out participants one
34
35 by one from the ANSD sample by systematically restricting the upper limit of the sample for
36
37 BMI and refitting the model above. We retained a statistically significant effects of GROUP
38
39 even when the sample size for the ANSD participants was reduced to 67% ($n=28$) of the
40
41 original 42, at a BMI cut-off of 22.3. Therefore, we suggest that our result is indeed robust.
42
43 Moreover, this test of the model is considerably more stringent than applying standard
44
45 regression diagnostics, because no data point in the analysis of the full sample exceeded the
46
47 Cook’s D or $DFITS$ critical values for undue influence in the model (i.e., 1 & 2
48
49 respectively). As a further check, we also re-ran the whole analysis having removed the 8
50
51 participants whose initial diagnosis was bulimia, and obtained remarkably similar,
52
53 statistically robust results. For this reduced model, the Type III tests of the fixed effects of
54
55 BMI, $F(1,129) = 175.33, p < .001, 95\% CI [0.68, 0.90]$, PSYCH, $F(1,129) = 14.40, p < .001,$
56
57 $95\% CI [0.50, 1.60]$, GROUP, $F(1,129) = 10.85, p = .001, 95\% CI [-18.03, -4.50]$, and the
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 interaction between BMI and GROUP, $F(1,129) = 11.03$, $p = .001$, 95% *CI* [0.22, 0.85], were
5
6 all significant at the specified .05 level.
7
8

9 **DL**

10 The mixed linear model for \log_{10} DL explained 22.1% of its variance. Both ANSD and
11 control participants showed a positive, linear relationship between actual BMI and \log_{10} DL,
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
The mixed linear model for \log_{10} DL explained 22.1% of its variance. Both ANSD and control participants showed a positive, linear relationship between actual BMI and \log_{10} DL, $F(1,137) = 21.98$, $p < .001$, 95% *CI* [0.0068, 0.025]. However, the significant main effect of GROUP, $F(1,137) = 7.05$, $p = .008$, 95% *CI* [-1.32, -0.19] as well as the interaction between GROUP and BMI, $F(1,137) = 5.00$, $p = .027$, 95% *CI* [0.0034, 0.056] show that the pattern of estimation by women with ANSD is statistically different from that of the controls, as can be seen in Fig. 3C. White dots with a solid white regression line and gray triangles with a solid black regression line represent participants with ANSD and non eating-disordered controls respectively. The control participants only showed a modest reduction in sensitivity to the task (i.e., increasing DL) with increasing BMI. This pattern was much more dramatic for participants with ANSD: low BMI participants with ANSD showed much smaller DL values than controls with similar BMI, suggesting very high sensitivity to the task. As the BMI of participants with ANSD increased, DL increased steeply towards the values of control participants, at a BMI of ~26. Finally, we did not find an effect of PSYCH, $F(1,137) = 0.75$, $p = .389$, 95% *CI* [-0.026, 0.067] on \log_{10} DL.

66
67
68
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
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Discussion

1
2
3
4 The aim of the current study was to investigate the relationship between BMI, body
5
6 size estimation and psychological status in women who have had a diagnosis of anorexia
7
8 nervosa and compare their responses to those of non eating-disordered controls. Based on
9
10 prior literature, we predicted two possible outcomes. According to the contraction bias model
11
12 (Fig. 1B), increasing BMI in women with ANSD should lead to *reducing* body size over-
13
14 estimation, because their judgements should follow the same trajectory with increasing BMI
15
16 as has been shown for non eating-disordered controls. In contrast, based on studies which
17
18 report strong positive correlations between BMI/body size and psychological concerns about
19
20 body shape and weight, Fig. 1C illustrates an opposing prediction: that body size over-
21
22 estimation should *increase* systematically with increasing BMI.
23
24
25
26
27

28 In our control participants, the accuracy of body size estimation is linearly predicted
29
30 by their own BMI, but with a slope less than unity (see Fig. 3A): low BMI controls over-
31
32 estimate body size, mid-range BMI controls' estimates are the most accurate and high BMI
33
34 controls under-estimate. This pattern of responses is entirely consistent with a normal feature
35
36 of magnitude estimation, i.e., contraction bias (Poulton, 1989). Contraction bias assumes that
37
38 a body size judgment is made by comparing a body with an internal standard or reference
39
40 based on an average of all the bodies that a person has ever seen. This judgement is most
41
42 accurate when comparing a body similar in size to the internal reference body, and
43
44 increasingly less accurate as the two diverge. In these latter cases, when there is an increasing
45
46 difference between the reference and the body to be estimated, the observer tends to select a
47
48 response closer to the reference value than it should be, hence the term contraction bias (i.e.,
49
50 sizes much larger than the reference are underestimated and smaller sizes than the reference
51
52 are overestimated).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 This contraction bias explanation is consistent with results from other studies. For
5
6 example, Tovée et al. (2003) used a large sample of both eating disordered and control
7
8 participants and found that as the participants' own BMI declines, their overestimation
9
10 increases, with highest overestimation in the very low BMI individuals. Additionally
11
12 contraction bias can also explain the fact that previous studies have consistently shown that
13
14 obese people under-estimate their size relative to normal BMI people (Kuchler & Variyama,
15
16 2003; Kuskowska-Wolk et al., 1989; Maximova et al., 2008; Robinson & Kirkham, 2013;
17
18 Truesdale & Stevens, 2008; Wetmore & Mockdad, 2012). Critically, given that contraction
19
20 bias is a normal attribute of our perceptual systems, these studies also suggest that there is a
21
22 substantial perceptual component to body size estimation that will be dependent on an
23
24 individual's own BMI and not on their psychological state.
25
26
27
28
29

