medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Title: The effect of body image preoccupation on decision making in eating disorders

Authors: Jakub Onysk, Peggy Seriès

Affiliation: University of Edinburgh

Author Note

Correspondence to:

Peggy Seriès (pseries@inf.ed.ac.uk), Institute for Adaptive and Neural Computation, 10 Crichton Street, Edinburgh EH8 9AB, UK

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Eating disorders are associated with one of the highest mortality rates among all mental disorders, yet there is very little research about them within the newly emerging and promising field of computational psychiatry. As such, we focus on investigating a previously unexplored, yet a core aspect of eating disorders – body image preoccupation. We continue a freshly opened debate about model-based learning in eating disorders and perform a study that utilises a two-step decision-making task and a reinforcement learning model to understand the effect of body image preoccupation on model-based learning in a subclinical eating disorder population, as recruited using Prolific. We find a significantly reduced model-based contribution in the body image disturbance task condition in the eating disorder group as compared to a healthy control. We propose a new digital biomarker that significantly predicts disordered eating, and body image issues.

Keywords: Computational psychiatry, reinforcement learning, eating disorders, body image, model-based learning, goal-directed control

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Eating disorders (ED) form a group of different conditions that, in an unhealthy and detrimental way, affects a person's relationship with food. This usually leads to physical and psychological problems, which severely decrease the quality of life. In fact, these problems can result in many deaths, as eating disorders are reported to have one of the highest, if not the highest, mortality rate among all mental disorders (Arcelus, Mitchell, Wales, & Nielsen, 2011; Fichter & Quadflieg, 2016; Godier & Park, 2014; Smink, van Hoeken, & Hoek, 2012).

Generally, ED involve heightened preoccupation with food, such as restriction, or consumption of unusually large amounts of food, which in some cases is followed by compensatory behaviours such as vomiting, use of laxatives, or overexercising (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). In extreme cases, eating disorders result in death either due to severe malnutrition, morbid obesity or suicide (Morris & Twaddle, 2007; Smink et al., 2012). Moreover, the recovery from ED can be as low as 24% even after 10 years (Berkman, Lohr, & Bulik, 2007), which in combination with high mortality and a significant decrease in quality of life, calls for extended research into the roots and treatments of ED.

In addition to eating related behaviours, one of the core symptoms of ED is body image disturbance, which can be understood as a negative misrepresentation of one's body, body image preoccupation, usually involving disgust, shame and dissatisfaction (Henn, Taube, Vocks, & Hartmann, 2019). We here aim to investigate how body image preoccupation in eating disorders affects basic mechanisms of decision making, namely, habitual (repeating of the same action as a response to a stimulus) and goal-directed (intentional and deliberate decision-making) behaviour (Dolan & Dayan, 2013). This will be captured in a computational framework – reinforcement learning (RL) – to better, and in a nuanced way describe the mechanisms at hand.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Background

Eating disorders.

To further describe ED, it is important to mention the three main types: Anorexia Nervosa (AN), Bulimia Nervosa (BN) and Binge-Eating Disorder (BED) as in 5th edition of The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). All share low life satisfaction, greatly impaired quality of life, and increased mortality or suicide risk.

Anorexia Nervosa.

AN is characterised by extreme restriction of food intake and the pursuit of weight loss. This is usually associated with an intense fear of gaining weight as well as with body image preoccupation. Individuals with AN tend to perform obsessive body-checks in the mirror and measuring of body parts. Even though it may be very rewarding for people with AN to notice weight-loss, the associated body image disturbance prevents them from recognising how malnourished they are, which furthers the cycle of restriction. Such behaviour usually, but not necessarily, leads to extremely low body weight. AN affects mainly females, but as males also suffer from the disorder.

Bulimia Nervosa.

BN differs from AN in that individuals with bulimia undergo recurrent episodes of binge eating followed by compensatory behaviours. Namely, they consume an unusually large amount of food in a relatively short amount of time, often to the point of pain, without much of a sense of control over their eating. To prevent a perceived weight gain that would follow a binge, they engage in behaviours such as self-induced vomiting, use of laxatives and diuretics, fasting,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

overexercising, and ingestion of weight-loss products or medications. These are usually associated with excessive self-evaluation of their body as a core determinant of self-worth.

Binge-Eating Disorder.

BED is very similar to BN in the presence of recurrent episodes of uncontrollable binge-eating, accompanied by the feeling of uncomfortable fullness, disgust and shame with oneself and eating problems. However, BED is not associated with compensatory behaviours as in BN. Moreover, the gender ratio of BED is less biased towards females.

Computational psychiatry.

One possible avenue to understand and help devise treatments for eating disorders, alongside the traditional approach of psychotherapy, psychiatry and neuroimaging (Kessler, Hutson, Herman, & Potenza, 2016; Linardon, Kothe, & Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, 2019; Simon et al., 2016) is the emerging field of computational psychiatry (CP). The field allows creating a framework that is able to provide a *digital* biomarker of different mental disorders. To achieve that, researchers focus on various modes of decision making that are tested with a mode-specific decision-making task and quantified with a computational model that captures individual and group differences (Q. J. M. Huys, Moutoussis, & Williams, 2011; Seriès, 2020). Some mental disorders such as schizophrenia, anxiety, and obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) have been linked to various such digital biomarkers of aberrations in a decision-making process (Raymond, Steele, & Seriès, 2017; Rocha, Alvarenga, Malloy-Diniz, & Corrêa, 2011; Valton, Romaniuk, Douglas Steele, Lawrie, & Seriès, 2017). Moreover, employing computational methods to understand mental disorders allows bridging the neurobiological and psychiatric levels of descriptions of an ill mind. Such link can lead to better and more advanced theories of mental

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

disorders, as well as inspires new treatment approaches, and promises improved early prevention (Q. J. Huys, Pizzagalli, Bogdan, & Dayan, 2013).

Computational psychiatry of eating disorders.

As mentioned above, depression, OCD, anxiety and schizophrenia have received a lot attention in the field of CP, with very promising results and theories. Eating disorders have received less attention: we could only find eleven papers in the last nine years about CP of eating disorders, either as a main subject or in a study of multiple disorders (Bernardoni et al., 2018; Chan et al., 2014; DeGuzman, Shott, Yang, Riederer, & Frank, 2017; Foerde et al., 2019; Frank, Reynolds, Shott, & O'Reilly, 2011; Giannunzio et al., 2018; Gillan, Kosinski, Whelan, Phelps, & Daw, 2016; Patzelt, Kool, Millner, & Gershman, 2019; Reiter, Heinze, Schlagenhauf, & Deserno, 2017; Verharen et al., 2019; Voon et al., 2015). For comparison, a number of papers on CP of schizophrenia by members of only one single group reaches 27 in the last eight years (TNU - publications, n.d.).

The main focus has been on two main aspects of decision making in eating disorders. One is related to how sensitive to punishments individuals with AN are, that is how well they are able to avoid negative experiences during a decision-making task, and how well they learn from negative feedback from the environment. Unfortunately, the results from five studies prove to be quite contradictory. For example, Bernardoni et al. (2018) show that sensitivity to punishments is increased in AN and they correlate this finding with neural features registered by fMRI using a slightly more nuanced version of the task used by Verharen et al. (2019), whose study suggests decreased sensitivity to punishments. While both studies provide fairly convincing support for their results, it is difficult to say whether AN are ultimately characterised by increased or decreased sensitivity to punishments.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The second main aspect of ED that has been of interest to computational psychiatrists is the trade-off between goal-directed and habitual system utilisation in decision-making. As mentioned in the introduction, goal-directed decision-making is related to acting in the environment with a goal in mind, intentionally and deliberately. It is usually characterised by forming an internal model of the environment that describes which states and actions will bring about the best results over prolonged time. On the other hand, habitual decision-making is associated with responding to stimuli in the environment in an automatic manner, without much deliberation, usually repeating those actions that immediately yield the best results. In this case, an agent does not create a model of the environment. As such, goal-directed behaviour utilises model-based learning, which allows building an accurate model of the states and actions and their associated values that takes into account a hidden probabilistic structure of the environment. However, this kind of learning is computationally more demanding, using more resources to support the process. The habitual behaviour employs model-free learning, which updates a running score of possible states and actions, based on the last experience, without registering any hidden structures in the environment. Such a process is computationally efficient as it relies mainly on the memory of the last events (Dolan & Dayan, 2013).

