THE NETWORK LANDSCAPE OF NON-CLINICAL EATING BEHAVIORS IN INDIA

A PREPRINT

Dipanjan Ray*
Department of Psychology and Cognitive Sciences, Koita Centre for Digital Health at Ashoka
Ashoka University
Plot No 2, Rajiv Gandhi Education City, Rai, Sonipat, Haryana 131029, India
dipanjan.ray@ashoka.edu.in

Anushka Ravishankar
Department of Psychology and Cognitive Sciences
Ashoka University
Plot No 2, Rajiv Gandhi Education City, Rai, Sonipat, Haryana 131029, India
anushka.ravishankar@ashoka.edu.in

Moumita Das†

Operations Management, Quantitative Methods and Information Systems
Indian Institute of Management Udaipur
Balicha, Udaipur, Rajasthan 313001, India
moumita.das@iimu.ac.in

ABSTRACT

Eating behaviors and their associated cognitions exist along a biopsychosocial continuum, yet their structural organization remains largely unmapped in non-Western contexts. Adopting a dimensional network perspective, this study characterizes the architecture of non-clinical eating behaviors in India—a region defined by a unique interplay of cultural, structural, and psychological influences. We utilized Mixed Graphical Models (MGMs) to estimate a weighted network of 35 variables from a geographically diverse Indian cohort (N=1,508). Our analysis reveals that the Indian eating behavior landscape is a highly optimized, small-world system (S=54.64) defined by a dual-layered hierarchy of influence. We found that structural and cultural variables—notably `HomeTypes` and `Religion`—serve as the primary local anchors (highest Expected Influence), driving the state of their immediate modules. Conversely, systemic integration across the entire network is maintained by a "socio-economic and regulatory bridge" comprising `Employment`, `Education`, and `Self-Esteem`. These nodes exhibited the highest betweenness centrality, functioning as the critical "highways" that link disparate socio-economic, psychological, and behavioral modules. Notably, while `Shape` and `Weight Concern` were highly predictable, they functioned as local cluster nodes rather than global integrators—directly challenging the body-image-centric models dominant in Western literature. These results demonstrate that in the Global South, structural social determinants form the primary scaffold of the biopsychosocial system. Our findings provide a data-driven blueprint for systemic, culturally attuned public health interventions that prioritize structural stability alongside individual regulatory resilience.

Keywords Network Analysis · Eating Behavior · Biopsychosocial Model · Mixed Graphical Models (MGM) · India

*Corresponding author.
†Corresponding author.

Significance Statement

While eating behaviors are traditionally conceptualized as individual psychological phenomena, this study reveals that in the Global South, they are fundamentally anchored by systemic social determinants. Using network science to map the biopsychosocial landscape of a large Indian cohort, we demonstrate a specific hierarchy of influence: while cultural and living conditions (e.g., religion and home type) act as local anchors for behavior, socio-economic factors (employment and education) and core psychological traits (self-esteem) function as the primary structural bridges that integrate the entire system. This architecture provides an empirical corrective to Western-centric models that prioritize body image as the central driver of eating pathology. Our findings suggest that in developing economies, public health strategies may be most effective when they target these "upstream" structural integrators, reframing eating behavior as a systemic expression of social, economic, and cultural stability.

1 Introduction

Eating behaviors and their associated cognitive patterns have traditionally been examined within categorical, disorder-based diagnostic frameworks, wherein conditions such as anorexia nervosa or binge eating disorder are treated as discrete clinical entities. While this approach has yielded substantial insights into psychopathology, it often obscures the dimensional and continuous nature of eating-related experiences that extend well beyond diagnostic thresholds. In response, an increasing body of scholarship has called for moving beyond categorical nosologies toward dimensional models that capture variation in symptoms and behaviors across both clinical and non-clinical populations [Insel et al., 2010, Borsboom, 2017]. From this perspective, eating behaviors and concerns—such as restrained eating, emotional eating, shape concern, or overvaluation of weight—are understood as existing along continua, frequently manifesting in subclinical forms that nonetheless carry meaningful psychological and health-related consequences.