30 Although contraction bias describes the gradient of the response between the accuracy
31
32 of the estimation against the BMI of the body being judged by the controls, the intercept for
33
34 this relationship is also influenced by body shape concerns (i.e., the function moves up or
35
36 down the y-axis depending on the level of their psychological concerns, illustrated in Fig.
37
38 3B). This shows that for a body of a given BMI, the degree of size over- or under-estimation
39
40 will also be modulated by the psychological state of the observer, even in the control
41
42 participants.
43
44
45
46

47 The difference limen (DL) for the control participants rises as the participants' own
48
49 BMIs rise (i.e., the participants' sensitivity to changing body size declines as their own BMI
50
51 rises). This can be explained by another well-established perceptual effect, Weber's law. This
52
53 states that the just noticeable difference (JND) between two stimuli will be a constant
54
55 proportion of their magnitude, leading to a constant Weber fraction over the stimulus range
56
57 (i.e., $\Delta I / I = K$, where I = stimulus magnitude and K = constant). This means that, for bodies,
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 it is easier to notice, for example, a one BMI unit difference between two low BMI bodies
5
6 than between two high BMI bodies. Over the full range of BMI, discriminating between
7
8 higher BMI bodies requires progressively larger differences in BMI between stimuli, which
9
10 in turn leads to progressively increasing DL values. Indeed, the data for controls in Fig. 3C
11
12 show an excellent fit to Weber's Law because the Weber fractions at, e.g., BMI 20 and 40 are
13
14 0.036 and 0.038 respectively, which fall within 5% of each other.
15
16