It has been shown that healthy population employs both model-free and model-based learning that trade off against each other (Daw, Gershman, Seymour, Dayan, & Dolan, 2011). Several studies attempted to see how this trade-off is different within eating disorders. The results are converging and suggest that sub-clinical ED group shows reduced model-based learning (Gillan et al., 2016) as well as clinical AN and BED groups (Foerde et al., 2019; Voon et al., 2015). Moreover, a recent study by Foerde et al.(2019) suggests an even more reduced utilisation of model-based learning in AN when the task is strictly food related as compared to a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

monetary task. This is of particular significance for two reasons. Firstly, AN is characterised by extreme pursuit of weight-loss, which can be understood as extreme goal-directed behaviour. As such, one would expect to see increased model-based learning in AN, yet the results suggest otherwise – such "goal-pursuit" of weight-loss in AN is actually habitual, almost compulsive. Secondly, the study investigates a food-related task (as opposed to monetary) that is relevant to eating disorders, and shows that model-based is further decreased compared to a monetary task.

Problem Statement

Evidently, there is little computational psychiatry research about eating disorders, which is surprising given the high mortality. As such, it is necessary to allocate more resources in that area, especially into the body image disturbance aspects, which being one of the core elements of the disorder has not been investigated.

Furthermore, some studies using model fitting methods during the investigation of the trade-off between model-based and model-free learning do not perform or ensure a good reliability analysis of the model and its fitting procedure (such as model comparison, parameter and model recovery) (Patzelt et al., 2019; Voon et al., 2015). As a result, the lack of reliability may potentially skew the interpretation and conclusions drawn.

Objectives and Hypothesis

To answer the above problems, we implement a decision-making task that captures both model-based and model-free contribution. The task is given to a sub-clinical population who score high on an eating disorder, and body image disturbance questionnaires. For comparison, a healthy control group (HC) is also be recruited.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Our aim is to extend the analysis of the trade-off between model-based and model-free learning (goal-directed and habitual behaviour) and explore how body image preoccupation affects the utilisation of model-based learning during decision-making. To do so, we analyse two task conditions, one of which targets the preoccupation with body image and its manifestation in decision making. The introduction of body image disturbance condition aims to create a context in which ED finds themselves during everyday struggle - excessive worry about body image and how to change it through dieting.

We hypothesise that: 1) In the monetary (neutral) condition and as described by previous studies, the group with ED will report a significantly decreased model-based learning and increased model-free learning as compared to HC. 2) Model-based learning will be further decreased in the body-image condition in the group with ED. HC will not report any significant differences between conditions.

Methods

Participants

An online study was performed. Participants for the study were recruited using Prolific, which is an online participant recruitment service used mainly for research and academic purposes (Prolific, n.d.). The platform provides a pool of participants that are reliable and allows to custom screen for different groups before recruitment.

Since for this study two groups were needed – a healthy control and an eating disorder group - we applied two separate sets of pre-screening criteria. For HC we looked for people who:

a) “Have never gone on a diet in the past.”

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

b) "Do no currently for at least one week restrict food intake to manage weight."

c) "Have no diagnosed mental health condition that is uncontrolled (by medication or intervention) and which has a significant impact on your daily life/activities."

d) "Do not have or have not had a diagnosed, on-going mental health illness or condition."

For ED, participants had to select that they have gone on a diet, as in criterion (a), and that they restrict food intake to either lose or maintain weight, as in criterion (b). Moreover, to ensure data of good quality both groups had additional criteria to meet:

(i) age between 18-38

(ii) have normal or corrected-to-normal vision

(iii) female as an assigned sex at birth

(iv) an approval rate of 98%

(v) a minimum of 20 previous submissions on Prolific.

Participants first completed a range of questionnaires to be then further selected to complete a decision-making task. The questionnaires were hosted on Qualtrics (an online survey software) (Qualtrics, n.d.), while the decision-making task was hosted partly on Qualtrics and partly on Pavlovia (an online behavioural experiment platform) (Pavlovia, n.d.), designed using PsychoPy software (PsychoPy, n.d.). For each part, participants were paid at a rate of £6.25 per hour. The questionnaire took on average 7 minutes to complete, while the task took on average 27 minutes. Subjects were based all around the world. The study was approved according to the University of Edinburgh's Informatics Research Ethics Process, with an RT number 2019/48215.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

After further selection based on questionnaires and application of exclusion criteria for the decision-making task (see Supplementary material), 38 (ED group) and 34 (HC group) participants were selected for data analysis.

A prior power analysis.

A prior power analysis was performed to determine the sample size needed (of each group) that achieves 80% power at the 5% level (for the sought significant difference) and at the 50% level (for the sought lack of significant difference between conditions in HC). We used G*Power software (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) in calculating the sample size of t-tests for: 1) the difference in mean model-based contribution between two conditions in both groups (two dependent means; matched pairs); 2) the difference in model-based contribution between two groups in the neutral condition (two independent means; two groups). Using means and twice the standard deviations[1] from a similar study (Foerde et al., 2019), the power analysis revealed that the first set of t-tests requires at least $n = 6$ ED and $n = 9$ HC participants, while the second requires $n = 38$ in each group.

Self-report questionnaires

In the first part of the study, participants answered questions about their age, gender, weight, and height. They also completed three questionnaires - Eating Attitudes Test (EAT-26) (Garner, Olmsted, Bohr, & Garfinkel, 1982), Appearance Anxiety Inventory (AAI) (Veale et al., 2014) and The Obsessive–Compulsive Inventory (OCI-R) (Foa et al., 2002) – to assess the

[1] due to the online and subclinical nature of the online task used in this study as compared to in-lab and clinical conditions of the reference study)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

spectrum of: an eating disorder, body image disturbance and obsessive-compulsive behaviours, respectively.

In order to create HC and ED groups, cut-off points were applied for the questionnaires as in the Table 1, chosen based on the literature. For EAT-26, it is suggested to use a cut-off of 11 for subclinical populations (Orbitello et al., 2006) that are characterised as displaying disordered eating behaviours that could warrant further clinical diagnosis. Hence, for HC we set a threshold of ≤ 10 and for ED ≥ 14 to achieve stronger effects. For AAI, a few cut-off points have been suggested: a score above 6 may suggest some issues with body image (Bjureberg et al., 2019), while scores between 15-20 is reported in an appearance-concerned adult population, and a score above 20 indicates a high-risk group for body image disturbance (Mastro, Zimmer-Gembeck, Webb, Farrell, & Waters, 2016). We therefore chose as cut-off for ED a score ≥ 14, whereas for HC a score of ≤ 10 was chosen. Lastly, an additional criterion for HC group was applied so that they do not display worrying obsessive-compulsive behaviours as these have also been associated with reduced model-based learning (Gillan et al., 2016). We selected a cut-off point of ≤ 10 on OCI-R questionnaire for HC, which is twice as low as the recommended optimal cut-off point (Foa et al., 2002). Moreover, two attention checks were implemented in the questionnaires to filter out participants not taking part in the study in good faith.

Table 1

Cut-off points for ED and HC on EAT-26, AAI, and OCI-R questionnaires

	HC	ED
EAT-26	≤10	≥14
AAI	≤10	≥14
OCI-R	≤10	any

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Two-step decision making task

Selected participants were asked to complete a two-step decision-making task in order to quantify model-based and model-free learning contribution (Daw et al., 2011).

Before proceeding with the task, participants were asked to select a body type that is most similar to their own from a diverse range of body types in the Supplementary Figure S1. Furthermore, they were instructed on how to complete the task by reading through an illustrated tutorial. After reading the instructions, they completed 25 trials of the task as a practice.



Figure 1. The structure of the two-step decision-making task. In the first stage (grey), a dashed arrow corresponds to a rare transition with the probability of 30%, while the bold arrow corresponds to a common transition with the probability of 70%. In the second stage, the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

speckled arrow is associated with the probability of receiving a reward. A duration of the stage is noted on the right side of it (stage one, two or the reward).

