Neural mechanisms underlying Social Recognition and Theory of Mind in Adolescent Patients with Bulimia Nervosa and Transdiagnostic Comparison with Anorexia Nervosa

Vanessa Ande Ruan[1,2, #], Arne Hartz[1], Manuel Hueck[1],
Brigitte Dahmen[1], Georg von Polier[1,3],
Beate Herpertz-Dahlmann[1], Kerstin Konrad[1,4], Martin Schulte-Rüther[1,5,6,*], Jochen Seitz[1,*]

[1] University Hospital Aachen, Clinic for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics

[2] Charité University Hospital Berlin, Clinic for Obstetrics

[3] Hospital of the Goethe University Frankfurt, Clinic for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Psychosomatics and Psychotherapy

[4] University Hospital Aachen, Clinic for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, Clinic for Neuropsychology

[5] University Medical Center Göttingen, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychotherapy

[6] Institute of Neurosciences and Medicine Jülich, Molecular Neuroscience and Neuroimaging (INM-11)

[#] Corresponding author

[*] authors contributed equally

Corresponding author:

Vanessa Ande Ruan, MSc
Auguststraße 1
10117 Berlin
vanessa.ruan@rwth-aachen.de
+49 (0) 151 212 083 62
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0064-5189

Ethics approval statement:

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Patient consent statement:

All study participants, and their legal guardians, provided informed written consent prior to study enrolment.

Permission to reproduce material from other sources:

The authors did not reproduce material from other sources.

Clinical trial registration:

No applicable.

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Theory of mind (ToM) is important for social interactions and typical development and has been found to be impaired in patients with anorexia nervosa (AN) and bulimia nervosa (BN). Hypoactivation in frontotemporal brain regions seems to be the underlying neural mechanism in AN while whole-brain analyses in BN are lacking.

Methods: We used the well-validated social recognition task fMRI paradigm to assess ToM in a total of 71 participants (16 BN, 18 AN, and 37 matched healthy controls (HC)).

Results: Compared to HC_{BN}, patients with BN showed hyperactivity in the right frontal pole, middle temporal gyrus and left temporal pole and differed fundamentally from previously observed hypoactivation in these regions in patients with AN before and after short-term weight rehabilitation. Interaction and overlap analyses confirmed that similar regions were affected in opposite directions in both diseases. Hyperactivation in BN was associated with clinical BN-severity markers binging and purging frequency.

Discussion: The hyperactivation in BN suggest different underlying neuronal mechanisms for theory of mind compared to AN. Hyperactivity might correspond to a different but also ineffective cognitive style in patients with BN when approaching social interactions. These important transdiagnostic differences are relevant for future brain-targeted therapeutic approaches.

INTRODUCTION

Bulimia nervosa (BN) is a severe eating disorder (DSM-5) that mostly occurs in female adolescents and young adults (Association, 2013). Patients suffering from BN show recurrent episodes of binge eating, followed by pathological compensatory behaviors (purging) to prevent weight gain, including self-induced vomiting and laxative misuse. Similar to patients with anorexia nervosa (AN), patients with BN frequently exhibit a distorted body image and weight phobia, and thus, attempt to lose weight (Herpertz-Dahlmann, 2015).

Recent findings suggest that social difficulties are an important factor in the onset and maintenance of eating disorder pathologies, and they contribute to unfavorable long-term outcomes (Agras et al., 2000; Schulte-Ruther, Mainz, Fink, Herpertz-Dahlmann, & Konrad, 2012; Strober, Freeman, & Morrell, 1997). Problem areas include reduced social skills and difficulties in interpersonal problem solving (Arcelus, Haslam, Farrow, & Meyer, 2013). It has been suggested that patients with a binge/purging psychopathology (e.g. patients with BN) are more strongly characterized by negative interactions and conflicts, interpersonal distrust, and ineffective problem-solving strategies. Restrictive eating pathology (more pronounced in patients with AN) is more strongly associated with a fear of negative evaluation, negative social comparison, and avoidance of expressing emotion (Arcelus et al., 2013). This resonates well with findings of a higher impulsivity in patients with BN than in AN, found to be associated with symptom severity (Seitz et al., 2013; Svedlund, Norring, Ginsberg, & von Hausswolff-Juhlin, 2019)). Contrary to BN, higher levels of social withdrawal were reported in AN (Adambegan et al., 2012; Nickel et al., 2019).

In addition to overall social problem areas, more specific impairments in social cognition have been described, and they appear to play an important role in the etiology and pathophysiology of AN and BN (Bora & Kose, 2016; Simonsen, Jakobsen, Grontved, & Kjaersdam Telleus, 2020). Social cognition abilities are important for successful social relationships. Patients with deficits in social cognition have difficulties perceiving and interpreting information about themselves and others and how to decipher social situations (Bora & Kose, 2016), and they are thus more likely to struggle during social interactions. One important aspect of social cognition is the "theory of mind" (ToM) ability, i.e., the metacognitive ability to appreciate the mental states of other people, such as their beliefs, intentions, and desires. Deficits in this ability may impair patients in understanding and accepting different perspectives of others, including the notion that one's own body image may be different from how others perceive it. Furthermore, such a deficit may influence one's own insight into the need for treatment (Bora & Kose, 2016; Vandereycken, 2006), further complicating the initiation and course of therapeutic interventions. On the behavioral level, ToM abilities were found to be impaired in patients with AN (Bora & Kose, 2016; Simonsen et al., 2020) and BN (Dejong et al., 2013; Kenyon et al., 2012). A recent meta-analysis (Bora & Kose, 2016) revealed the strongest social cognition deficits in acute AN with medium to large effect sizes and somewhat smaller effects in BN and recovered AN. In patients with AN, the duration of illness, reduced BMI, and depressive symptoms are associated with the severity of ToM deficits. Other studies have also demonstrated a relationship between ToM deficits and bulimic symptoms in patients with BN (Sacchetti et al., 2019). To summarize, ToM deficits could play a substantial role in both the etiology and pathophysiology of AN and BN, but only very few studies have investigated ToM in patients with BN, and hardly anything is known about differential contributing factors to ToM in both disorders.

The neural processes underlying ToM processing have been well studied in healthy controls. Several studies have consistently described activation in brain regions associated with ToM, including the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC), posterior cingulate/precuneus, bilateral temporoparietal junctions (TPJ) and anterior temporal lobes (Gallagher et al., 2000; Schurz, Radua, Aichhorn, Richlan, & Perner, 2014). A few studies have investigated neural substrates of ToM in adults and adolescents with AN

(McAdams & Krawczyk, 2011; Schulte-Ruther et al., 2012), while only one study has been performed in adults with BN (McAdams & Krawczyk, 2013). The findings in patients with AN suggest hypoactivation in the mPFC, temporal and parietal brain regions (McAdams & Krawczyk, 2011; Schulte-Ruther et al., 2012) in both acute and recovered patients, and more severe neurofunctional deficits predict worse clinical outcomes at the 1-year follow-up (Schulte-Ruther et al., 2012). McAdams and Krawczyk (2013) used an ROI approach and observed hypoactivation in the right TPJ of adults with BN but did not find differential effects in the medial prefrontal cortex. However, there is a striking lack of investigations of ToM in early manifestations of BN in adolescent and young adult patients on the one hand and whole brain analyses on the other hand.