17
18
19 In this study, women with ANSD showed a qualitatively different pattern of results
20
21 compared to the controls, and these differences are statistically robust. For women with
22
23 ANSD, the lowest BMI individuals are actually the most accurate in their body size
24
25 estimation and they are also very sensitive to changes in body size (i.e., they show a low DL
26
27 value) in low BMI bodies. This sensitivity is considerably greater than that seen for controls.
28
29 However, as the ANSD individuals' BMI increases, they start to systematically over-estimate
30
31 their body size (as indexed by PSE) and the magnitude of this over-estimation scales linearly
32
33 with their BMI. This is reflected in the sharp increase in the DL values, indicating a rapid
34
35 reduction in sensitivity to changes in body size as the BMI of the bodies' increases.
36
37 Moreover, the gradient of this relationship for DL in women with ANSD far exceeds the
38
39 prediction from Weber's law. Overall, therefore, the pattern of over- and under-estimation of
40
41 body size is quite different to that described in the control participants, is the opposite of the
42
43 pattern of responses predicted by contraction bias, and is more consistent with the prediction
44
45 in Fig. 1C.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 In Fig. 1C, we had originally hypothesised that the low BMI women with anorexia
53
54 would have relatively low body size concerns and that the recovering women with anorexia
55
56 would show an increase in concerns as their BMI rose. What we found was that women with
57
58 ANSD did have greater psychological concerns, on average, than controls (see Table 2).
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 However, the influence of psychological concerns on the relationship between personal BMI
5
6 and body size estimation was the same for both groups (see the difference between
7
8 continuous and dotted regression lines in Fig. 3B) – i.e., increasing psychological concerns
9
10 were linked to higher body size estimations across the entire sample, changing the intercepts,
11
12 but not the slopes, by the same amount for both groups. This means that changing
13
14 psychological concerns cannot be directly responsible for the perceptual differences in the
15
16 two groups that we observe, i.e., the different slopes for PSE and DL in Fig. 3A and C.
17
18 Instead, we suggest that the key to explaining our findings lies in the different ways that
19
20 women with ANSD *interpret* changes in body size and psychological concern, compared to
21
22 controls. In what follows, we use signal detection theory, to account for the results in women
23
24 with ANSD, based on the reduction in their sensitivity to changes in body size as the BMI of
25
26 the bodies being judged increases.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Consider the paradigm being used. Each participant has to say whether a body being
34
35 shown is fatter or thinner than themselves. As the BMI of ANSD participants increases, they
36
37 become less able to distinguish small differences between the BMI of the stimuli and the
38
39 body size they believe they have because they are less sensitive (i.e., increasing DL) to
40
41 differences in body size (see Fig. 3C). This means that in order for a low BMI and a higher
42
43 BMI woman with anorexia to have the same confidence in expressing a judgement about
44
45 their respective body sizes, the participant who has a higher personal BMI, will only response
46
47 ‘larger than me’ to stimuli that are, proportionately, considerably larger than they are, as
48
49 compared to the participant who has a lower personal BMI. Psychophysically, this is
50
51 reflected in a so-called criterion shift: i.e., not only does the slope of the psychometric
52
53 function become shallower for the participant with a higher personal BMI (i.e., reduced
54
55 sensitivity), but the curve itself is also shifted to the right (see Fig. 3D). Thus, we propose
56
57 that because of their reduced sensitivity to changes in body size, the higher BMI ANSD
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 participants shift their response criterion in order to remain confident that their responses are
5
6 correct, which in turn causes an increase in PSE and consequent over-estimation of body size.
7
8 We suggest that an insistence to maintain the same confidence in the decisions made by
9
10 women with ANSD is consistent with their documented aversion to making errors in
11
12 judgements (Kaye, Fudge, & Paulus, 2009; Wagner et al., 2007). We ran a post-hoc
13
14 correlation analysis which supports this interpretation, because the level of psychological
15
16 concern in women with ANSD was positively correlated with body size estimates (i.e., PSE;
17
18 $r = .30, p = .05$) but independent of sensitivity to body size change (i.e., DL; $r = .17, p = .29$).
19
20 When we partialled out the influence of sensitivity (DL), the correlation between
21
22 psychological concerns and body size estimation was rendered non-significant ($r = .25, p =$
23
24 $.11$). This therefore suggests that sensitivity to change in body size plays a critical role in
25
26 modulating the relationship between psychological concern and body size estimation in
27
28 women with anorexia.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Gardner and Moncrieff (1988) used Signal Detection Theory to analyse their data
36
37 from a 2AFC task in which participants had to judge whether images of themselves were
38
39 normal or distorted. While they found no difference in task sensitivity (indexed by d-prime)
40
41 between women with AN and controls, nevertheless, the women with AN showed a more lax
42
43 response criterion. Gardner and Moncrieff (1988) suggested that this may make women with
44
45 AN more likely than controls to report an image of themselves as distorted. If we assume an
46
47 average height for their sample of 1.6m, then the average BMI of the women with AN and
48
49 controls in the Gardner and Moncrieff study were ~17.5 and ~22 respectively. At these BMI
50
51 levels, we do see marked differences in task sensitivity (indexed by DL) between women
52
53 with ANSD and controls in the current study. We suggest two reasons for the differences
54
55 between studies. The first is that Gardner and Moncrieff (1988) used the video distortion
56
57 technique (VDT) to produce their body stimuli. As illustrated in Fig. 2, there are systematic
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 differences in the body shapes produced by the VDT compared to our CGI method which
5
6 might induce different patterns of responses in women with ANSD and controls. Secondly, it
7
8 is possible that the use of a distortion question (i.e., normal versus distorted) may have
9
10 invoked a different response pattern from the women with AN than the thinner or fatter
11
12 question we used and which is potentially a more psychologically and emotionally charged
13
14 judgement for them to make. Our results suggest that women with ANSD are extremely
15
16 sensitive to shape change in low BMI bodies and so they may be better placed than controls
17
18 to detect visual changes in the VDT images which do not usually accompany weight
19
20 loss/gain. Further research is needed to clarify the nature and implications of these
21
22 methodological differences.
23
24
25
26
27

28 While the account we have given of our data uses ideas from signal detection theory,
29
30 it does leave open the question of what mechanism might cause the dramatic differences in
31
32 task sensitivity demonstrated by women with ANSD; clearly a specific focus for future
33
34 research. One possibility is that the higher sensitivity (i.e., lower DL) to changes in body size
35
36 in ANSD women who have low BMI, relative to controls, is due to an expertise effect (i.e.,
37
38 the development of expertise in low BMI body discrimination). Women with AN spend a
39
40 great deal of time looking at low BMI bodies including their own, but also online as part of
41
42 their obsession with the thin ideal (Norris, Boydell, Pinhas, & Katzman, 2006; Ransom, La
43
44 Guardia, Woody, & Boyd, 2010). This could explain why our participants were more
45
46 sensitive to low BMI body change than the controls. Repeated evaluation and discriminations
47
48 of low BMI bodies could allow the development of an expertise in discriminating between
49
50 low BMI bodies. ANSD individuals' sensitivity to size change in higher BMI bodies showed
51
52 a rapid decline, far faster than is seen in the control participants. Body shape changes in a
53
54 non-linear fashion with increasing BMI (Wells, Treleaven, & Cole, 2007), so the pattern of
55
56 shape change with weight increase is different in low BMI bodies as compared to heavier
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 BMI bodies. Arguably, therefore, the expertise developed by women with ANSD might be
5
6 specific to low BMI bodies and may not generalise to discriminating between higher BMI
7
8 bodies.
9