The task reproduces that of Daw et al. (2011) but was conceived as a treasure game to make it as engaging and easy to understand as possible (Figure 1). In the first stage (grey stage), participants are presented with a choice between two stimuli - on the left, a ship against a sunset, while on the right, a pirate ship near a lighthouse. They are asked to play a role of a treasure hunter and decide which ship to board. Each ship can sail to two destinations - a blue island and a purple island. The game has a hidden structure, which participants have to learn, such that the normal ship sails to the blue island 70% of the time (common transition) and to the purple island 30% of the time (rare transition), while the pirate ship sails to the blue island 30% of the time and to the purple island 70% of the time.

Once the participant boards the chosen ship, they are taken to one of the islands (stage two), where two chests await them. Here, they are asked to quickly select the chest to try their chances at finding a treasure (a pirate coin). However, each chest is assigned a probability of containing the coin, which evolves over time according to a Gaussian random walk with a standard deviation $\sigma = 0.0275$, as in the Figure 2 (more details in the Supplementary material). The job of the participant is to track, over time, which chest is the most favourable, i.e. has the highest chance of yielding the coin. After the chest is opened and the participant receives the coin (or not), they are taken back to the first stage to repeat the trial.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. The sample evolution of the reward probability for each of the chest in stage 2 over 150 trials, in the order as in Figure 1. The probabilities evolve according to a Gaussian random walk with $\sigma = 0.0275$. One set of two evolutions always starts randomly in a range [0.58, 0.72], while the other set of two starts in [0.31, 0.45]. The values of probabilities are bounded in [0.25, 0.75].

There are two conditions, 150 trials each. Each condition consists of two series of 75 trials, with a short break in between to counteract a possible loss of attention or tiredness. The neutral condition is exactly like in the Figure 1, with a pirate coin as a reward (Figure 3A). The other condition, the body image disturbance (BID) condition, differs from the neutral in that the reward is a pirate coin next to a body type that the participant selected as the most similar to their own (Figure 3C). The aim of the BID condition is to gauge the effects of body image preoccupation on decision-making.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 3. Possible reward outcomes during the task. In the neutral condition, participants could receive either **A** or **B**, while in the BID condition they could receive either **C** or **B**. An empty box **B** indicates no reward. The body type was selected by the participant before the task, more body type examples can be found in the Supplementary Figure S1.

For a balanced design half of the participants in each group completed the neutral condition first, followed by the BID condition. The other half completed the task in a reverse order. All results are then based on the average across two subgroups.

Model-based and model-free learning in the task.

The reason to use the task to capture the contribution of model-based and model-free learning lies in the stage-like structure and probabilistic nature of the task, thanks to which we can easily distinguish between two strategies a participant can have, usually is a mix of the two.

For the purpose of this example, we focus on two extreme cases (Gillan et al., 2016). On one hand, an agent could utilise only model-free learning strategy. This means that they would make their decision as to which ship and chest to select purely based on the reward they received (or lack thereof), usually repeating the rewarded action, regardless of the fact the transition type. On the other hand, a participant who uses only model-based strategy, takes into account the learnt transition structure of the task, on top of the knowledge about previous rewards. Moreover, they track the probability of receiving the reward to know which chest is the most favourable.

Model-based and model free learning - an RL model

The model has two stages, which are described and quantified below (Foerde et al., 2019; Gillan et al., 2016). For simplicity, we begin with the update equation of the state-action value

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

function, $Q^{II}(s_2, c_2)$ for the second stage states and actions. There are two possible stage two states s_2: 1 - the blue island; 2 - the purple island, such that $s_2 \in \{1,2\}$. On each island, an agent can make two separate choices c_2: L - open the left chest; R - open the right chest, such that $c_2 \in \{L, R\}$. Moreover, after opening the chest, the agent can receive the reward, $r \in \{0,1\}$, where 0 corresponds to an empty chest, and 1 corresponds to the pirate coin. At the start of the task all value functions are initialised at zero. On any trial, t, we update the value function $Q^{II}(s_2, c_2)$ of the visited state and action taken as in the Eq. 1. The subscript, t, indicates the current trial values, whereas $t + 1$ indicates the values at the following trial. α is the learning rate.

$$Q_{t+1}^{II}(s_{2,t}, c_{2,t}) = (1 - \alpha)Q_t^{II}(s_{2,t}, c_{2,t}) + r_t \quad (1)$$

To calculate the probability of making a choice $c \in \{L, R\}$ at stage two, we use the *softmax* function as in Eq. 2, with an inverse temperature parameter β_2 quantifying the influence of the value function on making the choice.

$$P(c_{2,t} = c) = \frac{\exp\{\beta_2 Q_t^{II}(s_{2,t}, c)\}}{\sum_{c' \in \{L,R\}} \exp\{\beta_2 Q_t^{II}(s_{2,t}, c')\}} \quad (2)$$

In stage one, we directly see how model-free and model-based learning play their part. Here, we have two sets of update equations. The first set, Eq. 4-5 is model-based, where the agent uses their knowledge about the environment - which stage two state-action is the best as well as the structure of the task (common vs. rare transition) to update the values of the ships in stage one. In this case, the value functions for both ships are updated simultaneously, such that the value of choosing the normal ship is the maximum over stage two actions on the blue island, while the value of the pirate ship is the maximum over stage two actions on the purple island (common transitions).

$$\boldsymbol{Q_t^{MB}} = [Q_t^{MB}(c_{1,t} = L), Q_t^{MB}(c_{1,t} = R)] \quad (3)$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

$$Q_t^{MB}(c_{1,t} = L) = \max_{c_2}\{Q_t^{II}(s_2 = 1, c_2)\} \quad (4)$$

$$Q_t^{MB}(c_{1,t} = R) = \max_{c_2}\{Q_t^{II}(s_2 = 2, c_2)\} \quad (5)$$

The second, model-free update in Eq. 6, updates the values of the ships based only on the reward received at the end of the trial.

$$Q_{t+1}^{MF}(c_{1,t}) = (1 - \alpha)Q_t^{MF}(c_{1,t}) + r_t \quad (6)$$

Model-free and model-based contributions are joined together in a weighted value function over two ship choices, Q^I, as in Eq. 7.

$$Q_t^I(c) = \beta_{MB}Q_t^{MB}(c) + \beta_{MF}Q_t^{MF}(c) + \rho I(c = c_{1,t-1}) \quad (7)$$

The contribution of each system is captured with β_{MB} (model-based) and β_{MF} (model-free) parameters. An additional indicator $I(c = c_{1,t-1})$ tells if the choice made on the current trial is repeated as in the previous one, with a parameter ρ describing how much switching or staying is done regardless of the feedback. Finally, the probability of choosing either ship is calculated as in Eq. 8, analogously to the second stage.

$$P(c_{1,t} = c) = \frac{\exp\{Q_t^I(c)\}}{\sum_{c' \in \{L,R\}} \exp\{Q_t^I(c')\}} \quad (8)$$

Unvisited states and unchosen actions were decayed by $(1 - \alpha)$. The model has a total of five parameters: $\beta_{MB}, \beta_{MF}, \beta_2, \alpha, \rho$.

Model reliability analysis

A model reliability analysis was done before (pre-hoc) and after (post-hoc) data collection. It consists of parameter and model recovery, and model comparison with alternative models. The analysis revealed that the model described above is satisfactorily reliable and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

superior to other alterative models considered, with average parameter recovery Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC = 0.83). More details can be found in the Supplementary material.

Model-based learning difference - predictor

An additional measure was introduced, $\Delta\beta_{MB} = \beta_{MB,neutral} - \beta_{MB,BID}$, to capture the difference in model-based learning across conditions ($neutral - BID$). The measure quantifies how much influence body image preoccupation has on model-based learning. Similar measures were calculated for other parameters.

$\Delta\beta_{MB}$ was used as a predictor of questionnaire scores and of a group (HC or ED) in a linear ($m1 - m3$) and logistic regression ($m4$). Models were implemented in R:

$m1 - m3$: lm(QS~ $\Delta\beta_{MB}$), where QS∈{EAT-26, AAI, OCI-R}

$m4$: glm(group~ $\Delta\beta_{MB}$, family=binomial()), where group∈{HC, ED}

Results

Model reliability

Pre- and post-hoc model reliability analysis was performed for 35 subjects, based on 150 trials of the task (unless otherwise specified). The procedures revealed that model 1, as described in the Methods, provides the best and most reliable fit to the data. It had the lowest BIC score, the best parameter recovery and it was recovered well. Therefore, model 1 was used to analyse the collected data. Detailed results from the model reliability analysis can be found in the Supplementary material.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Post-hoc parameter recovery of the best model.