Taken together, social cognitive processing, ToM abilities, and their neural substrates are particularly relevant topics for investigation across different eating disorders. Increasingly, transdiagnostic investigations of brain activation studies have revealed specific patterns of hyperactivation and hypoactivation and their relation to symptom clusters (McTeague et al., 2020). However, respective studies focusing on eating disorders are scarce. Notable differences between neural substrates may have the potential to substantially inform clinical practice and translation because they suggest that some therapeutic strategies might be more effective for specific neurobehavioral phenotypes (McTeague et al., 2020).

The present study aimed to investigate the neural substrates of ToM processing in adolescent and young adult patients with BN, including a transdiagnostic comparison with patients with AN before and after weight rehabilitation. Considering previous findings of behavioral deficits in ToM in patients with BN, we expected aberrant brain activation patterns in patients with BN compared to those in HCs. Additionally, we explored associations of brain activation and eating disorder severity patients with BN. Given the qualitative differences in social difficulties in patients with BN compared to patients with AN, we were interested whether these relate to distinct ToM brain activation patterns.

METHODS

Participants

Twenty-two female adolescent and young adult patients with BN according to DSM-IV, aged 15-23 years, and 20 healthy controls (HC$_{BN}$), matched for age and IQ, participated in this study. Six patients and two HC$_{BN}$ were excluded post hoc from the study due to technical difficulties that impacted data acquisition during the scanning procedure (n=4) or due to excessive movement (n=4) (Power, 2017), leaving a total sample of 16 BNs and 18 HC$_{BN}$. The patients were consecutively recruited by the in- and outpatient clinics of the Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry of Aachen University Hospital, Germanyand the University Outpatient Clinic in Mainz, Germany, which are both specialist centers for eating disorders. . The exclusion criteria included a history of psychosis or ASD, severe substance abuse, and IQ < 80, however, taking medication was acceptable. HC$_{BN}$ were enrolled via local advertisements that did not state the aims of the study. The HC$_{BN}$ exclusion criteria included current psychiatric disorders or lifetime eating disorders and an IQ < 80. BN-associated symptoms were assessed with a structured clinical interview for the assessment of AN and BN (SIAB-EX, patients only) and the Eating Disorder Inventory (EDI-2). Additionally, the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) was administered.

Three patients showed improvement after inclusion with respect to acute symptoms (bingeing and vomiting frequencies) but still satisfied the criteria for atypical BN at the time of the MR assessment. Four patients were diagnosed with a current major depressive episode, two of whom received serotonin reuptake inhibitors during the study. For the demographic and clinical data of the enrolled participants, see table 1. Furthermore, we included a sample of 18 patients diagnosed with AN according to DSM-IV and 20 healthy controls (HC$_{AN}$) which has been previously published (Schulte-Ruther et al., 2012) in our final analysis for comparison. In short, all the patients with AN were recruited

as inpatients at the Aachen University Hospital and diagnosed based on DSM-IV by a board-certified psychiatrist. Assessments were conducted longitudinally at admission (T1) and discharge (T2) after short-term weight recovery and included the EDI-2 and BDI. Age- and IQ-matched HC_{AN} were recruited locally via advertisements, were confirmed to not have any lifetime psychiatric diagnoses, and were assessed once.

The current study was approved by the local Ethics Committee of Aachen University Hospital in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. All the participants and their legal guardians (if applicable) provided informed written consent before being included in the study.

Social Attribution Task

While lying in the scanner, participants performed a social attribution task designed to induce ToM processing that was similar to the task established by Heider & Simmel, (1944) but optimized for fMRI. A total of 24 15.1-second video clips of three white geometric shapes moving on a black background around a box were presented to the participants. The video clips were grouped into three conditions (eight videos per condition) and presented in a randomized order. The first condition implied that the geometric shapes behaved in a way suggesting personal agency and reciprocal contingent social interaction. After each video, participants were asked to indicate whether all shapes were "friends" via a button press with the left or right index finger. In the two other (non-ToM) conditions, the shapes were either (1) circling at various speeds like "bumper cars" or (2) moved along simple trajectories governed by Newtonian physics like billiard balls ("physical"). After each of these non-ToM clips, participants were asked to decide whether all the shapes were equally "strong". Before each video, a condition-specific instruction cue appeared for three seconds. Group differences were calculated between average correct rating of BN vs HC_{BN}, AN_{T1} vs HC_{AN} and AN_{T2} vs HC_{AN} using two sided T-tests. 2x2 ANOVAs were used to compare BN, HC_{BN}, AN_{T1} and HC_{AN} and HC_{AN} as well as BN, HC_{BN}, AN_{T2} and HC_{AN}.

MR Technical Parameters

All the MR measurements of the participants with BN and the respective HC were acquired with a 3-Tesla TRIO magnetic resonance (MR) scanner (Siemens, Erlangen, Germany) using a standard circular polarized (CP) head coil (TxRX-coil) at Aachen RWTH University Hospital. MR measurements of patients with AN and their respective HC were acquired using an identical Siemens TRIO scanner and CP head coil at Research Center Jülich.

For functional imaging of the BN sample, gradient-echo echoplanar T2*-weighted images (EPIs) were acquired (time to echo [TE] 30 ms, repetition time [TR] = 2424 ms, α = 80°, field of view [FOV] = 192 mm, voxel size = 3x3x3 mm^3, matrix size = 64 x 64, 40 transverse slices, ascending slice acquisition, interleaved) in one session (approximately 12 minutes). A number of participants had 34 instead of 40 transverse slices (nBN=14 nHC=8). An additional regressor was used in later second-level analyses to correct for potential differences. Identical scanning parameters and sequences were used for both timepoints of the AN sample, with the exception of a slightly different α of 90° and non-interleaved ascending slice acquisition.

Anatomical images were acquired using a standard T1-weighted 3D magnetization-prepared, rapid acquisition gradient echo (MP-RAGE) pulse sequence.

Behavioral and fMRI Data Analysis

Statistical analysis of the behavioral data was conducted with SPSS 25. Descriptive variables referring to the sample (demographic variables, diagnostic parameters, questionnaire data and video correct/incorrect answers) were analyzed with two-tailed Student's t-tests.

Analysis of the functional imaging data was performed with SPM12 v7771 (Wellcome Department of Imaging Neuroscience, London, UK) implemented in MATLAB R2019b (Mathworks, Natick, MA) running in a Debian (Sid) environment. Default SPM settings were used unless stated otherwise.