10
11
12 Although we have emphasised the role of perceptual factors in our explanation, we
13
14 acknowledge that a range of psychological, cultural and socio-economic factors influence our
15
16 judgement of bodies. A number of studies have suggested that we make judgements about
17
18 complex stimuli such as faces and bodies by reference to a template based on the average of
19
20 all that class of stimuli that they have seen (e.g., Leopold, O'Toole, Vetter, & Blanz, 2001;
21
22 Winkler & Rhodes, 2005). This average can be selectively manipulated by showing a
23
24 sequence of thin or fat bodies to shift an observer's perception of what constitutes a normal
25
26 body (Winkler & Rhodes, 2005). However, this "visual diet" is not the only factor in
27
28 preferred body size. For example, showing larger bodies in a positive light can increase the
29
30 preference for larger bodies (Boothroyd, Tovée, & Pollet, 2012). An example of this "visual
31
32 valency" is the change in body preferences as people move between cultures. People living in
33
34 rural KwaZulu Natal in South Africa prefer a much larger BMI (Tovée, Swami, Furnham, &
35
36 Mangalparsad, 2006), but people from KwaZulu Natal moving to the UK shift their
37
38 preferences towards a lower BMI. The average BMI of people in both regions is not
39
40 significantly different, but in KwaZulu Natal a heavier body is associated with health and
41
42 higher socioeconomic status whereas in the UK the opposite is the case. Thus, it is the value
43
44 placed a particular body size by a culture that seems to predict preferred body size. So
45
46 multiple factors influence body preferences.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Our results have important implications for treatment of people at both ends of the
55
56 weight spectrum. Women with ANSD are very accurate in their body size judgements when
57
58 they have a low BMI (BMI<17.5) and tend to actually slightly under-estimate their body size.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 This suggests that body size over-estimation as a maintenance factor for low BMI women
5
6 with anorexia has a comparatively weak effect. However, as they are very sensitive to
7
8 changes in the size and shape of a low BMI body, they are also able to detect any increase in
9
10 their weight. This may stimulate a renewal of weight reduction behaviours. In this case it is
11
12 not an inaccurate perception of their body that is the potential problem, but instead their
13
14 ability to accurately detect weight increase.
15
16
17

18
19 However, as their BMI rises, women with ANSD rapidly develop an over-estimation
20
21 of their body size and a rapid decrease in the sensitivity with which they can detect changes
22
23 in body size. These changes occur significantly faster as participant BMI increases in women
24
25 with ANSD as compared to controls of a corresponding BMI (see Figure 3A & B). This has
26
27 important implications for potential relapse in recovering patients. They will see themselves
28
29 as larger than they actually are and a large proportion of this over-estimation will be based on
30
31 perceptual factors not easily treated through talking therapies such as cognitive behavioural
32
33 therapy (CBT). Given the core nature of body size concerns for AN (Cash & Deagle, 1997;
34
35 Fairburn, Cooper, & Shafran, 2003), this represents a potentially important factor in any
36
37 subsequent relapse and may contribute to the relatively high relapse rate (Channon &
38
39 DeSilva, 1985; Slade & Russell, 1973). However, this is not to say that CBT cannot play a
40
41 role in reducing body size over-estimation. For a given BMI, our results suggest that the
42
43 degree of over-estimation by women with ANSD is modulated by their body size and shape
44
45 concerns. So talking therapies such as CBT, can potentially reduce the over-estimation of
46
47 body size by targeting these concerns. However, to improve perceptual judgements a
48
49 perceptual training program may also be needed to try and recalibrate their judgements.
50
51
52

53
54
55
56 The results also have significant implications for the treatment of obesity. A number
57
58 of studies have suggested that levels of obesity are increasing in the general population
59
60
61

(Ogden, Carroll, Curtin, McDowell, Tabak, & Flegal, 2006; Swinburn, Sacks, Hall, McPherson, Finegood, Moodie, & Gortmaker, 2011). At the same time, it has been reported that people who are overweight have difficulty in detecting that their weight is increasing (Truedale & Stevens, 2008; Wetmore & Modkdad, 2012). This has been explained by an adaptation effect, suggesting that the general trend in the population to be heavier has redefined what we judge to be overweight (Robinson & Kirkham, 2013). However, our results suggest two other factors could also play a role. Firstly, contraction bias produces a systematic under-estimation of our body size as we gain weight. Secondly, Weber's law predicts that we will be systematically less able to detect weight increase (as indexed by the JND) as our BMI rises. Both of these factors could act to make it more difficult for overweight people to detect weight increase, and so reduce the probability of a person taking weight control measures (Wardle, Haase, & Steptoe, 2006; Wetmore & Modkdad, 2012). This could potentially be treated by a training program which would improve discrimination of heavier bodies (the development of the "expertise effect" which reduce the JND for higher BMI bodies).

This study uses CGI 3D modelling to produce photorealistic bodies with a biometrically accurate simulation of weight change. These techniques are in increasing use as the modelling software becomes more user friendly to non-computer scientists and at the same time produces more realistic results (e.g., Evans, Tovée, Boothroyd, & Drewett, 2013; Frederick, Hadji-Michael, Furnham, & Swami, 2010; Glauert, Rhodes, Byrne, Fink, & Grammer, 2009; Tovée, Edmonds, & Vuong, 2012). This allows the use of sets of bodies which hold constant such features as their skin texture, proportions and facial features. However, we would underline the importance of biometric validation of these images as the software used to generate these images does not produce simple linear changes in body size

and without careful calibration of the resultant bodies, they may not be biometrically accurate and therefore may introduce a whole new set of artefacts into body research.