We repeated post-hoc parameter recovery of the best model for sufficient number of EM iterations, this time for 50 runs, to illustrate and provide a more detailed analysis. The average Pearson correlation coefficients (PCCs) from 50 runs of the procedure are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Mean and standard deviation of Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) of each model parameter

mean ±SD	β_{MB}	β_{MF}	β_2	α	ρ
PCC	0.68±0.10	0.82± 0.06	0.88±0.04	0.91±0.05	0.86±0.06

Note. This is averaged across 50 runs of parameter recovery procedure of the best model (model 1), each with a different seed, with sufficient number of EM iterations.

The PCCs from a sample parameter recovery run for the best model (model 1) are plotted in Figure 4.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Recovered vs. simulated model parameters from a sample run of parameter recovery procedure for the best model. PCC was marked as a diagonal line with a PCC slope fitted to the recovered parameters. Simulated parameters were drawn from a Normal distribution with mean±SD of the fitted parameter values of ED group in a neutral condition as the mean and covariance matrix of the distribution.

The parameter of most interest, β_{MB}, has an average PCC of 0.68, which is sufficient to use in the analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Demographic and questionnaires summary

The screening procedures resulted in recruiting two significantly different groups - healthy control (HC) and eating disorder (ED). The summarised information, along with two-sample t-tests, can be found in Table 3. The groups are mainly characterised by average total scores on the three questionnaires. HC scored on average 3.21, 4.76, 5.62, while ED scored: 30.71, 26.97, 26.05 on EAT-26, AAI and OCI-R questionnaires, respectively. This is significantly different across all questionnaires ($p<0.001$). Since the groups also significantly differ in age and Body Mass Index (BMI), these variables were included as covariates in the regression analysis to see if they explain the variance.

Table 3

Summary of demographic information and questionnaire scores in each group (HC and ED)

	HC (n=34) Mean ±SD	ED (n=38) Mean ±SD	t value	p value
Age	26.29 ± 4.66	30.71 ± 4.45	-4.11	**<0.001***
BMI (kg/m^2)	21.73 ± 4.23	26.97 ± 7.42	-3.40	**0.001***
EAT-26	3.21 ± 2.82	26.05 ± 10.78	-11.99	**<0.001***
AAI	4.76 ± 2.91	23.82 ± 7.09	-14.60	**<0.001***
OCI-R	5.62 ± 3.41	22.97 ± 11.1	-8.75	**<0.001***

Note. This includes means and standard deviations (SD) of age, BMI, EAT-26, AAI, and OCI-R scores, as well as t- and p- values of the two-sample t-tests.

Task performance - rewards and reaction times

Firstly, the performance in the task was analysed independent of the reinforcement learning model. Average characteristics were calculated for each group (detailed results in Table S2).These model-independent measures include: total reward in the neutral and BID condition, and the total reward after completing the full task, as well as mean reaction times (RT) during the neutral, BID, and across both conditions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The only significant difference (p=0.0463) is in the total reward received during the neutral condition, where, on average, ED received significantly less total reward (77.66) than HC (82.15). All the other measures do not differ between groups.

RL parameter estimates - model-based and model-free learning

RL model parameters were fit as described in the Methods and the Supplementary material. For each subject, a relative model-based fractional reliance was also calculated, treated as a new parameter (Foerde et al., 2019):

$$w = \frac{\beta_{MB}}{\beta_{MB} + \beta_{MF}}$$

A comparison of average parameter estimates with standard errors (SE) of $\beta_{MB}, \beta_{MF,}$, α, w between groups and conditions can be found in Figure 5.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 5. Mean $\pm$ standard error (SE) of the estimated model parameters in HC (blue) and ED (red) during each condition (neutral and BID). **A:** β_{MB}, **B**: β_{MF}, **C:** α, **D:** w.

The initial results suggest that ED is less model-based (β_{MB}, w) than HC in both conditions. ED is also less model-free β_{MF} than HC. There is no visible difference in the learning rate, α, between groups in the neutral condition, while ED has a smaller α in the BID condition. A detailed statistical analysis of the results is performed below.

Results from two-sample t-tests.

To look for significant differences in parameter estimates between groups and conditions two-sample t-tests were performed. The results of the statistical tests can be found for the: comparison of the parameters between neutral and BID conditions in HC (Table 5); comparison of the parameters between neutral and BID conditions in ED (Table 6); comparison of parameters between groups in a neutral and BID condition (main left and right column in Table 7, respectively). There were no significant results for the ρ parameter (supplementary Tables S12-S14).

For HC there was no significant difference in parameter estimates between the neutral and BID condition. However, there was a strong significant difference in the model-based learning parameter, β_{MB}, between the two conditions in the eating disorder group. In the neutral condition, ED had an average $\beta_{MB} = 0.21$, which dropped significantly ($p<0.001$) to $\beta_{MB} = 0.06$ in the BID condition.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 5

Comparison of estimated model parameters, $\beta_{MB}, \beta_{MF}, \alpha, w$, *in HC between two conditions*

HC (n=34)				
	neutral Mean ±SD	BID Mean ±SD	t value	p value
β_{MB}	0.43 ± 0.50	0.53 ± 0.75	-0.62	0.538
β_{MF}	1.40 ± 0.94	1.39 ± 0.46	0.04	0.972
α	0.50 ± 0.26	0.61 ± 0.27	-1.73	0.088
w	0.17 ± 0.44	0.21 ± 0.27	-0.44	0.660

Note. Includes two-sample t-tests (including t- and p-values).

Table 6

Comparison of estimated model parameters, $\beta_{MB}, \beta_{MF}, \alpha, w$, *in ED between two conditions*

ED (n=38)				
	neutral Mean ±SD	BID Mean ±SD	t value	p value
β_{MB}	0.21 ± 0.15	0.06 ± 0.06	5.66	**<0.001***
β_{MF}	0.84 ± 0.67	0.99 ± 0.63	-1.02	0.313
α	0.49 ± 0.27	0.49 ± 0.28	0.11	0.912
w	0.11 ± 0.39	0.02 ± 0.58	0.74	0.463

Note. Includes two-sample t-tests (including t- and p-values).

Furthermore, comparing the estimated parameters in the neutral condition between groups showed a significant difference in $\beta_{MB} = 0.43$ (HC), $\beta_{MB} = 0.21$ (ED) (p=0.0096) and in $\beta_{MF} = 1.4$ (HC), $\beta_{MF} = 0.84$ (p=0.0049). The difference in the BID condition was also significant between the two groups for $\beta_{MB} = 0.53$ (HC), $\beta_{MB} = 0.06$ (ED) (p=0.0003), but also for $\beta_{MF} = 1.39$ (HC), $\beta_{MF} = 0.99$ (ED) (p=0.0036). There were no differences between groups and conditions for the learning rate, α and the relative model-based fractional reliance, w.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 7

Difference in model parameters, in a neutral and BID condition between two groups

	neutral HC vs neutral ED		BID HC vs BID ED	
	t value	p value	t value	p value
β_{MB}	-2.67	**0.010***	-3.85	**<0.001***
β_{MF}	-2.90	**0.005***	-3.01	**0.004***
α	-0.06	0.955	-1.87	0.066
w	-0.63	0.529	-1.69	0.095

Note. Includes two-sample t-tests (including t- and p-values).

These results suggest that ED group is less model-based in the BID condition vs. the neutral condition, but also less model-based than HC across both conditions. Moreover, the ED group appears less model-free in the neutral and BID condition than HC. The unexpected decreased model-free learning result, along with decreased model-based learning in ED may suggest an overall decreased learning capability of ED during the task. Alternatively, model-free parametrisation in model 1 using just β_{MF} might incorrectly capture model-free contribution, while model 2 parametrisation might be more accurate in splitting model-free learning parameter: β_{MF}=$\beta_{MF0} + \beta_{MF1}$ (Supplementary material). An additional and more comprehensive study would have to be designed to verify these suggestions.