Anatomical and functional images were realigned and slice-timed [Quelle im Kommentar] with respect to slice 6 (AN data set, BN data set vice versa due to non-interleaved slice acquisition), coregistrated to the mean realigned and slicetimed functional image, normalized, and smoothed with an 8 mm (full-width-half maximum) Gaussian kernel.

Individual first-level models were established and included estimated realignment parameters as regressors to account for residual variance related to movement. Boxcar functions (aligned with the onset and duration of the videos) were convolved with a canonical model of the hemodynamic response function and its first-order temporal derivative for each condition separately. Parameter estimates of the resulting general linear model (GLM) were calculated for each voxel and each regressor. Simple contrasts of these regressors (against fixation cross baseline) were used for the second level models.

For population inference, whole-brain second-level models were computed using a flexible factorial ANOVA with subject and group (HC_{BN}, BN, HC_{AN}, AN) as independent factors and condition (social, physical, bumper) as a dependent factor, assuming nonsphericity for all factors (nonsphericity correction using covariance components as implemented in SPM12). The number of slices was additionally entered as a covariate to account for potential confounds. Specific effects at each voxel were tested by applying the appropriate linear contrasts to the parameter estimates. Analyses were performed separately for AN_{T1} and AN_{T2}. For reporting, a strict voxelwise threshold was applied ($p <$ .05 familywise error (FWE) correction). According to our previous publication (Schulte-Ruther et al., 2012), we reported results pertaining to the factor task by comparing the ToM condition against the collapsed non-ToM conditions (contrast: 2 x social – (bumper + physical)).

Rendered images were created using BSPMVIEW (v.20180918) implemented in MATLAB R2019b.

AN_{T1}, AN_{T2} and HC_{AN} data from Schulte-Ruther et al. (2012) were reanalyzed using the exact same analysis settings and pipeline as the BN and HC_{BN} data to allow for a direct statistical comparison. A single exception was made for the slice timing procedure because the two datasets differed in the order of slice acquisition (interleaved for BN, ascending for AN).

To account for any potential residual differences due to data acquisition and processing, we only considered direct group comparisons between BN and AN in relation to their respective HC comparison groups.

ToM-network

First, we assessed the overall network involved in ToM processing by contrasting the ToM condition against the non-ToM conditions across the newly acquired dataset of BN and HC_{BN} combined.

BN vs HC

Next, we used the respective ToM vs. non-ToM contrast and compared differences between BN and HC_{BN}, i.e., hypo- or hyperactivation in patients with BN compared to HC_{BN}, by assessing the group x task interaction contrasts. Results were reported at a statistical threshold of p<.05, FWE-corrected across the whole brain.

In light of previous reports of hypoactivation in ToM-related processing in eating disorders, including our own study (Schulte-Rüther, 2012), we performed an additional VOI analysis to allow for a more lenient threshold testing for hypoactivation using our previous AN-data. VOIs were generated by

expanding existing FWE-significant clusters of AN_{T1} vs HC_{AN} by relaxing the multiple comparison correction to p<0.001 uncorrected.

To exclude potentially confounding effects, the above analysis was repeated excluding patients with major depression or SSRI medication, respectively. Individual beta-values were extracted for all the whole brain FWE-corrected significant clusters for visual inspection. In an exploratory analysis, these beta values were also used to check for a potential role of a prior diagnosis of AN in patients with BN. We compared the 8 patients with a prior AN diagnosis with 8 without a prior diagnosis using two-sided independent Student's t-tests.

AN vs HC

To compare the activation patterns related to ToM in patients with BN to the patterns in patients with AN, we first replicated the analyses reported by Schulte-Ruther et al. (2012), which suggested hypoactivation in ToM-related areas compared to HC. To account for the potential effects of starvation, we performed the analyses separately for the T1 measurement (acute starvation) and the T2 measurement after short-term weight recovery. For this purpose, AN_{T1} vs HC_{AN} and AN_{T2} vs HC_{AN} ToM vs. non-ToM were compared, and the results are reported at a threshold of p<.05 FWE-corrected across the whole brain.

BN vs AN

To perform direct statistical comparisons for the difference in ToM-related processing between patients with BN and AN, we also compared the respective group-specific effects of patients with AN and BN (determined by comparison to their own respective HC group) using the contrasts (BN-HC_{BN}) vs. (AN-HC_{AN}) for the ToM vs. non-ToM comparisons. Again, the analyses were performed separately for both T1 and T2 on a whole brain level and were FWE-corrected.

Beta-plots and clinical correlations

Furthermore, the extracted beta-values were used to calculate the ToM-specific contrast values for each of the clusters that showed significant differences between patients with BN and HC_{BN}. We performed correlation analyses to check for associations of brain activation with clinical variables within patients with BN. One-sided Spearman's rank correlations were used to analyze the association with BN severity (number of objective binges, vomiting and laxative use in the last two weeks).

RESULTS

Clinical and behavioral data

The clinical data of the patients with AN and BN and their respective HCs are summarized in table 1. The samples of patients and HCs were well matched for age and IQ. In addition to increased eating disorder symptoms, patients with BN also showed higher depressive symptoms than their HC_{BN}. ToM and non-ToM videos were correctly rated in 77.3-83.1% of the participants with BN and HC_{BN} for ToM and 56.5-69.7% for non-ToM, and 78.4-81.4% for participants with AN for ToM and 54-54.9% for non-ToM. There was no difference in the ability to correctly rate the three categories of videos between BN or AN and their respective HC nor a difference between BN and AN (all p>0.05).

fMRI Data

ToM-network

In the combined analysis of both groups, BN and HC_{BN}, the contrast between ToM vs. non-ToM confirmed neural activation in the mPFC, frontal pole, posterior and anterior temporal gyrus, TPJ, temporal pole, fusiform gyrus and inferior and superior frontal gyrus typically associated with ToM-related processing. (Fig 1)

BN vs HC

We did not find any significant clusters at the whole-brain level, that would indicate reduced activation in patients with BN. Even when investigating region of interest analysis with increased detection power using predefined VOIs, we did not find any significant hypoactivation in patients with BN. However, when comparing BN > HC_{BN}, we did find 5 significantly hyperactive clusters in the whole-brain analysis in the mPFC, the middle temporal gyrus/superior temporal sulcus (STS), temporal pole and hippocampus (Fig 2, table 2). Beta plot analysis of the three significant regions within the ToM-network showed increased activation for the ToM condition in patients with BN vs HC_{BN} (Fig 2). Excluding patients with major depression or SSRI medication did not significantly change the results (supp. Fig 7+8, supp. Table 1). Exploratory analysis did not reveal any differences in beta-values between patients with BN and prior AN and those without (data not shown).