In conclusion, our results suggest that body size over-estimation is not only much more variable than might have been appreciated previously, given the strong dependence on individual BMI, but it also shows striking differences between women with ANSD and controls. The accuracy of control participants can be explained by the combined effects of two perceptual functions, contraction bias and Weber's law, with a modulating effect of psychological concerns about body size. By comparison, as their BMI increases, the accuracy of estimation by women with ANSD seems to be predicted primarily by a rapid criterion shift which is to compensate for a rapid decline in sensitivity to body size change.

References

- Beck, A.T., Ward, C.H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 4, 561-571.
- Berkman, N.D., Lohr, K.N., & Bulik, C.M. (2007). Outcomes of eating disorders: a systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 40, 293-309. doi: 10.1002/eat.20369
- Boothroyd, L.G., Tovée, M.J., & Pollet, T.V. (2012). Visual diet versus associative learning as mechanisms of change in body size preferences. *PLoS One*, 7, e48691. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0048691
- Cash, T.F., & Deagle, E.A. (1997). The nature and extent of body-image disturbances in anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 22, 107-126.

- 1
2
3
4 Casper, R.C., Halmi, K.A., Goldberg, S.C., Eckert, E., & Davis, J. (1979). Disturbances in
5
6 body image estimation as related to other characteristics and outcome in anorexia
7
8 nervosa. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *134*, 60-66.
9
- 10
11
12 Channon, S., & DeSilva, W. (1985). Psychological correlates of weight gain in patients with
13
14 anorexia nervosa. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *19*, 267-271.
15
16
- 17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Cornelissen, P.L., Toveé, M.J., & Bateson, M. (2009). Patterns of subcutaneous fat
deposition and the relationship between body mass index and waist-to-hip ratio:
Implications for models of physical attractiveness. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*,
256, 343-350. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.09.041
- Cornelissen, P.L., Johns, A., & Toveé, M.J. (2013). Body size over-estimation in women with
anorexia nervosa is not qualitatively different from female controls. *Body Image*, *10*,
103-111. doi: 10.1016/j.bodyim.2012.09.003
- Durnin, J., & Womersley, J. (1974). Body fat assessed from total body density and its
estimation from skinfold thickness: measurements on 481 men and women aged from
16 to 72 years. *British Journal of Nutrition*, *32*, 77-97.
- Evans, C., & Dolan, B. (1993). Body Shape Questionnaire: derivation of shortened “alternate
forms”. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *13*, 315-321.
- Evans, E.H., Toveé, M.J., Boothroyd, L.G., & Drewett, R.F. (2013). Body dissatisfaction and
disordered eating attitudes in 7- to 11-year old girls: testing a sociocultural model.
Body Image, *10*, 8-15. doi: 10.1016/j.bodyim.2012.10.001
- Fairburn, C.G., & Beglin, S.J. (1994). Assessment of eating disorders: Interview or
self-report questionnaire? *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *16*, 363-370.

- 1
2
3
4 Fairburn, C.G., Cooper, Z., & Shafran, R. (2003). Cognitive behaviour therapy for eating
5
6 disorders: A “transdiagnostic” theory and treatment. *Behaviour Research and*
7
8 *Therapy, 41*, 509-528. doi:10.1016/S0005-7967(02)00088-8
9
- 10
11 Fairburn, C.G., & Harrison, P.J. (2003). Eating disorders. *Lancet, 361*, 407–16.
12
13 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(03)12378-1
14
15
16
- 17 Fernández, F., Probst, M., Meerman, R., & Vandereycken, W. (1994). Body size estimation
18
19 and body dissatisfaction in eating disorder patients and normal controls. *International*
20
21 *Journal of Eating Disorders, 16*, 307-310.
22
23
24
- 25 Frederick, D.A., Hadji-Michael, M, Furnham, A., & Swami, V. (2010). The influence of leg-
26
27 to-body ratio (LBR) on judgments of female physical attractiveness: assessments of
28
29 computer-generated images varying in LBR. *Body Image, 7*, 51-55.
30
31 doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2009.09.001
32
33
34
- 35 Garner, D.M., & Garfinkel, P.E. (1979). The eating attitudes test: an index of the symptoms
36
37 of anorexia nervosa. *Psychological Medicine, 9*, 273-279.
38
39
- 40 Gardner, R.M. (1996). Methodological issues in assessment of the perceptual component of
41
42 body image disturbance. *British Journal of Psychology, 87*, 327-337.
43
44
45
- 46 Gardner, R.M., & Moncrieff, C. (1988). Body image distortion in anorexics as a non-sensory
47
48 phenomenon: A signal detection approach. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44*, 101-
49
50 107.
51
52
- 53 Gardner, R.M., & Bokenkamp, E.D. (1996). The role of sensory and nonsensory factors in
54
55 body size estimations of eating disorder subjects. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 52*,
56
57 3-15.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Gardner, R.M., Brown, D.L., & Boice, R. (2012). Using amazon's mechanical turk website to
5
6 measure accuracy of body size estimation and body dissatisfaction. *Body image*, 9,
7
8 532-534. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2012.06.006
9