Results from regression analysis.

To further test the effect of the group and condition on the model-based parameter β_{MB}, a random effects linear regression was performed with group and condition as fixed effects per subject. The regression results can be found in Table 8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 8

Random effects linear regression analysis of model-based learning parameter β_{MB}(simple)

(AIC=176.18)	Estimate	SE	t value	p value
Intercept (HC, neutral)	0.43	0.08	5.89	**<0.001***
ED group	-0.23	0.11	-2.16	**0.033***
BID condition	0.10	0.08	1.28	0.206
ED group × BID condition	-0.24	0.10	-2.33	**0.023***

Note. Group and condition are treated as fixed-effect covariates per subject. Akaike information criterion (AIC) is included for comparison to a model with age and BMI as extra covariates in Table 9. More details about the regression model are in the Supplementary material.

There is a significant effect of ED (p=0.0329) and its interaction with a BID condition (p=0.0226) on the model-based parameter β_{MB}. The regression coefficient estimates correspond to β_{MB} values in each group-condition, as in Tables 5-6.

To see if age and BMI can have an effect on model-based learning, a more complex regression model with age and BMI as extra covariates was fitted as in Table 9.

Table 9

Random effects linear regression analysis of model-based learning parameter β_{MB}(nested)

(AIC=187.38)	Estimate	SE	t value	p value
Intercept (HC, neutral)	0.43	0.08	5.89	0.061
ED group	-0.23	0.11	-2.16	0.103
BID condition	0.10	0.08	1.28	0.233
Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.69	0.494
BMI	0.00	0.01	-0.04	0.969
ED group × BID condition	-0.24	0.10	-2.33	**0.034***

Note. Group, condition, age and BMI are treated as fixed-effect covariates per subject. AIC is included for comparison with a simpler model in Table 8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

However, in this case, the more complex model does not show any significant effects of age and BMI on β_{MB} (only the interaction of being in the ED group and the BID condition). The Akaike information criterion (AIC) was computed for that model for comparison with a simpler model. The simpler model provides a better fit since it has a lower AIC=176.18 as compared to the model with age and BMI (AIC=187.38).

Difference between parameters across conditions

To further examine the effect of body image preoccupation on decision-making, new variables, $\Delta\beta_{MB}, \Delta\beta_{MF}, \Delta\alpha, \Delta w$, were calculated to capture how much model parameters changed from the neutral condition in the BID condition. The mean values with standard errors of the parameter differences for each group are shown in Figure 6.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 6. Mean $\pm$ standard error (SE) of the estimated model parameter differences between conditions in HC (blue) and ED (red). **A:** $\Delta\beta_{MB}$, **B**: $\Delta\beta_{MF}$, **C:** $\Delta\alpha$, **D:** Δw.

Preliminary inspection suggests that the parameter differences analysis shows a positive difference of model-based contribution in ED as compared to HC (negative difference), which means that model-based learning decreased in ED and increased in HC between conditions. There is also a negative difference in model-free learning for ED, with no change for HC, while the learning rate remains the same in ED and improves in HC. Fractional reliance, w, reflects the behaviour of $\Delta\beta_{MB}$.

Results from two-sample t-tests $\Delta\beta_{MB}$.

Further statistical analysis based on two-sample t-tests revealed a significant difference of $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ (p=0.0226) and $\Delta\alpha$ (p=0.0428) between HC and ED, with ED having a larger difference of $\Delta\beta_{MB} = 0.15$ than HC ($\Delta\beta_{MB} =$ -0.1). Also, ED almost do not adjust their learning rate ($\Delta\alpha$ = 0.01), as compared to an increased learning rate in HC ($\Delta\alpha$ = -0.11). More detailed results of the statistical tests can be found in Table 10. There were no significant results for the $\Delta\rho$ parameter differences (supplementary Tables S15).

Table 10

Comparison of model parameter differences $\Delta\beta_{MB}, \Delta\beta_{MF}, \Delta\alpha, \Delta w$ between groups

	HC (n=34)	ED (n=38)		
	Mean $\pm$SD	Mean $\pm$SD	t value	p value
$\Delta\beta_{MB}$	-0.10 ± 0.62	0.15 ± 0.15	2.33	**0.023***
$\Delta\beta_{MF}$	0.01 ± 0.76	-0.15 ± 0.58	-0.99	0.325
$\Delta\alpha$	-0.11 ± 0.19	0.01 ± 0.28	2.06	**0.043***
Δw	-0.04 ± 0.45	0.08 ± 0.67	0.91	0.368

Note. Includes associated two-sample t tests, including t- and p-values.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Results suggests that the body image preoccupation significantly reduces model-based learning in ED compared to HC. Moreover, ED does not exhibit any adjustment of learning rate due to body image preoccupation, compared to adjusted α in HC.

$\Delta\beta_{MB}$ as a predictor - results from regression analysis.

The new variable, $\Delta\beta_{MB}$, was used a predictor (digital biomarker) in different regression models of independent variables such as: group (logistic regression), as well as disordered eating, body image disturbance, and OCD-like behaviours based on the questionnaire scores (linear regression). The regression results are found in Table 11.

Table 11

Regression analysis results of different independent variables, y, with $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ as a covariate

Independent variable	$\Delta\beta_{MB}$ coeff.	p value
Disordered eating	7.36	**0.044***
Body image disturbance	6.40	**0.026***
OCD	5.73	0.070
Group (log odds for ED)	1.49	**0.041***

Note. y was taken to be: EAT-26 (disordered eating), AAI (body image disturbance), OCI-R (OCD) scores, and log odds of being in the ED group.

Different regression models show that the new measure $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ can be used to predict disordered eating, body image disturbance, as well as belonging to the ED group. However, the measure does not significantly predict OCD-like behaviours. The classification performance for the logistic regression model can be found in classification (contingency) Table 12, with HC as a negative class and ED as a positive class.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 12

The contingency table for logistic regression of group with $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ as a predictor

Obs. \ Pred.	HC (−)	ED (+)
HC (−)	16	18
ED (+)	5	33

Note. ED is a positive class (+), HC is a negative class (−).

The logistic regression model appears to be good at predicting that a person is qualified as ED - 33 true positives and 5 false negatives. However, the model performs less accurately in predicting HC membership – 16 true negatives and 18 false positives.

Correlations of $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ with other covariates.

Lastly, we checked if the new variable $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ correlates with any other covariates such as BMI, age, EAT-26, AAI, and OCI-R scores in the ED group. The correlation plots with PCCs and p-values for the hypothesis of no relationship between $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ and the covariates can be found in Figure 7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 7. Correlation plot of BMI, age, EAT-26, AAI and OCI-R scores with $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ in ED group. Pearson's correlation coefficient (PCC) and p-values are included.

The correlation analysis revealed that $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ has a significantly negative correlation with BMI (p=0.013) in ED group, which means that the higher the $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ the lower the BMI. For the other covariates there is no correlation with $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ in the ED group.

Further analysis of covariate correlation with $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ in both groups revealed two positive correlations with EAT-26 and AAI scores (Table 13, Figure 8). This shows the value of the predictor for characterising disordered behaviours across a population.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 8. Correlation plot of BMI, age, EAT-26, AAI and OCI-R scores with $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ across both groups. Pearson's correlation coefficient (PCC) and p-values are included.

Table 13

PCC between $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ and the covariates across HC and ED together

	BMI	Age	EAT-26	AAI	OCI-R
PCC	0.107	-0.118	0.238	0.262	0.215
p-value	0.404	0.324	**0.044***	**0.026***	0.070

Note. P-values for the hypothesis of no relationship between the $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ and covariates (BMI, age, EAT-26, AAI, and OCI-R scores) are included.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

The current study focused on the missing element in computational psychiatry research on eating disorders - body image preoccupation. In particular, the impaired utilisation of goal-directed and habitual behaviour was explored.

First of all, the findings from a two-step decision-making task show a significant effect of body image preoccupation (as implemented in a BID condition) on model-based learning in an eating disorder group. This suggests that body image preoccupation significantly reduces goal-directed behaviour in a population struggling with both disordered eating and body image issues. We did not find such an effect in a healthy control, which suggest the effect is indeed disorder related. Additionally, the reduction in model-based learning across conditions was not associated with age nor BMI, when comparing two groups.