Crucially, the empirical foundations of these dimensional models are overwhelmingly derived from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) populations. This "universalist" bias assumes that the drivers of eating pathology—primarily internalized thin-ideals and body dissatisfaction—function identically across the globe. However, this assumption remains largely untested in the Global South, where the structural determinants of health may play a more foundational role in shaping behavioral phenotypes.

India offers a particularly complex and underexplored context for understanding eating behavior from such a dimensional standpoint. Embedded within a diverse matrix of sociocultural practices, religious norms, caste-linked food rules, and region-specific dietary traditions, eating in India is not merely a physiological necessity but a deeply social and symbolic act [Harper, 1961]. Unlike many Western contexts—where thin-ideal internalization and body dissatisfaction dominate accounts of disordered eating [Nasser, 1988]—Indian experiences often unfold at the intersection of rapid modernization, shifting gender roles, intergenerational value conflicts, and urbanization. The simultaneous presence of undernutrition, obesity, and rising body image concerns further complicates this landscape. Despite this complexity, empirical research in India has largely prioritized clinical diagnoses or nutritional outcomes [Vaidyanathan et al., 2019], with comparatively little attention to the psychological and social dynamics of eating behavior within the general population.

To address these limitations, we adopt a network perspective on mental health—an emerging framework that conceptualizes psychological phenomena as complex biopsychosocial systems rather than as expressions of latent disorders [Borsboom and Cramer, 2013, Fried et al., 2017, Ebrahimi, 2023]. Within this framework, mental health conditions are understood as networks of mutually interacting behaviors, cognitions, and traits, whose interdependencies give rise to patterns of vulnerability and resilience. This perspective reflects a broader shift in mental health research toward recognizing that psychological difficulties arise not from isolated symptoms or singular causal pathways, but from dynamic interactions among biological, psychological, and social components. Such an approach is particularly well suited to identify whether the "core" of eating behavior in a non-Western population is anchored by different systemic drivers.

In the present study, we employ a Mixed Graphical Model (MGM) [Haslbeck and Waldorp, 2020, Fried et al., 2020], a statistical network approach designed to accommodate variables of mixed measurement types (continuous, categorical, and count data), to examine the biopsychosocial structure of eating behavior in a large non-clinical Indian sample. We conceptualize biological characteristics (e.g., BMI, health conditions), psychological tendencies (e.g., self-esteem, loneliness), demographic factors (e.g., regional variation, urban–rural residence, caste), social influences (e.g., peer pressure, family norms), and eating-specific cognitions and behaviors (e.g., binge eating, weight concern, purging, overexercise) as nodes within an interconnected system. Estimating conditional dependencies among these nodes allows us to construct a weighted network that reveals central features, clustering patterns, and cross-domain pathways linking biological, psychological, and social processes.

The goals of the present study were threefold: (1) to map the interrelations among biopsychosocial variables and eating-related constructs in a diverse Indian population; (2) to identify communities of variables that cluster together within the network; and (3) to determine central or “hub” nodes that may serve as leverage points for early intervention. Ultimately, this study seeks to shift the global discourse from a focus on downstream symptoms to the upstream structural factors that define the landscape of eating behavior in the Global South.

2 Results

2.1 Demographic Characteristics

The final sample (N=1,508) exhibited a balanced gender distribution (48.9% Male, 50.7% Female). Consistent with the digital nature of the recruitment platform, a substantial majority of respondents resided in urban areas (86.4%). Geographically, the sample covered a wide range of Indian states and Union Territories, with the highest representation from Maharashtra (12.9%), Kerala (11.5%), and Delhi (9.4%).

Regarding socioeconomic status, the majority of participants (61.5%) identified as General Category, followed by Other Backward Class (22.2%) [3]. In terms of religious affiliation, the sample was predominantly Hindu (74.8%) and Muslim (13.0%). Educationally, the largest segment of the sample held an Undergraduate degree (45.0%), while 29.2% possessed a Postgraduate degree. A detailed summary of the socio-demographic and economic characteristics is presented in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Demographic Overview of Participants

[3] Socio-political identity was categorized according to the Government of India's classification system: General Category (historically more privileged groups), Other Backward Classes (OBC), and Scheduled Castes/Tribes (SC/ST) (groups historically facing structural and socio-economic marginalization). These categories serve as critical proxies for social stratification in the Indian context.