10
11 Gescheider, G.A. (1997). *Psychophysics: The Fundamentals*. (3rd Ed.) Lawrence Erlbaum,
12
13 New Jersey.
14

15
16
17 Glauert, R., Rhodes, G., Byrne, S., Fink, B., & Grammer, K. (2009). Body dissatisfaction and
18
19 the effects of perceptual exposure on body norms and ideals. *International Journal of*
20
21 *Eating Disorders*, 42, 443-452. doi: 10.1002/eat.20640
22
23

24
25 Hasler, N., Stoll, C., Sunkel, M., Rosenhahn, B., & Seidel, H.P. (2009). A statistical model of
26
27 human pose and body shape. *Computer Graphics Forum*, 28, 337-346.
28
29 doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8659.2009.01373.x
30
31

32
33 Kaye, W.H., Fudge, J.L., & Paulus, M. (2009). New insights into symptoms and neurocircuit
34
35 function of anorexia nervosa. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 10, 573-584.
36
37 doi:10.1038/nrn2682.
38
39

40
41 Kuchler, F., & Variyam, JN (2003). Mistakes were made: misperception as a barrier to
42
43 reducing overweight. *International Journal of Obesity*, 27, 856–86.
44
45 doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0802293
46
47

48
49 Kuskowska-Wolk, A., & Rössner, S. (1989). The “true” prevalence of obesity: a comparison
50
51 of objective weight and height measures versus self-reported and calibrated data.
52
53 *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*, 7, 79-82.
54
55

56
57 Leopold, D.A., O'Toole, A.J., Vetter, T., & Blanz, V. (2001). Prototype-referenced shape
58
59 encoding revealed by high-level aftereffects. *Nature Neuroscience*, 4, 89–94.
60
61

- 1
2
3
4 Maximova, K., McGrath, J.J., Barnett, T., O'Loughlin, J., Paradis, G., & Lambert, M. (2008).
5
6 Do you see what I see? Weight status misperception and exposure to obesity among
7
8 children and adolescents. *International Journal of Obesity*, *32*, 1008-1015. doi:
9
10 10.1038/ijo.2008.15.
11
12
13
14 McCabe, M.P., Ricciardelli, L.A., & Ridge, D. (2006). "Who thinks I need a perfect body?"
15
16 Perceptions and internal dialogue among adolescents about their bodies. *Sex Roles*,
17
18 *55*, 409-419. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9093-0
19
20
21
22 Meerman, R. (1983). Experimental investigation of disturbances in body image estimation in
23
24 anorexia nervosa patients, and ballet and gymnastics pupils. *International Journal of*
25
26 *Eating Disorders*, *2*, 91-100.
27
28
29
30 Mond, J.M., Hay, P., Rodgers, B., & Owen, C. (2006). Eating disorder examination
31
32 questionnaire (EDE-Q): norms for young adult women. *Behaviour Research and*
33
34 *Therapy*, *44*, 53-62. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2004.12.003
35
36
37
38 Mussap, A.J., McCabe, M.P., & Ricciardelli, L.A. (2008). Implications of accuracy,
39
40 sensitivity, and variability of body size estimations to disordered eating. *Body Image*,
41
42 *5*, 80-90. doi: 10.1016/j.bodyim.2007.07.003
43
44
45 Norris, M.L., Boydell, K.M., Pinhas, L., & Katzman, D.K. (2006). Ana and the internet: A
46
47 review of pro-anorexia websites. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *39*, 443-
48
49 447. doi: 10.1002/eat.20305
50
51
52
53 Ogden, C.L., Carroll, M., Curtin, L.R., McDowell, M.A., Tabak, C.J., & Flegal, K.M. (2006).
54
55 Prevalence of overweight and obesity in the United States, 199-2004. *Journal of the*
56
57 *American Medical Association*, *295*, 1549-155. doi:10.1001/jama.295.13.1549.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Pike, K.M. (1998). Long-term course of anorexia nervosa: response, relapse, remission, and
5
6 recovery. *Clinical Psychology Review, 18*, 447-475.
7
8
9
10 Poulton, E.C., (1989). *Bias in quantifying judgements*. Hove: Erlbaum.
11
12
13 Probst, M., Vandereycken, W., & Van Coppenolle, H. (1997). Body-size estimation in eating
14
15 disorders using video distortion on a life-size screen. *Psychotherapy and*
16
17 *Psychosomatics, 66*, 87-91.
18
19
20 Probst, M., Vandereycken, W., Van Coppenolle, H., & Pieters, G. (1998). Body size
21
22 estimation in anorexia nervosa patients: the significance of overestimation. *Journal of*
23
24 *Psychosomatic Research, 44*, 451-456.
25
26
27
28 Ransom, D.C., La Guardia, J.G., Woody, E.Z., & Boyd, J.L. (2010). Interpersonal
29
30 interactions on online forums addressing eating concerns. *International Journal of*
31
32 *Eating Disorders, 43*, 161-170. doi: 10.1002/eat.20629
33
34
35
36 Robinson, E., & Kirkham, T.C. (2013). Is he a healthy weight? Exposure to obesity changes
37
38 perception of the weight status of others. *International Journal of Obesity, 38*, 663-
39
40 667. doi:10.1038/ijo.2013.154
41
42
43
44 Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
45
46 University Press.
47
48
49 Slade, P., & Russell, G. (1973). Awareness of body dimensions in anorexia nervosa: cross-
50
51 sectional and longitudinal studies. *Psychological Medicine, 3*, 188-199.
52
53
54
55 Stice, E., & Shaw, H.E. (2002). Role of body dissatisfaction in the onset and maintenance of
56
57 eating pathology: a synthesis of research findings. *Journal of Psychosomatic*
58
59 *Research, 53*, 985-993. doi: 10.1016/S0022-3999(02)00488-9
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Striegel-Moore, R.H., Franko, D.L., Thompson, D., Barton, B., Schreiber, G.B., & Daniels,
5
6 S.R. (2004). Changes in weight and body image over time in women with eating
7
8 disorders. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 36, 315-327.