Furthermore, treating the difference between the measures of model-based learning in the neutral and BID condition as a new variable (digital biomarker), we have shown that it is a good predictor of disordered eating behaviours, body image disturbance, and being qualified to an eating disorder group. It was not associated with OCD-like behaviours. This is an important finding that extends previous results that correlate reduced model-based learning in one general set of eating disorders and compulsive disorders (Gillan et al., 2016; Voon et al., 2015). It is a promising variable that could help better understand the mechanisms of eating disorder psychopathology on a more fine-grained level.

Moreover, we replicated previous findings that suggest a decreased model-based learning, during a neutral (monetary) condition of the two-step decision-making task, in groups characterised by disordered eating and compulsive behaviours (Foerde et al., 2019; Gillan et al.,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2016; Voon et al., 2015), while ensuring a reliable modelling procedure through an application of parameter and model recovery before and after collecting the data.

The results confirm the set hypothesis of decreased model-based learning between groups and between conditions in ED. However, the simultaneous decrease in model-free learning in this group is surprising and will deserve further investigation. This result is also contrary to previous studies that find no difference in model-free learning between groups (Foerde et al., 2019; Gillan et al., 2016). A potential reason for the difference of results is the high heterogeneity in the estimates of model-free learning parameter both in ED and HC group, which may have skewed the results. In fact, HC group, in general, has more heterogeneous estimates of parameters than ED. This may be due to the HC group being in fact composed of different subgroups, possibly even along the eating disorder continuum, for example if they were not entirely sincere when answering the questionnaires. Alternatively, ED may exhibit a generally reduced learning capability, or model 1 does not accurately capture the model-free contribution.

Implications

First of all, as far as we know, this is the first study that looked at the body image preoccupation from a computational perspective. We singled out and verified a potential digital biomarker of eating disorders. Our study complies with a novel RDoC framework (Insel et al., 2010) that aims to investigate and understand mental disorders by integrating many levels of information such as behaviour and self-report. Such a framework helps overcome the downsides of a classical psychiatric approach, namely, comorbidity[2] of disorders, heterogeneity[3], and

[2] Co-existence of multiple disorders in one individual
[3] Qualifying for the same diagnosis despite totally different symptoms

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

arbitrary definition of what constitutes a disorder (NIMH, n.d.). The proposed new biomarker is based in a rigorous and quantified behavioural paradigm that addresses an underlying mechanism of the disorder - body image preoccupation effect on model-based learning.

The fact that body image preoccupation is associated with decreased contribution of model-based learning provides some support for the hypothesised mechanism of extreme habitual body preoccupation. “I want to be skinny” once set as a goal, evolves over time into a rigid and habitual body checking. In the neutral condition, there is a fairly good amount of model-based learning contribution (though less so than in the healthy control group). However, when an individual's body type is displayed onto a screen it may act as a trigger for the habitual behaviour of body comparison and concern. As such, a body-preoccupied state leads to significant reduction in the model-based capabilities that should be allocated towards task completion. Our result adds to the discussion reopened by Foerde et al. (2019) about domain-general/specific deficits in goal-directed learning. It provides support for the view that goal-directed control impairments are not specific to monetary tasks but suggests that it could be aggravated in conditions that trigger body image preoccupations.

Moreover, the new biomarker, $\Delta\beta_{MB}$, could be used as a diagnostic tool, since it was shown to be a significant predictor of EAT-26 and AAI scores, as well as of belonging to an eating disorder group. In some cases, where obtaining a reliable and honest set of answer to questionnaires is not available, one could administer the two-step decision making task that includes the BID condition, even in the comfort of an individual's home, and use the results from the task as a guideline for professional psychotherapists as to whether purse further treatment avenues.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The high heterogeneity (standard deviation) of parameter estimates (model-based/free) in the healthy control may suggest that some healthy controls share some traits with the ED group that explains reduced model-based learning. This might be related to traits that we have not directly explored in our study but that have been associated with deficits in model-based learning, e.g. alcohol addiction, or impulsivity (Gillan et al., 2016). We assume that compulsivity's negative effect on model-based learning (Gillan et al., 2016) is not a factor here as we have tried to control for this by excluding participants with high OCI-R scores in the healthy control group. Alternatively, it is possible that some participants from a healthy control group do in fact have body image preoccupation issues. A potential factor in group misclassification could be a wide-spread and widely accepted societal preoccupation with dieting, looks as well as the phenomenon of body shaming that could render the recruitment of a 'healthy' population difficult (Kar, 2019; Sujoldzić & De Lucia, 2007). This could manifest in participants as selecting the option of "no past diet experience" in the screening stage despite 'clean eating' they might engage in as a widely accepted 'health standard', which is actually emotionally distressing and linked with functional impairments (Ambwani, Shippe, Gao, & Austin, 2019). As such, the heterogeneity in the parameter estimates in the healthy control may highlight the blurred boundary between health and dieting, and indeed call into question the possibility of a truly healthy control group within this field of research.

Lastly, the results can inspire modern therapy avenues to strengthen model-based learning capabilities and help relax rigidly formed disordered eating and body preoccupation habits. For example, Costin and Grabb (Costin & Grabb, 2012) suggest that within each sufferer of an eating disorder there are two 'Selves': The "Healthy Self" - a part of them that wants recovery and fosters healthy habits- and "the Eating Disorder Self", which overtime gains its identity through

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

repeated binges and/or restriction and depreciative, critical self-talk, becomes a strong and automatic driving force of disordered behaviour. The latter could correspond to the diminished contribution of model-based learning, present as a lack of recognition of all behavioural pathways available, namely the healthy ones that are more beneficial to an individual over time.

Authors suggest that in order to move towards recovery, sufferers should reinforce their Healthy Self. This is done through therapeutic activities that counter negative thoughts (and corresponding behaviours) with healthy thoughts (and corresponding behaviours). As a result, the sufferers begin to identify and choose new pathways. They find that the dire consequences as imagined by the Eating Disorder Self do not come to fruition, while the quality of life and relationship to body and food improves.

The principal idea behind such a therapeutic technique is that eventually the sufferers' Healthy Self comes to dominate and assimilate into their one true Self. They are left more open to choosing paths that are - according to their (new, truly healthful) experience - more likely to be beneficial for their health, both mentally and physically. Essentially, this corresponds to reinforcing model-based learning by taking a look at one's environment and following actions that are more thought-through and sufficiently analysed through a non-distorted lens. The results from our study offer additional support that people struggling with eating disorders accompanied by body image disturbance might benefit from such, and similar, therapeutic activities.

Limitations

Kool et al. (Kool, Cushman, & Gershman, 2016) suggest that the structure of the two step decision making task used here does not accurately estimate the trade-off between model-based and model-free learning. The authors propose certain modifications to the task to increase that

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

accuracy such as changing the drift rate in the Gaussian random walk of reward probabilities, reducing the number of stage two choices to one per state, or introducing a deterministic transition structure. However, it has been shown that in some cases of slight variations to the task structure, the reinforcement learning model will not be able to distinguish between model-based and model-free actions as efficiently as in the standard task (Silva & Hare, 2018). More analysis would have to be performed for every variation, while the task in the current form has proven to yield reliable and consistent results (Foerde et al., 2019; Gillan et al., 2016; Voon et al., 2015).

An additional insight that should be taken into consideration is that a plain interaction between just model-based and model-free learning might not be enough to explain the choices and decision-making styles of individuals under the current conception of two step tasks as well as the models associated with it. Possibly, the surprising results about $\Delta\beta_{MF}$ can be explained by an additional learning system. Moreover, it is important to take extra precautions to ensure a solid understanding of the task by participants, as it has been shown that participants are likely to misconstrue the task. All together, it might be useful to consider additional learning strategies and models aside from the currently used model-based and model-free learning systems (Feher da Silva & Hare, 2020).