Figure 2: The Weighted Biopsychosocial Network of Non-Clinical Eating Cognition and Behavior: The network consists of 35 nodes, representing variables from biological (red), psychological (green), social (blue), miscellaneous (light blue), eating cognition (yellow), and eating behavior (orange) domains. Edges represent conditional dependencies. Green edges indicate positive associations, red edges (not prominently visible at this level) indicate negative associations, and grey edges represent non-valence associations (e.g., between categorical variables). Edge thickness is proportional to the association's strength (weight). The pie fill within each node represents its predictability (R^2), indicating the proportion of variance explained by its neighboring nodes.

2.2 Weighted Mixed Graphical Model (MGM) Analysis

A Mixed Graphical Model (MGM) was estimated to explore the complex web of conditional dependencies among 35 biological, psychological, social, and eating-related variables. Variables spanned demographic, biological, psychological, and social domains, and are described below with justification and references (Table 1).The resulting network structure, representing the full biopsychosocial system, is visualized in Figure 2.

Table 1: Rationale for inclusion of nodes in the network analysis

Node	Rationale	Key References
Age, Gender, Region, Urban/Rural, Caste, Religion	Basic demographic variables linked to variability in eating patterns and social determinants of health	[Vaidyanathan and Menon, 2024]; [Jain et al., 2024]
Education, Employment, Family Income, Home Type	Socioeconomic indicators often associated with food access, dietary quality, and psychological distress	[Darmon and Drewnowski, 2008]; [Bhargava, 2004]
BMI, Health Condition	Indicators of physical health status and metabolic risk, closely related to eating patterns and body image	[Bulik and Reichborn-Kjennerud, 2003];[Arcan et al., 2014]
Parent History of Eating Disorder	Genetic/familial predisposition and intergenerational transmission of disordered eating	[Strober et al., 2000]; [Lilenfeld et al., 1998]
Concern/Doubt, Personal Standards, Loneliness, Emotion Regulation, Self-Esteem	Psychological variables shown to influence disordered eating via perfectionism, emotional dysregulation, and self-concept	[Mora et al., 2017];[Arcelus et al., 2013];[Arcelus et al., 2015];[Fairburn et al., 2003a]; [Levine, 2012];[Wilson, 2017]
Food Insecurity	Chronic stressor associated with disordered eating and binge behaviors in multiple populations	[Becker et al., 2017]; [Hazzard et al., 2020]
Family, Peer, Media Pressure	Key sociocultural factors contributing to body dissatisfaction and dietary control attempts	[Rodgers et al., 2021];[Levine and Murnen, 2009]
Diet Type, Food Source, Diet Change in Past	Dietary behavior indicators reflecting nutritional intake patterns and behavioral flexibility	[Mörkl et al., 2024]; [Nasser, 2009]; [Bardone-Cone et al., 2012]; [Story et al., 2008]
Overeating, Loss of Control, Binge Days, Purging, Overexercise	Core behavioral markers of disordered eating patterns; widely used in both clinical and dimensional frameworks	[Hudson et al., 2007]; [Keel, 2017]

2.2.1 Node Predictability

The predictability (R^2) of each node, visualized by the pie-fill, indicates the proportion of its variance that is explained by its direct neighbors in the network. A clear pattern was observed: nodes within the **Eating Cognition** (e.g., `EatingConcern` (26),`ShapeConcern` (27), `WeightConcern` (28)) and **Eating Behaviour** (e.g., `DietaryRestraint` (29),`LossOfControl` (31),`BingeDays` (32),`Purging` (33)) domains exhibited the highest predictability values. Psychological factors, such as `ConcernDoubts` (6), and `EmotionRegulation` (9) also showed high predictability. In contrast, many demographic and social factors (e.g., `Gender` (2), `HealthPerception` (4), `Education` (13), `Employment` (14), `Caste` (15), `Religion` (16)) had lower R^2 values.