9
10 doi: 10.1002/eat.20053

11
12
13
14 Swinburn, B.A., Sacks, G., Hall, K.D., McPherson, K., Finegood, D.T., Moodie, M.L., &
15
16 Gortmaker, S.L. (2011). The global obesity pandemic: shaped by global drivers and
17
18 local environments. *Lancet*, 378, 804–814. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60813-1

19
20
21
22 Tovée, M.J., Benson, P.J., Emery, J.L., Mason, S.M., & Cohen-Tovée, E.M. (2003).

23
24 Measurement of body size and shape perception in eating-disordered and control
25
26 observers using body-shape software. *British Journal of Psychology*, 94, 501-516.

27
28 doi: 10.1348/000712603322503060

29
30
31
32 Tovée, M.J., Edmonds, L., & Vuong, Q.C. (2012). Categorical perception of human female
33
34 physical attractiveness and health. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 33, 85-93. doi:
35
36 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2011.05.008.

37
38
39
40 Tovée, M.J., Swami, V., Furnham, A., & Mangalparsad, R. (2006). Changing perceptions of
41
42 attractiveness as observers are exposed to a different culture. *Evolution and Human*
43
44 *Behavior* 2006, 27(6), 443-456. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2006.05.004

45
46
47 Treasure, J., Claudino, A.M., & Zucker, N. (2010). Eating disorders. *Lancet*, 375, 583–593.

48
49 doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(09\)61748-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61748-7)

50
51
52
53 Truesdale, K., & Stevens, J. (2008). Do the obese know they are obese? *North Carolina*
54
55 *Medical Journal*, 69, 188–194.

56
57
58 Wagner, A., Aizenstein, H., Venkatraman, V., Fudge, J., May, J., Mazurkewicz, L., ... Kaye,
59
60 W.H. (2007). Altered reward processing in women recovered from anorexia nervosa.

1
2
3
4 *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 164, 1842-1849. doi:
5
6 10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.07040575.
7

8
9
10 Wardle, J., Haase, A.M., & Steptoe, A. (2006). Body image and weight control in young
11
12 adults: international comparisons in university students from 22 countries.
13
14 *International Journal of Obesity*, 30, 644–651. doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0803050
15

16
17 Wells, J.C., Treleaven, P., & Cole, T.J. (2007). BMI compared with 3-dimensional body
18
19 shape: the UK national sizing survey. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 85,
20
21 419-425. doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0803727.
22

23
24
25 Wetmore, C., & Modkdad, A.H. (2012). In denial: misperceptions of weight change among
26
27 adults in the United States. *Preventative Medicine*, 56, 93–100.
28
29 doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0803727
30

31
32
33 Winkler, C., & Rhodes, G. (2005). Perceptual adaptation affects attractiveness of female
34
35 bodies. *British Journal of Psychology*, 96, 141-154. doi: 10.1348/000712605X36343
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Acknowledgements**

45
46
47 KKC was supported by a PhD studentship funded by Northumbria University; We
48
49 thank: B-Eat, NIWE for help with the recruitment of participants; Dr. Nick Neave for help
50
51 with implementing the study; Jonathan Prichard for help with biometric measurements; Dr
52
53 Vesa Kiviniemi for advice on statistical analysis.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure Captions**Figure 1**

(A) Schematic representation of the results from Cornelissen et al. (2013); (B) The pattern of body size estimation predicted by the contraction bias model in women with AN, or recovering from AN (i.e., in an eating disordered group with a wider BMI range); (C) The pattern of body size over estimation predicted by increasing psychological concerns, rather than contraction bias. See text for details.

Figure 2

The top row shows three CGI images from our database of stimuli. The second row shows the body shape changes produced by applying the video distortion technique (VDT) to the central image in the first row. The third row shows the difference between the two methods of image manipulation. See text for details.