AN vs HC

We separately compared the contrast ToM vs non-ToM for AN at admission (AN_{T1}) and at discharge after short-term weight recovery (AN_{T2}) with HC. In HC > AN_{T1}, we uncovered five hypoactive regions in medial temporal and mPFC regions that confirmed our previous analysis by Schulte-Ruther et al. (2012). Of these, three regions were in close proximity to hyperactive regions in patients with BN (Fig 3; for beta plots, see supp. Fig 1) that were also well inside the ToM network. When comparing HC > AN_{T2}, we found a similar pattern of four significant regions that again confirmed the hypoactivation previously found by Schulte-Ruther et al. (2012), and these regions were again in close proximity to the hyperactive regions in patients with BN (supp. Fig 2).

BN vs AN

The direct comparison of BN vs acute AN (relative to their respective HC: BN-HC_{BN} vs AN_{T1}-HC_{AN}) revealed seven significant frontal, temporal and temporoparietal clusters in the whole-brain analysis (Fig 3, supp. Fig 3 and table 2). Beta-plot analyses showed consistently higher activation in patients with BN in the ToM-condition compared to patients with AN in all seven regions.

The direct comparison of patients with BN and patients with AN_{T2} after short-term weight recovery (BN-HC_{BN}> AN_{T2}-HC_{AN}) revealed very similar findings compared to AN_{T1} (table 2 and supp. Fig 4).

The close proximity of the BN> HC_{BN}, HC_{AN}>AN and BN>AN findings is visualized in a joint overlay with AN_{T1} (Fig 3 and supp. Fig 5) and AN_{T2} (supp. Fig 6). Additionally, correcting the above analyses for age did not significantly change the results (supp. Fig 9+10, supp. Table 2).

Association with clinical measures

For patients with BN only, hyperactivation in the right middle temporal gyrus/STS was associated with illness severity marker binging (Spearman's rho: 0.490, p: 0.032) and laxative abuse (Spearman's rho: 0.570, p: 0.011), while hyperactivation in the right medial prefrontal gyrus was associated with laxative abuse (Spearman's rho: 0.460, p: 0.037).

DISCUSSION

The present study is the first to investigate the neural signatures of ToM in adolescent and young adult patients with BN. We found significant hyperactivation in BN > HC$_{BN}$ in areas encompassing the mPFC/frontal pole, temporal pole and middle temporal gyrus/STS. Importantly, the extent of hyperactivation was associated with different illness severity measures. This pattern contrasts with hypoactivation in similar regions in patients with AN, suggesting important transdiagnostic distinctions in the neurobehavioral phenotypes across these two types of eating disorders.

Similar to our previous study of patients with AN (Schulte-Ruther et al., 2012) and other studies using the same stimuli and paradigm (Schultz et al., 2003), we did not observe behavioral group differences in reaction times or the percentage of correct choices for the employed task and all participants were able to successfully perform the task. Thus, the fMRI results can be interpreted with respect to differences in functional brain organization and are unlikely to reflect potential nonspecific differences, such as attention to the task or processing speed.

Patients with BN did not show any *hypo*activation compared to HC$_{BN}$ for the ToM videos (even in a more lenient VOI analysis) but rather robust *hyper*activations in the right mPFC/frontal pole, middle temporal gyrus/STS, and temporal pole (table 2, Fig 2). The mPFC, in particular the anterior rostral mPFC, is considered to be one of the most important regions for representing mental states and predicting others' behavior (Gallagher et al., 2000). This region has been characterized as the main hub for "mentalizing", i.e., representing the mental states of oneself and other people as decoupled from reality (Amodio & Frith, 2006; Mitchell, Macrae, & Banaji, 2006). Regions at the temporal pole have been characterized as "semantic hubs" that are important for bringing together semantic and autobiographical memory and binding emotional reactions to preprocessed sensual input (Olson, Plotzker, & Ezzyat, 2007; Simmons & Martin, 2009). These are thus essential for mentalizing processes by integrating semantic and autobiographic memories with the patient's momentary socioemotional reaction (Frith & Frith, 2006). The middle temporal gyrus/STS has been implicated in the interpretation of relevant social cues and is also often activated in ToM experiments (Gallagher et al., 2000; Schulte-Ruther et al., 2012).

In light of the absence of behavioral differences for the employed task, hyperactivity in these brain regions could either signify primary alterations and overactivity within this network associated with ToM abilities (e.g., as a predisposition or consequence of the disease) or may reflect secondary compensatory activity due to initially less effective neural networks (i.e., more effort is needed for the same behavior/task). More research is warranted to clarify which of these potential explanations may hold true. In all cases, the observed pattern may signify a distinct neurobehavioral phenotype associated with acute BN in adolescents. Supporting a clinical importance of these alterations, hyperactivity in the mPFC and medial temporal gyrus/STS was also associated with markers of illness severity such as the extent of binging and purging symptoms.

Considering the functional role of the hyperactive areas, it might be speculated that more effort needed for the same task could represent an overinterpretation of social situations ("overmentalizing"). Especially in situations with impoverished cues (such as in the present paradigm), picking up on the reactions of others, navigating their social environment and interacting meaningfully with peers might thus be more difficult for these patients. These factors may render social situations more stressful and possibly predispose patients to inappropriate reactions, including overreactions. This notion might be further supported by the elevated level of impulsivity in patients with BN (Mobbs, Van der Linden, d'Acremont, & Perroud, 2008; Rosval et al., 2006). Impulsivity is known to be negatively associated with ToM abilities (Pineda-Alhucema, Aristizabal, Escudero-Cabarcas, Acosta-Lopez, & Velez, 2018): Patients with high values of impulsivity tend to arrive at quicker interpretations and give themselves less time to resolve ambiguous situations. It is furthermore associated with higher symptom severity and more comorbidities, such as ADHD and risk-taking behavior (Seitz et al., 2013).

Of note, our results are different from a previous study using the same task in adult patients with BN and AN that reported *hypo*activation in TPJ (McAdams & Krawczyk, 2013) in patients with both disorders and inconclusive results in the mPFC; however, that study focused only on these two regions using a VOI and not a whole-brain approach. Furthermore, a fundamental difference between our study and the study of McAdams et al. is that their adult sample had a mean age of 28 years (18-42 years), while our patients were adolescents and young adults with a mean age of 17.8 years (15-23 years), suggesting that developmental aspects are likely to come into play. For example, several studies have shown an inverted u-shape association with increasing neural activation during ToM activity in adolescence and decreasing activation in adult ages (Dai & Scherf, 2019), particularly in areas such as the mPFC. Other studies have shown that atypical neural activity in clinical patients dynamically shifts with maturation, suggesting either primary disease-related changes with age or a differential speed of development (Morken, Helland, Hugdahl, & Specht, 2017). With respect to BN, a delay in ToM network maturation in patients with BN, including a delayed maturational decrease of adolescence-associated neural activity, could explain our hyperactive findings and the behavioral ToM deficits described in the literature.