2.2.2 Network Edge Associations

The network edges, representing the strength and nature of conditional dependencies between variables, were estimated via the weighted MGM (Figure 2). The associations are categorized by their valence and measurement type:

- **Positive Associations (Green Edges):** Prominent positive dependencies were observed among several groups of nodes. Within the psychological domain, strong edges linked `ConcernDoubts` (6), `PersonalStandards` (7), `Loneliness` (8), and `EmotionRegulation` (9). In the eating-related domain, dense connectivity was found between cognitive variables—`EatingConcern` (26), `ShapeConcern` (27), and `WeightConcern` (28)—and behavioral variables including `DietaryRestraint` (29), `LossOfControl` (31), `Purging` (33), and `Overexercise` (35). Notably, `ConcernDoubts` (6) also exhibited a positive association with `EatingConcern` (26). Additionally, a triad of positive edges connected `FamilyPressure` (20), `PeerPressure` (21), and `MediaPressure` (22).

- **Negative Associations (Red Edges):** Inverse relationships were identified between specific node pairs across different domains. These included associations between `PersonalStandards` (7) and `Loneliness` (8), and between `EmotionRegulation` (9) and `SelfEsteem` (10). Furthermore, a negative association was observed between `FamilyIncome` (17) and `Food_insecurity` (19).
- **Non-Valence Associations (Grey Edges):** The network is characterized by a high density of non-valence edges, which represent dependencies where a directional sign is not mathematically defined. This occurs in associations involving categorical variables. Prominent grey edges were observed between demographic variables, specifically `Regions` (11), `Caste` (15), and `Religion` (16). Structural and biological variables also showed strong non-valence associations, such as those between `Urban` (12) and `Laxatives` (34), and `EatingDisorderParents` (5) with `Food_insecurity` (19), `Purging` (33), `PersonalStandards` (7), and `ConcernDoubts` (6). Additionally, `HomeTypes` (18) was associated with both `Food_insecurity` (19) and `FoodSources` (24), while `Gender` (2) was linked to `Employment` (14).

In summary, the weighted MGM reveals a complex architecture of dependencies, where positive associations dominate the cognitive and behavioral domains, while non-valence edges bridge socio-demographic, structural, and psychological variables.

2.3 Network Stability Analysis

To assess the reliability of the estimated network structure and edge weights, a non-parametric bootstrapping procedure (1,000 iterations) was conducted. The resulting stabilized network, which visualizes only those edges that were consistently present across bootstrap samples, is presented in Figure 3. This analysis identifies the "robust backbone" of the biopsychosocial system by filtering out potentially spurious or sample-dependent associations.

The stabilized network is notably sparser than the full weighted MGM, yet it reveals a highly robust set of associations primarily defined by socio-demographic, structural, and behavioral variables. All stable edges identified in this procedure are represented as green in Figure 3, signifying robust conditional dependencies.

The most prominent stable associations were observed between structural and environmental variables, specifically involving `Regions` (11), `Education` (13), `Employment` (14), `Religion` (16), and `HomeTypes` (18). Robust edges linked `Regions` (11) with `Religion` (16), `HomeTypes` (18), `Diet` (23), and `FoodSources` (24). Similarly, `Education` (13) showed stable associations with `Religion` (16), `HomeTypes` (18), and `HealthPerception` (4). `Employment` (14) was stably connected to `HomeTypes` (18), `Diet` (23), `FoodSources` (24), and `HealthPerception` (4). Notably, `HealthPerception` (4) also exhibited a strong stable connection with `Religion` (16).

Furthermore, the stability analysis identified reliable pathways linking these structural anchors to specific behaviors. `HomeTypes` (18) exhibited stable edges with `Diet` (23), `FoodSources` (24), and `Laxatives` (34). `Religion` (16) was stably associated with `Diet` (23), `FoodSources` (24), and `Purging` (33).

Other consistently observed edges included the influence of `Age` (1) on `Education` (13) and `Employment` (14), and within the psychological domain, the edge between `PersonalStandards` (7) and `Loneliness` (8) remained stable.

In summary, while the full MGM identifies a dense web of interactions, the stability analysis highlights that the most reliable conditional dependencies in this Indian cohort are those anchoring individual behaviors, health perceptions, and psychological states to broader socio-demographic and structural contexts.