Figure 3

(A) Shows the relationship between participants' BMI (x-axis) and their subjective estimate of body size (PSE) with the effects of PSYCH statistically controlled. (B) Shows the relationship between participants' BMI (x-axis) and fitted values of estimated body size (PSE) computed from the mixed model at ± 1 SD of the mean PSYCH value for each group. (C) The relationship between participants' BMI (x-axis) and their sensitivity at estimating body size (Log10 DL) with the effects of PSYCH statistically controlled. (D) A sketch plot to illustrate the relationship between the psychometric function for body size estimation and the calculation of PSE (i.e., the value of BMI at y and y' when percentage 'larger' responses = 50%) and DL (i.e., the difference in BMI between z & x and z' & x'). These points correspond

1
2
3
4 to values of BMI when percentage 'larger' responses equal 75% and 25%, respectively). Two
5
6 situations are illustrated: accurate and sensitive performance (black) versus over-estimating
7
8 and insensitive performance (white).
9

Table 1

Means and standard deviations of the characteristics of the three ANSD subgroups.

	ANSD1 (n=12)		ANSD2 (n=20)		ANSD3 (n=10)		ANSD 1v2	ANSD 1v3	ANSD 2v3
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>p</i>
Participant characteristics									
Age (years)	22.42	3.65	25.80	7.62	22.36	3.44	.78	.99	.81
BMI (weight/height ²)	18.40	2.35	21.03	2.95	22.62	1.59	.12	<.01	.63
Age at onset (years)	17.42	3.92	15.55	2.01	16.45	1.97	.54	.99	.92
When treatment ended (years)	0.00	0.00	3.45	4.11	1.95	2.90	-	.23	.96
Duration of illness (years)	5.04	4.70	6.75	6.79	4.91	3.05	.99	.99	.99
Depression and self esteem									
RSE score	8.33	2.35	16.58	5.03	15.70	5.81	<.01	.02	.99
BDI score	31.91	9.49	15.74	8.10	15.00	10.46	<.01	.01	.99
Eating and body shape concern									
EAT score	39.25	15.70	21.10	13.27	28.80	15.51	.01	.72	.80
BSQ score	71.00	17.69	55.50	17.00	62.20	18.47	.16	.95	.98
EDEQ score	4.01	1.34	2.75	1.18	3.05	1.65	.09	.76	.99
EDEQ wc score	4.08	1.58	3.05	1.34	3.70	1.50	.40	.99	.92
EDEQ bs score	4.70	1.35	3.77	1.41	3.81	1.58	.50	.81	.99
Psychophysical performance									
PSE (weight/height ²)	20.57	4.93	21.95	5.26	23.66	4.15	.99	.66	.98
OE i.e. PSE – BMI	2.17	3.25	1.10	2.83	1.04	3.03	.99	.77	.93
DL (weight/height ²)	0.53	0.28	0.65	0.46	0.98	1.05	.97	.99	.99

Note. ANSD1: AN participants being treated at the time of testing. ANSD 2: AN participants no longer being treated; ANSD 3: atypical AN or Bulimia that switched to AN. BDI = Beck Depression Inventory. RSE = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. EAT = Eating Attitudes Test. BSQ = Body Shape Questionnaire. EDEQ = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire global score. EDEQ wc = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire weight concern subscale. EDEQ bs = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire body shape concern subscale. PSE = Point of Subjective Equality. OE = Over Estimation. DL = Difference Limen.

Table 2: Means and standard deviations for the participant characteristics, separated according to whether they belong to the ANSD or the healthy control group.

	ANSD (<i>n</i> =42)		Control(<i>n</i> =100)		<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Participant characteristics					
Age (years)	23.80	6.05	24.02	8.91	.99
BMI (weight/height ²)	20.89	2.84	24.01	5.03	<.01
Percentage body fat	25.56	6.41	31.63	5.04	<.01
Depression and self esteem					
BDI	20.00	11.37	9.09	6.08	<.01
RSE	14.00	5.96	18.56	4.79	<.01
Eating and body shape concern					
EAT	27.38	15.55	11.07	9.08	<.01
BSQ	61.10	18.63	50.08	17.33	<.01
EDEQ	3.12	1.42	2.01	1.21	<.01
EDEQ wc	3.50	1.48	2.21	1.44	<.01
EDEQ bs	4.04	1.46	2.97	1.50	<.01
Psychophysical performance					
PSE (weight/height ²)	22.21	4.95	23.80	5.13	.36
OE (i.e. PSE – BMI)	1.41	3.04	-0.14	2.85	.04
DL (weight/height ²)	0.72	0.66	0.99	0.81	.32

Note. BDI = Beck Depression Inventory. RSE = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. EAT = Eating Attitudes Test. BSQ = Body Shape Questionnaire. EDEQ = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire global score. EDEQ wc = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire weight concern subscale. EDEQ bs = Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire body shape concern subscale. PSE = Point of Subjective Equality. OE = Over Estimation. DL = Difference Limen.

Figure-1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure-2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

BMI ~13

BMI ~17

BMI ~21

CGI



VDT



Difference
between
CGI
and VDT



 VDT
 CGI




Figure-3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