Second, the adult patients in the study by McAdams et al. tended to have a longer duration of illness. This may suggest that the prolonged chronic stress of living with the disease, secondary compensatory changes or results of therapy could further modulate (and in this case: downregulate) reactivity in brain networks related to ToM, masking the initial hyperreactivity observed in our adolescent patients. Investigating adolescents and young adults with mostly shorter illness durations avoids this potentially confounding influence. Longitudinal studies tracking the developmental trajectory of BN neural circuits, as well as the influence of the chronification of the disease, are needed to further elucidate these important issues.

A striking finding of this study is that we provide the first transdiagnostic characterization of brain areas related to social cognition across eating disorder pathologies with marked differences in the patterns of hypo- and hyperactivation in adolescent and young adult patients with BN and AN. The hyperactivation in ToM-networks observed in patients with BN were in stark contrast to the hypoactivation observed in patients with AN by our group and others (McAdams & Krawczyk, 2013; Schulte-Ruther et al., 2012). Using the exact same paradigm, we were able to analyze our BN data and previous AN data together in the same model. The overlapping analysis of BN hyperactivation and AN hypoactivation (Fig 3 and supp Fig 5-6) and the direct comparison of brain activations in patients with BN versus AN, including their respective controls (Fig 3, supp fig 3-4), revealed atypical patterns in patients in very similar regions but in opposite directions. This was found in comparison with both, acutely starved patients with AN as well as with weight recovered patients with AN ruling out a potentially confounding effect of low body weight or acute starvation often criticized in transdiagnostic studies that include patients with AN. Thus, it might be concluded that behavioral deficits in patients with BN with respect to ToM and social cognition are related to fundamentally different neural signatures compared to those found in patients with AN (Bora & Kose, 2016), suggesting dissociable neurobehavioral phenotypes. Patients with BN may tend to use a more active cognitive style for social recognition, which is potentially prone to more effort needed for the task. It remains to be elucidated if this also includes more metacognitions as well as impulsive overreacting and ad hoc jumping to conclusions on a behavioral basis. The identification of such relationships between neurobehavioral phenotypes, clinical symptomatology and difficulties in social cognition and interactions is of utmost importance to advance clinical care and needs to be researched further. Several therapeutic attempts have been made to treat ToM and social cognition deficits in patients with AN and BN, including "Mentalizing-based Psychotherapy" (Robinson et al., 2014) and "Cognitive Remediation and Emotion Skills Training" (CREST) Initial results suggest improvements in patients' abilities to label emotions and reduce social anhedonia. Other successful and effective programs, such as the "Maudsley Model of

Anorexia Nervosa Treatments in Adults" (MANTRA) (Schmidt et al., 2015) and "Radically Open Dialectical Behavioural Therapy" (RO-DBT) (Lynch et al., 2013), also focus on social and emotional problems. Despite such partly encouraging results in improving social interaction abilities in eating disorder patients, the relative effectiveness of these therapeutic approaches in different types of eating disorders (such as BN and AN) and their relationship with cognitive style and neurobehavioral phenotypes should be studied in greater detail. By increasing our understanding of ToM deficits and their underlying neural processes, our study could spur new research to study the implications for clinically relevant behavior and ultimately help inform the above programs and clinicians to improve patient therapy in the realm of social interaction difficulties. Ideally, the therapeutic strategy employed should be optimized for the neurobehavioral phenotype of the disorder (McTeague et al., 2020).

Strengths and limitations

First, our sample size is small, and we might have missed additional findings due to reduced detection power. However, even with this sample we could show significant findings of hyperactivity in ToM-related regions in patients with BN in a stringently FWE-corrected whole-brain analysis. Second, due to the paradigm chosen, we could not show any behavioral differences in ToM-performance to be directly associated with underlying neurobiology. The main strengths of this study are the well-established social attribution task and its identical use on all five patient and control samples, enabling us to directly compare differences in neural signals between these groups transdiagnostically.

Conclusion

We aimed to elucidate the neural underpinnings of ToM deficits in adolescents and young adults with BN. Hyperactivation in key frontal and temporal ToM-regions were associated with clinical disease severity markers. Patients with AN showed, as previously demonstrated, hypoactivation in very similar regions, suggesting a markedly different underlying neural functioning. Further research needs to connect our brain findings with their corresponding behavioral consequences and to determine how these associations might differ in patients with BN and AN. If corroborated, our findings could have implications to address these deficits therapeutically in a more differentiated way.

References

Adambegan, M., Wagner, G., Nader, I. W., Fernandez-Aranda, F., Treasure, J., & Karwautz, A. (2012). Internalizing and externalizing behaviour problems in childhood contribute to the development of anorexia and bulimia nervosa-a study comparing sister pairs. *Eur Eat Disord Rev, 20*(2), 116-120. doi:10.1002/erv.1152

Agras, W. S., Crow, S. J., Halmi, K. A., Mitchell, J. E., Wilson, G. T., & Kraemer, H. C. (2000). Outcome predictors for the cognitive behavior treatment of bulimia nervosa: data from a multisite study. *Am J Psychiatry, 157*(8), 1302-1308. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.157.8.1302

Amodio, D. M., & Frith, C. D. (2006). Meeting of minds: the medial frontal cortex and social cognition. *Nature Reviews: Neuroscience, 7*(4), 268-277. doi:10.1038/nrn1884

Arcelus, J., Haslam, M., Farrow, C., & Meyer, C. (2013). The role of interpersonal functioning in the maintenance of eating psychopathology: a systematic review and testable model. *Clinical Psychology Review, 33*(1), 156-167. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2012.10.009

American Medical Association, A. P. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®)*: American Psychiatric Pub.

Bora, E., & Kose, S. (2016). Meta-analysis of theory of mind in anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa: A specific Impairment of cognitive perspective taking in anorexia nervosa? *Int J Eat Disord, 49*(8), 739-740. doi:10.1002/eat.22572

Claes, L., Vandereycken, W., & Vertommen, H. (2005). Impulsivity-related traits in eating disorder patients. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*(4), 739-749. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.022

Dai, J., & Scherf, K. S. (2019). Puberty and functional brain development in humans: Convergence in findings? *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, 39*. doi:10.1016/j.dcn.2019.100690

Dejong, H., Van den Eynde, F., Broadbent, H., Kenyon, M. D., Lavender, A., Startup, H., & Schmidt, U. (2013). Social cognition in bulimia nervosa: a systematic review. *Eur Psychiatry, 28*(1), 1-6. doi:10.1016/j.eurpsy.2011.07.002

Frith, C. D., & Frith, U. (2006). The neural basis of mentalizing. *Neuron, 50*(4), 531-534. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2006.05.001

Gallagher, H. L., Happe, F., Brunswick, N., Fletcher, P. C., Frith, U., & Frith, C. D. (2000). Reading the mind in cartoons and stories: an fMRI study of 'theory of mind' in verbal and nonverbal tasks. *Neuropsychologia, 38*(1), 11-21. doi:10.1016/s0028-3932(99)00053-6