Two potential issues with the used modelling procedures are: a relatively low PCC of $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ (0.68) compared to other parameters (mean: 0.87); negative values of the model-based fractional reliance parameter, w, that is usually in a $(0,1)$ range (Daw et al., 2011; Foerde et al., 2019; Kool et al., 2016). We believe that two issues are connected to each other. The link lies in the fact the estimates of $\Delta\beta_{MB}, \Delta\beta_{MF}$ can be negative from the start due to an unsuitable prior distribution (Gaussian) they are drawn from. A better choice for the prior is a Gamma distribution, whose random variables are only positive and hence would constrain $\Delta\beta_{MB}, \Delta\beta_{MF}$ to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

be greater than zero. Further, EM fitting algorithm would have to be slightly tweaked to take into account the new distribution in estimating its hyper-parameters. In turn, this would place the model-based fractional reliance w between 0 and 1, and would hopefully increase the parameter recovery thanks to a correct distribution.

What is more, the variable estimates of $\Delta\beta_{MF}$ parameter in both groups and of $\Delta\beta_{MB}$ in HC may suggest (apart from the difficulty in recruiting a truly healthy control) an insufficient number of participants given the online nature of the study. Ideally, more participants would have to be recruited to achieve a lower variability in the parameter estimates. In addition, a different model fitting technique could be used.

An alternative explanation to the reduction of model-based learning on the body image preoccupation condition in the eating disorder group can be attributed to a stress response rather than an effect that is strictly body image related. Otto, Raio, Chiang, Phelps, & Daw (2013) showed that as a result of a stress response (submerging a hand in ice cold water) model-based learning noticed a decreased contribution to decision-making. Given that body image preoccupation can be characterised as a distressing experience, the result from our study could be potentially explained by a generic stress response. However, to verify this alternative explanation, measures of the cortisol level for comparison between conditions would have to be taken. Also, it would be useful to perform a brain imaging study to identify which neural response is associated with reduced model-based learning in the BID condition and compare it to a hypothesised, stress-related response.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Further work

There are a couple of steps that could be taken in order to further explore the mechanisms and effects of body image preoccupation on decision-making in eating disorders. A natural step is to perform a very similar study as here, perhaps on a clinical population (rather than sub-clinical) and use brain imaging such as fMRI to try and correlate the behavioural-computational changes in the ED group with neural signatures to provide a neurobiological basis of body image preoccupation effects on decision-making. Ideally, in the future, a more whole understanding of eating disorders and accompanying body image issues could help devise new and more effective treatment options.

Furthermore, we suggest using a slightly more reliable model fitting technique for the two step task that utilises hierarchical Bayesian estimation methods, for instance hBayes package (Ahn, Haines, & Zhang, 2017). This approach has recently been shown to provide the most reliable estimation of model parameters for the two step decision-making task (Brown, Chen, Gillan, & Price, 2020).

If a more reliable fitting method is used, it might be possible to include an extra parameter that would extend the model used in this study. The extension was not performed here due to very low recovery of this new parameter using the EM fitting method. The new parameter would capture the reward sensitivity to see how much value the eating disorder group places on the silhouette that most resembles their own. It would be interesting to see how the reward sensitivity changes with model-based learning. The extension can be easily implemented by multiplying the reward term in Eq.: 1, 6 by a reward sensitivity parameter ψ.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conclusions

Given the high mortality of eating disorders, this study expands the sparse field of computational psychiatry of eating disorders that so far has focused on the general perception of reward (Bernardoni et al., 2018; Verharen et al., 2019), and quantification of model-based learning in a neutral setting (Gillan et al., 2016; Voon et al., 2015) or in relation to food choices (Foerde et al., 2019). Since one of the prevalent aspects of eating disorders is body image preoccupation, we explored its effect on model-based learning in comparison with a healthy control. The results from the online study on a subclinical population show a significantly reducing effect of body image preoccupation on model-based learning that is not present in the healthy control. This finding provides a novel insight into the mechanisms of the disorder and the effect that the core element of the disorder, such as body image preoccupation, has on decision-making. Directed by the above result, further inquiry can be performed into more nuanced treatment strategies that could help to break from rigid habits and strengthen model-based capabilities of patients related to the perception of their body through well-tailored therapeutic activities.

Declarations

Funding

Institute for Adaptive and Neural Computation, University of Edinburgh, UK.

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to submit the work for publication. Funding covered compensation for study participation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conflicts of interest

The authors have declared no competing interest.

Ethics approval

The study was approved according to the University of Edinburgh's Informatics Research Ethics Process, with an RT number 2019/48215.

Consent to participate

For the data to be stored and used in the study, participants provided consent by clicking "Agree" in the consent form after having read the participant information sheet.

Consent for publication

As part of consent to participate, subjects agreed that the results of this study may be summarised in published articles, reports, and presentations. Quotes or key findings are to be anonymized: any information that could, in our assessment, allow anyone to identify the participant. Participant consented that information collected can also be used for future research and that data may be archived for a minimum of 2 years.

Availability of data and materials

Decision-making task behavioural data and questionnaire scores will be available at https://github.com/onyskj/ED_bodyimg_data_code.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Code availability

Code will be available at https://github.com/onyskj/ED_bodyimg_data_code.

Authors' contributions

Jakub Onysk – Writing (original draft), visualisation, investigation, formal analysis, methodology, code.

Peggy Seriès – Conceptualisation, Supervision, Review and editing, project administration.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

Ahn, W.-Y., Haines, N., & Zhang, L. (2017). Revealing Neurocomputational Mechanisms of Reinforcement Learning and Decision-Making With the hBayesDM Package. *Computational Psychiatry*, *1*, 24–57. https://doi.org/10.1162/CPSY_a_00002

Ambwani, S., Shippe, M., Gao, Z., & Austin, S. B. (2019). Is #cleaneating a healthy or harmful dietary strategy? Perceptions of clean eating and associations with disordered eating among young adults. *Journal of Eating Disorders*, *7*(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40337-019-0246-2

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5®)*. American Psychiatric Pub.

Arcelus, J., Mitchell, A. J., Wales, J., & Nielsen, S. (2011). Mortality Rates in Patients With Anorexia Nervosa and Other Eating Disorders: A Meta-analysis of 36 Studies. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *68*(7), 724–731. https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.74

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*(4), 293–309. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.20369

Bernardoni, F., Geisler, D., King, J. A., Javadi, A.-H., Ritschel, F., Murr, J., … Ehrlich, S. (2018). Altered Medial Frontal Feedback Learning Signals in Anorexia Nervosa. *Biological Psychiatry*, *83*(3), 235–243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.07.024

Bjureberg, J., Enander, J., Andersson, E., Ivanov, V. Z., Rück, C., & Fernández de la Cruz, L. (2019). Sudden Gains in Internet-Based Cognitive Behavior Therapy for Body Dysmorphic Disorder. *Behavior Therapy*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2019.11.002

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Brown, V. M., Chen, J., Gillan, C. M., & Price, R. B. (2020). Improving the Reliability of Computational Analyses: Model-Based Planning and Its Relationship With Compulsivity. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2019.12.019

Chan, T. W. S., Ahn, W.-Y., Bates, J. E., Busemeyer, J. R., Guillaume, S., Redgrave, G. W., … Courtet, P. (2014). Differential impairments underlying decision making in anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa: A cognitive modeling analysis: Decision-Maing In Anorexia And Bulimia. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *47*(2), 157–167. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22223

Costin, C., & Grabb, G. S. (2012). *8 keys to recovery from an eating disorder: Effective strategies from therapeutic practice and personal experience* (1st ed). New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Daw, N. D., Gershman, S. J., Seymour, B., Dayan, P., & Dolan, R. J. (2011). Model-Based Influences on Humans' Choices and Striatal Prediction Errors. *Neuron*, *69*(6), 1204–1215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.02.027

DeGuzman, M., Shott, M. E., Yang, T. T., Riederer, J., & Frank, G. K. W. (2017). Association of Elevated Reward Prediction Error Response With Weight Gain in Adolescent Anorexia Nervosa. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *174*(6), 557–565. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.16060671

Dolan, R. J., & Dayan, P. (2013). Goals and Habits in the Brain. *Neuron*, *80*(2), 312–325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.09.007

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*(2), 175–191. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146

Feher da Silva, C., & Hare, T. A. (2020). Humans primarily use model-based inference in the two-stage task. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0905-y

Fichter, M. M., & Quadflieg, N. (2016). Mortality in eating disorders—Results of a large prospective clinical longitudinal study. *The International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *49*(4), 391–401. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22501