Heider, F., & Simmel, M. (1944). An Experimental Study of Apparent Behavior. *The American Journal of Psychology, 57*(2), 243-259. doi:10.2307/1416950

Herpertz-Dahlmann, B. (2015). Adolescent eating disorders: update on definitions, symptomatology, epidemiology, and comorbidity. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 24*(1), 177-196. doi:10.1016/j.chc.2014.08.003

Kenyon, M., Samarawickrema, N., Dejong, H., Van den Eynde, F., Startup, H., Lavender, A., . . . Schmidt, U. (2012). Theory of mind in bulimia nervosa. *Int J Eat Disord, 45*(3), 377-384. doi:10.1002/eat.20967

Lynch, T. R., Gray, K. L., Hempel, R. J., Titley, M., Chen, E. Y., & O'Mahen, H. A. (2013). Radically open-dialectical behavior therapy for adult anorexia nervosa: feasibility and outcomes from an inpatient program. *BMC Psychiatry, 13*, 293. doi:10.1186/1471-244X-13-293

Mary, A., Slama, H., Mousty, P., Massat, I., Capiau, T., Drabs, V., & Peigneux, P. (2016). Executive and attentional contributions to Theory of Mind deficit in attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *Child Neuropsychology, 22*(3), 345-365. doi:10.1080/09297049.2015.1012491

McAdams, C. J., & Krawczyk, D. C. (2011). Impaired neural processing of social attribution in anorexia nervosa. *Psychiatry Res, 194*(1), 54-63. doi:10.1016/j.pscychresns.2011.06.016

McAdams, C. J., & Krawczyk, D. C. (2013). Neural Responses during Social and Self-Knowledge Tasks in Bulimia Nervosa. *Front Psychiatry, 4*, 103. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2013.00103

McTeague, L. M., Rosenberg, B. M., Lopez, J. W., Carreon, D. M., Huemer, J., Jiang, Y., . . . Etkin, A. (2020). Identification of Common Neural Circuit Disruptions in Emotional Processing Across Psychiatric Disorders. *Am J Psychiatry, 177*(5), 411-421. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.18111271

Mitchell, J. P., Macrae, C. N., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). Dissociable medial prefrontal contributions to judgments of similar and dissimilar others. *Neuron, 50*(4), 655-663. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2006.03.040

Mobbs, O., Van der Linden, M., d'Acremont, M., & Perroud, A. (2008). Cognitive deficits and biases for food and body in bulimia: investigation using an affective shifting task. *Eat Behav, 9*(4), 455-461. doi:10.1016/j.eatbeh.2008.07.002

Morken, F., Helland, T., Hugdahl, K., & Specht, K. (2017). Reading in dyslexia across literacy development: A longitudinal study of effective connectivity. *Neuroimage, 144*(Pt A), 92-100. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.09.060

Nazar, B. P., Bernardes, C., Peachey, G., Sergeant, J., Mattos, P., & Treasure, J. (2016). The risk of eating disorders comorbid with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Eat Disord, 49*(12), 1045-1057. doi:10.1002/eat.22643

Nickel, K., Maier, S., Endres, D., Joos, A., Maier, V., Tebartz van Elst, L., & Zeeck, A. (2019). Systematic Review: Overlap Between Eating, Autism Spectrum, and Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Front Psychiatry, 10*, 708. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2019.00708

Olson, I. R., Plotzker, A., & Ezzyat, Y. (2007). The Enigmatic temporal pole: a review of findings on social and emotional processing. *Brain, 130*(Pt 7), 1718-1731. doi:10.1093/brain/awm052

Ozbaran, B., Kalyoncu, T., & Kose, S. (2018). Theory of mind and emotion regulation difficulties in children with ADHD. *Psychiatry Res, 270*, 117-122. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2018.09.034

Pineda-Alhucema, W., Aristizabal, E., Escudero-Cabarcas, J., Acosta-Lopez, J. E., & Velez, J. I. (2018). Executive Function and Theory of Mind in Children with ADHD: a Systematic Review. *Neuropsychology Review, 28*(3), 341-358. doi:10.1007/s11065-018-9381-9

Power, J. D. (2017). A simple but useful way to assess fMRI scan qualities. *Neuroimage, 154*, 150-158. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.08.009

Robinson, P., Barrett, B., Bateman, A., Hakeem, A., Hellier, J., Lemonsky, F., . . . Fonagy, P. (2014). Study Protocol for a randomized controlled trial of mentalization based therapy against specialist supportive clinical management in patients with both eating disorders and symptoms of borderline personality disorder. *BMC Psychiatry, 14*, 51. doi:10.1186/1471-244X-14-51

Rosval, L., Steiger, H., Bruce, K., Israel, M., Richardson, J., & Aubut, M. (2006). Impulsivity in women with eating disorders: problem of response inhibition, planning, or attention? *Int J Eat Disord, 39*(7), 590-593. doi:10.1002/eat.20296

Sacchetti, S., Robinson, P., Bogaardt, A., Clare, A., Ouellet-Courtois, C., Luyten, P., . . . Fonagy, P. (2019). Reduced mentalizing in patients with bulimia nervosa and features of borderline personality disorder: A case-control study. *BMC Psychiatry, 19*(1), 134. doi:10.1186/s12888-019-2112-9

Schmidt, U., Magill, N., Renwick, B., Keyes, A., Kenyon, M., Dejong, H., . . . Landau, S. (2015). The Maudsley Outpatient Study of Treatments for Anorexia Nervosa and Related Conditions (MOSAIC): Comparison of the Maudsley Model of Anorexia Nervosa Treatment for Adults (MANTRA) with specialist supportive clinical management (SSCM) in outpatients with broadly defined anorexia nervosa: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 83*(4), 796-807. doi:10.1037/ccp0000019

Schulte-Ruther, M., Mainz, V., Fink, G. R., Herpertz-Dahlmann, B., & Konrad, K. (2012). Theory of mind and the brain in anorexia nervosa: relation to treatment outcome. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry, 51*(8), 832-841 e811. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2012.06.007

Schultz, R. T., Grelotti, D. J., Klin, A., Kleinman, J., Van der Gaag, C., Marois, R., & Skudlarski, P. (2003). The role of the fusiform face area in social cognition: implications for the pathobiology of autism. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 358*(1430), 415-427. doi:10.1098/rstb.2002.1208

Schurz, M., Radua, J., Aichhorn, M., Richlan, F., & Perner, J. (2014). Fractionating theory of mind: a meta-analysis of functional brain imaging studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 42*, 9-34. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.01.009

Seitz, J., Kahraman-Lanzerath, B., Legenbauer, T., Sarrar, L., Herpertz, S., Salbach-Andrae, H., . . . Herpertz-Dahlmann, B. (2013). The role of impulsivity, inattention and comorbid ADHD in patients with bulimia nervosa. *PloS One, 8*(5), e63891. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0063891

Simmons, W. K., & Martin, A. (2009). The anterior temporal lobes and the functional architecture of semantic memory. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society, 15*(5), 645-649. doi:10.1017/S1355617709990348

Simonsen, C. B., Jakobsen, A. G., Grontved, S., & Kjaersdam Telleus, G. (2020). The mentalization profile in patients with eating disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nord J Psychiatry*, 1-12. doi:10.1080/08039488.2019.1707869

Strober, M., Freeman, R., & Morrell, W. (1997). The long-term course of severe anorexia nervosa in adolescents: survival analysis of recovery, relapse, and outcome predictors over 10-15 years in a prospective study. *Int J Eat Disord, 22*(4), 339-360. doi:10.1002/(sici)1098-108x(199712)22:4<339::aid-eat1>3.0.co;2-n

Svedlund, N. E., Norring, C., Ginsberg, Y., & von Hausswolff-Juhlin, Y. (2019). [Treatment of eating disorders with concurrent ADHD symptoms: knowledge, knowledge gaps and clinical implications]. *Lakartidningen, 116*. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31529419

Vandereycken, W. (2006). Denial of illness in anorexia nervosa—a conceptual review: part 1 diagnostic significance and assessment. *European Eating Disorders Review, 14*(5), 341-351. doi:10.1002/erv.721

Table 1 Demographics and clinical characteristics of female adolescents with bulimia nervosa, anorexia nervosa and respective healthy control.

	Bulimia Nervosa (N = 16)	Healthy Controls (N = 18)	Anorexia Nervosa Admission (N = 18)	Anorexia Nervosa Discharge (N = 18)	Healthy Controls (N = 20)
	BN	HC$_{BN}$	AN$_{T1}$	AN$_{T2}$	HC$_{AN}$
Age	17.81 (2.74)	17.5 (1.42)	15.69 (1.55)	16.03 (1.53)	15.85 (1.96)
(years)	[15;23]	[15;19]	[12.58;17.83]	[12.88;18.25]	[12.25; 18.78]
IQ	102.67 (10.22)	102.78 (7.67)	107.41 (7.75)	108.08 (5.84)	110.06 (15.95)
(points)	[86;118]	[93;124]	[90;120]	[99;120]	[90;135]
Body Mass Index	20.17 (2.30)	21.51 (2.57)	15.85 (1.55)	18.01 (1.06)	22.25 (3.38)
(kg/m²)	[17.3;24.8]	[16.9;27]	[16,17;19.87]	[16.17;19.87]	[18.33;32.14]
EDI 2	338.50 (77.51)	198.11 (55.52)	262.29 (56.14)	248.56 (64.22)	
(total score)	[204;463]	[135;334]	[130;350]	[130;350]	-
BDI 2	24.29 (15.40)	3.61 (5.12)	21.76 (10.52)	10.88 (8.87)	
(total score)	[1;48]	[0;21]	[0;28]	[0;28]	-
SIAB	85.06 (30.02)				
(total sum)	[34;152]	-			
Objective binge episodes	3.60 (8.99)				
(over last 2 weeks)	[0;35]	-			
Vomiting episodes	4.25 (8.96)				
(over last 2 weeks)	[0;35]	-			
Laxative use	0.31 (0.87)				
(last 2 weeks)	[0;3]	-			
ToM Social	83.06 (13.63)	77.28 (14.33)	81.39 (10.42)	81.25 (11.54)	78.40 (12.66)
(% correct)	[50;100]	[50;100]	[63;100]	[50;100]	[50;100]
ToM Physical	69.00 (19.28)	69,72 (15.65)	54.23 (15.35)	61.11 (18.10)	64.63 (17.31)
(% correct)	[38;100]	[38;88]	[13;75]	[29;100]	[25;88]
ToM Bumper	63.56 (15.44)	56.5 (16.29)	54.04 (23.79)	54.86 (22.34)	54.56 (17.67)
(% correct)	[38;88]	[25;88]	[13;100]	[25;100]	[25;88]

Note: EDI 2 = Eating Disorder Inventory 2; BDI 2 = Beck Depression Inventory 2; SIAB = structured interview for eating disorders; ToM = Theory of Mind.

Table 2 Peaks of Significant Group Differences

Anatomical Region	H	k	x	y	z	t
BN > HC$_{BN}$						
Medial PFC/frontal pole	R	9	16	58	24	5.26
Middle Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	L	6	-52	2	-26	5.25
Middle Temporal Gyrus/STS	R	2	58	-36	0	5.18
White matter	L	1	-26	-30	0	4.98
Hippocampus	L	1	-36	-32	-6	4.88
HC$_{AN}$ > AN$_{T1}$						
Medial Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	R	67	56	6	-20	6.40
Middle Temporal Gyrus/STS	R	120	48	-20	-8	6.17
Middle Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	L	5	-56	2	-14	5.39
Cerebellum (VII)	L	11	-22	-78	-38	5.33
Medial PFC/frontal pole	R	8	2	56	22	4.97
HC$_{AN}$ > AN$_{T2}$						
Middle Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	R	17	56	8	-18	5.89
Middle Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	L	6	-56	2	-14	5.49
Middle/Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	21	62	-16	-4	5.18
Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	1	62	-6	-4	4.86
Interactions BN-HC$_{BN}$ > AN$_{T1}$- HC$_{AN}$						
Middle Temporal Gyrus	R	250	48	-22	-8	6.43
Medial PFC	R	75	46	36	-10	6.06
Posterior PFC	R	20	8	18	64	5.80
Medial PFC/frontal pole	R	37	14	58	26	5.77
Medial Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	R	29	50	12	-26	5.52
Medial Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	L	5	-56	2	-14	5.21
Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	13	48	-40	24	5.17
Medial PFC	R	5	42	26	-16	4.90
Interactions BN-HC$_{BN}$ > AN$_{T2}$- HC$_{AN}$						
Medial Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	R	12	52	12	-22	5.63
Medial PFC/frontal pole	R	19	14	58	26	5.63
Medial Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	L	12	-52	2	-24	5.53
Middle Temporal Gyrus	R	14	56	-36	0	5.45
Middle Temporal Gyrus	L	8	-56	0	-12	5.42
Middle Temporal Gyrus	R	14	60	-12	-10	5.33
Middle Temporal Gyrus	R	8	50	-22	-8	5.11
Superior Medial Gyrus	L	6	-8	58	14	4.95

Note: Threshold p < .05 corrected for multiple comparisons at the cluster level (voxel level: p < .005, t > 2.60). H = hemisphere; k = cluster size; L = left; R = right.