Foa, E. B., Huppert, J. D., Leiberg, S., Langner, R., Kichic, R., Hajcak, G., & Salkovskis, P. M. (2002). The Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory: Development and validation of a short version. *Psychological Assessment*, *14*(4), 485–496. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.14.4.485

Foerde, K., Daw, N., Rufin, T., Walsh, B. T., Shohamy, D., & Steinglass, J. (2019). Deficient goal-directed control in a population characterized by extreme goal pursuit. *MedRxiv*. https://doi.org/10.1101/19002089

Frank, G. K. W., Reynolds, J. R., Shott, M. E., & O'Reilly, R. C. (2011). Altered Temporal Difference Learning in Bulimia Nervosa. *Biological Psychiatry*, *70*(8), 728–735. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.05.011

Garner, D. M., Olmsted, M. P., Bohr, Y., & Garfinkel, P. E. (1982). The Eating Attitudes Test: Psychometric features and clinical correlates. *Psychological Medicine*, *12*(4), 871–878. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291700049163

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Giannunzio, V., Degortes, D., Tenconi, E., Collantoni, E., Solmi, M., Santonastaso, P., & Favaro, A. (2018). Decision-making impairment in anorexia nervosa: New insights into the role of age and decision-making style. *European Eating Disorders Review*, *26*(4), 302–314. https://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2595

Gillan, C. M., Kosinski, M., Whelan, R., Phelps, E. A., & Daw, N. D. (2016). Characterizing a psychiatric symptom dimension related to deficits in goal-directed control. *ELife*, *5*, e11305. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.11305

Godier, L. R., & Park, R. J. (2014). Compulsivity in anorexia nervosa: A transdiagnostic concept. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00778

Henn, A. T., Taube, C. O., Vocks, S., & Hartmann, A. S. (2019). Body Image as Well as Eating Disorder and Body Dysmorphic Disorder Symptoms in Heterosexual, Homosexual, and Bisexual Women. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *10*, 531. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2019.00531

Huys, Q. J. M., Moutoussis, M., & Williams, J. (2011). Are computational models of any use to psychiatry? *Neural Networks*, *24*(6), 544–551. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2011.03.001

Huys, Q. J., Pizzagalli, D. A., Bogdan, R., & Dayan, P. (2013). Mapping anhedonia onto reinforcement learning: A behavioural meta-analysis. *Biology of Mood & Anxiety Disorders*, *3*(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/2045-5380-3-12

Insel, T., Cuthbert, B., Garvey, M., Heinssen, R., Pine, D. S., Quinn, K., … Wang, P. (2010). Research Domain Criteria (RDoC): Toward a New Classification Framework for Research on Mental Disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *167*(7), 748–751. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2010.09091379

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Kar, P. (2019). Partha Kar: Dieting and body shaming. *BMJ*, *364*. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l1222

Kessler, R. M., Hutson, P. H., Herman, B. K., & Potenza, M. N. (2016). The neurobiological basis of binge-eating disorder. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *63*, 223–238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.01.013

Kool, W., Cushman, F. A., & Gershman, S. J. (2016). When Does Model-Based Control Pay Off? *PLOS Computational Biology*, *12*(8), e1005090. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005090

Linardon, J., Kothe, E. J., & Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M. (2019). Efficacy of psychotherapy for bulimia nervosa and binge-eating disorder on self-esteem improvement: Meta-analysis. *European Eating Disorders Review*, *27*(2), 109–123. https://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2662

Mastro, S., Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Webb, H. J., Farrell, L., & Waters, A. (2016). Young adolescents' appearance anxiety and body dysmorphic symptoms: Social problems, self-perceptions and comorbidities. *Journal of Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders*, *8*, 50–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocrd.2015.12.001

Morris, J., & Twaddle, S. (2007). Anorexia nervosa. *BMJ*, *334*(7599), 894–898. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39171.616840.BE

NIMH. (n.d.). NIMH | About RDoC. Retrieved 16 August 2020, from https://www.nimh.nih.gov/research/research-funded-by-nimh/rdoc/about-rdoc.shtml

Orbitello, B., Ciano, R., Corsaro, M., Rocco, P. L., Taboga, C., Tonutti, L., … Balestrieri, M. (2006). The EAT-26 as screening instrument for clinical nutrition unit attenders. *International Journal of Obesity*, *30*(6), 977–981. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ijo.0803238

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Otto, A. R., Raio, C. M., Chiang, A., Phelps, E. A., & Daw, N. D. (2013). Working-memory capacity protects model-based learning from stress. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *110*(52), 20941–20946. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1312011110

Patzelt, E. H., Kool, W., Millner, A. J., & Gershman, S. J. (2019). Incentives Boost Model-Based Control Across a Range of Severity on Several Psychiatric Constructs. *Biological Psychiatry*, *85*(5), 425–433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.06.018

Pavlovia. (n.d.). Pavlovia. Retrieved 5 August 2020, from https://pavlovia.org/

Prolific. (n.d.). Prolific | Online participant recruitment for surveys and market research. Retrieved 4 August 2020, from https://www.prolific.co/

PsychoPy. (n.d.). Home—PsychoPy v3.0. Retrieved 14 April 2020, from https://www.psychopy.org/

Qualtrics. (n.d.). Qualtrics—Leading Experience Management & Survey Software. Retrieved 5 August 2020, from Qualtrics website: https://www.qualtrics.com/uk/

Raymond, J. G., Steele, J. D., & Seriès, P. (2017). Modeling Trait Anxiety: From Computational Processes to Personality. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2017.00001

Reiter, A. M. F., Heinze, H.-J., Schlagenhauf, F., & Deserno, L. (2017). Impaired Flexible Reward-Based Decision-Making in Binge Eating Disorder: Evidence from Computational Modeling and Functional Neuroimaging. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *42*(3), 628–637. https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2016.95

Rocha, F. F. da, Alvarenga, N. B., Malloy-Diniz, L., & Corrêa, H. (2011). Decision-making impairment in obsessive-compulsive disorder as measured by the Iowa Gambling Task.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Arquivos de Neuro-Psiquiatria, *69*(4), 642–647. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0004-282X2011000500013

Seriès, P. (Ed.). (2020). *Computational psychiatry: A primer*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Silva, C. F. da, & Hare, T. A. (2018). A note on the analysis of two-stage task results: How changes in task structure affect what model-free and model-based strategies predict about the effects of reward and transition on the stay probability. *PLOS ONE*, *13*(4), e0195328. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195328

Simon, J. J., Skunde, M., Walther, S., Bendszus, M., Herzog, W., & Friederich, H.-C. (2016). Neural signature of food reward processing in bulimic-type eating disorders. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *11*(9), 1393–1401. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw049

Smink, F. R. E., van Hoeken, D., & Hoek, H. W. (2012). Epidemiology of Eating Disorders: Incidence, Prevalence and Mortality Rates. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *14*(4), 406–414. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-012-0282-y

Sujoldzić, A., & De Lucia, A. (2007). A cross-cultural study of adolescents—BMI, body image and psychological well-being. *Collegium Antropologicum*, *31*(1), 123–130.

TNU - publications. (n.d.). TNU - publications. Retrieved 28 July 2020, from https://www.tnu.ethz.ch/en/publications/

Valton, V., Romaniuk, L., Douglas Steele, J., Lawrie, S., & Seriès, P. (2017). Comprehensive review: Computational modelling of schizophrenia. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *83*, 631–646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.08.022

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.15.20232090; this version posted November 19, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Veale, D., Eshkevari, E., Kanakam, N., Ellison, N., Costa, A., & Werner, T. (2014). The Appearance Anxiety Inventory: Validation of a Process Measure in the Treatment of Body Dysmorphic Disorder. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, *42*(5), 605–616. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352465813000556

Verharen, J. P. H., Danner, U. N., Schröder, S., Aarts, E., van Elburg, A. A., & Adan, R. A. H. (2019). Insensitivity to Losses: A Core Feature in Patients With Anorexia Nervosa? *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2019.05.001

Voon, V., Derbyshire, K., Rück, C., Irvine, M. A., Worbe, Y., Enander, J., … Bullmore, E. T. (2015). Disorders of compulsivity: A common bias towards learning habits. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *20*(3), 345–352. https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2014.44