Supplementary Table 1 Brain Activation Peaks of Significant Group Differences BN versus HC$_{BN}$ corrected for Depression and SSRI

Anatomical Region	H	k	x	y	z	t
BN > HC$_{BN}$ depression corrected						
White matter	L	1	-36	-32	-6	5.08
Middle Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	L	3	-52	2	-26	5.04
Medial PFC/frontal pole	R	6	14	58	26	5.02
Hippocampus	L	1	-34	-34	-10	4.90
BN > HC$_{BN}$ SSRI corrected						
Middle Temporal Gyrus	R	9	58	-36	0	5.33
Medial PFC/frontal pole	R	11	14	56	26	5.05

Note: Threshold p < .05 corrected for multiple comparisons at the cluster level (voxel level: p < .005, t > 2.60). H = hemisphere; k = cluster size; L = left; R = right.

Supplementary Table 2 Brain Activation Peaks of Significant Group Differences BN versus AN corrected for age

Anatomical Region	H	k	x	y	z	t
Interactions BN-HC$_{BN}$ > AN$_{T1}$-HC$_{AN}$ age corrected						
Middle Temporal Gyrus	R	262	48	-22	-8	6.14
Medial PFC	R	76	46	36	-10	5.82
Posterior PFC	R	19	8	18	64	5.54
Medial PFC/frontal pole	R	36	14	58	26	5.53
Medial Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	R	30	50	12	-26	5.34
Medial Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	L	5	-56	2	-14	5.22
Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	11	48	-40	24	5.12
Medial PFC	R	5	42	26	-16	4.93
Interactions BN-HC$_{BN}$ > AN$_{T1}$-HC$_{AN}$ age corrected						
Medial PFC/frontal pole	R	18	14	58	26	5.61
Medial Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	R	12	52	12	-22	5.58
Middle Temporal Gyrus	L	18	56	-36	0	5.54
Middle Temporal Gyrus/temporal pole	R	12	-52	2	-24	5.31
Middle Temporal Gyrus	L	9	-56	0	-12	5.26
Middle Temporal Gyrus	R	12	60	-12	-10	5.12
Middle Temporal Gyrus	R	8	50	-22	-8	4.93
Superior Medial Gyrus	L	6	-8	58	14	4.87

Note: Threshold p < .05 corrected for multiple comparisons at the cluster level (voxel level: p < .005, t > 2.60). H = hemisphere; k = cluster size; L = left; R = right.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig 1: ToM-Network: ToM vs non-ToM in BN and HC$_{BN}$ combined. Whole brain analysis, FWE corrected p<0.05

Fig 2 Hyperactivity in patients with BN: BN vs HC$_{BN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM). Significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected p<0.05, are depicted here p<0.001 uncorrected for display purposes only. Beta-plots of significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.

Fig 3 Close proximity of hyperactivity in patients with BN and hypoactivity in patients with AN at admission.
1st row: Hyperactivity in patients with BN: BN - HC$_{BN}$
2nd row: Hypoactivity in patients with AN: AN$_{T1}$-HC$_{AN}$
3rd row: Direct comparison of BN with AN$_{T1}$ (and their respective HC) BN>HC$_{BN}$ vs AN$_{T1}$ >HC$_{AN}$
4th row: Overlay demonstrating close proximity of hyper- and hypoactive regions. BN>HC$_{BN}$ in yellow, HC$_{AN}$>AN$_{T1}$ in blue, both BN>HC$_{BN}$ and HC$_{AN}$>AN$_{T1}$ in red, BN>AN$_{T1}$ (including respective HC) not overlapping with the first two in green.
All group comparisons used ToM vs non-ToM of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected p<0.05. Here, p<0.001 uncorrected is used for display purposes.

Sup Fig 1 Hypoactivity in acutely ill patients with AN: AN$_{T1}$ vs HC$_{AN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM) of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected p<0.05. Here, p<0.001 uncorrected is used for display purposes. Beta-plots of all significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.

Sup Fig 2 Hypoactivity in short term weight restored patients with AN: AN$_{T2}$ vs HC$_{AN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM) of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected p<0.05. Here, p<0.001 uncorrected is used for display purposes. Beta-plots of all significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.

Sup Fig 3 Direct comparison of BN and acutely ill AN (including their respective controls): Positive Contrast BN>HC$_{BN}$ vs AN$_{T1}$ >HC$_{AN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM) of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected p<0.05. Here, p<0.001 uncorrected is used for display purposes. Beta-plots of all significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.

Sup Fig 4 Direct comparison of BN and short time weight restored AN (including their respective controls): Positive Contrast BN>HC$_{BN}$ vs AN$_{T2}$ >HC$_{AN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM) of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected p<0.05. Here, p<0.001 uncorrected is used for display purposes. Beta-plots of all significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.

Sup Fig 5 Overlay demonstrating close proximity of hyper- and hypoactive regions. BN>HC$_{BN}$ in yellow, HC$_{AN}$>AN$_{T1}$ in blue, both BN>HC$_{BN}$ and HC$_{AN}$>AN$_{T1}$ in red, BN>AN$_{T1}$ (including respective HC) not overlapping with the first two in green. Significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected $p<0.05$. Here, $p<0.001$ uncorrected is used for display purposes only.

Sup Fig 6 Overlay demonstrating close proximity of hyper- and hypoactive regions. BN>HC$_{BN}$ in yellow, HC$_{AN}$>AN$_{T2}$ in blue, both BN>HC$_{BN}$ and HC$_{AN}$>AN$_{T2}$ in red, BN>AN$_{T2}$ (including respective HC) not overlapping with the first two in green. Significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected $p<0.05$. Here $p<0.001$ uncorrected is used for display purposes only.

Sup Fig 7 Direct comparison of BN and short time weight restored AN (including their respective controls): Positive Contrast BN>HC$_{BN}$ vs AN$_{T2}$ >HC$_{AN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM) of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected $p<0.05$. Here, $p<0.001$ uncorrected is used for display purposes. Beta-plots of all significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.

Sup Fig 8 Direct comparison of BN and short time weight restored AN (including their respective controls): Positive Contrast BN>HC$_{BN}$ vs AN$_{T2}$ >HC$_{AN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM) of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected $p<0.05$. Here, $p<0.001$ uncorrected is used for display purposes. Beta-plots of all significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.

Sup Fig 9 Direct comparison of BN and acutely ill AN (including their respective controls): Positive Contrast BN>HC$_{BN}$ vs AN$_{T1}$ >HC$_{AN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM) of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected $p<0.05$. Here, $p<0.001$ uncorrected is used for display purposes. Beta-plots of all significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.

Sup Fig 10 Direct comparison of BN and short time weight restored AN (including their respective controls): Positive Contrast BN>HC$_{BN}$ vs ANT2 >HC$_{AN}$ (ToM vs non-ToM) of significant clusters of the whole brain analysis, FWE corrected $p<0.05$. Here, $p<0.001$ uncorrected is used for display purposes. Beta-plots of all significant clusters include separate mean beta scores for both groups and s (social), b (bumper) and p (physical) respectively. Greater activation for social compared to bumper and physical (ToM vs non-ToM) supports regions being part of the ToM-network depicted in figure 1.