2.4 Global Network Topology Measures & Small-worldness

Following the stability analysis, the global topological properties of the weighted network (Figure 2) were quantified to characterize the overall system architecture. These measures provide a mathematical snapshot of how efficiently information—or "pathological cascades"—can spread through the biopsychosocial system. The key metrics are summarized in Table 2.

The network exhibited a high Global Clustering Coefficient (Transitivity) of 0.583 and a low Average Weighted Distance (L) of 0.030. This combination of high local density and short global connectivity is a hallmark of a "small-world" architecture. The presence of this structure was confirmed by an exceptionally high Small-worldness Index (S=54.64), indicating that the Indian eating behavior landscape is significantly more optimized for rapid, system-wide integration than a random network of the same size and degree distribution.

Furthermore, the network was found to be disassortative (Assortativity = -0.143). This negative correlation suggests a "star-like" topology where highly central hubs (such as `Employment` and `HomeTypes`) tend to connect to less central,

more peripheral nodes. In a public health context, this disassortative small-world structure implies a system that is robust to random fluctuations but highly vulnerable to targeted disruptions of its primary hubs.

Table 2: Global Network Topology Measures

Measure	Value
Average Weighted Distance (L)	0.0297
Weighted Diameter	0.0877
Assortativity (by Degree)	-0.1428
Global Clustering Coefficient (C)	0.5830
Small-worldness Index (S)	54.636

Note: L and Diameter represent the average and maximum weighted shortest paths between nodes. Small-worldness (S) was calculated as the ratio of the normalized clustering coefficient to the normalized path length relative to 100 degree-preserved random networks.

2.5 Community Detection Analysis (Segregation)

To investigate the structural "segregation" of the network and identify densely interconnected modules, we employed the Louvain community detection algorithm. This modularity-maximization approach identified a 6-community solution, revealing a highly organized functional landscape where variables cluster based on their mutual conditional dependencies (Figure 4).

- **Community 1 (Demographic-Labor):** This module represents the intersection of life-stage and social participation, clustering `Age` (1), `Gender` (2), `Education` (13), and `Employment` (14).
- **Community 2 (Eating Pathology Core):** This large community integrates biological markers with clinical concerns and behaviors. It contains `BMI` (3), the cognitive triad of `EatingConcern` (26), `ShapeConcern` (27), and `WeightConcern` (28), and behaviors including `DietaryRestraint` (29), `LossOfControl` (31), `BingeDays` (32), and `Overexercise` (35).
- **Community 3 (Psychological Resilience & Vulnerability):** This module captures the internal psychological landscape, clustering `HealthPerception` (4), `ConcernDoubts` (6), `PersonalStandards` (7), `Loneliness` (8), `EmotionRegulation` (9), and `SelfEsteem` (10).
- **Community 4 (Socio-Environmental Risk):** This community highlights the role of the physical and economic environment, grouping `EatingDisorderParents` (5), `Urban` (12), `FamilyIncome` (17), `HomeTypes` (18), `Food_insecurity` (19), `FoodSources` (24), `DietChange` (25), and `Laxatives` (34).
- **Community 5 (Cultural-Behavioral Interface):** This distinct module links structural-cultural identity with specific dietary and compensatory practices. It includes `Regions` (11), `Caste` (15), `Religion` (16), and `Diet` (23), alongside `Overeating` (30) and `Purging` (33).
- **Community 6 (Social Pressure):** A localized module focused exclusively on external interpersonal influences: `FamilyPressure` (20), `PeerPressure` (21), and `MediaPressure` (22).

These findings demonstrate that the Indian eating behavior landscape is not a homogenous web of correlations but is organized into specialized "functional neighborhoods." The presence of variables like `Caste` and `Religion` within a community that includes `Purging` and `Diet` suggests that in this population, specific disordered behaviors may be uniquely anchored in cultural and regional frameworks rather than purely psychological ones.

2.6 Graph Theoretic Centrality Measures (Integration)

To identify the most influential and "integrative" nodes within the network, we computed standardized centrality measures (Figure 5). These metrics distinguish between nodes that exert the most local influence and those that act as global "brokers" across the biopsychosocial system.

- **Expected Influence (EI):** Expected Influence represents the cumulative structural importance of a node by accounting for the sum of its shared variance with all neighbors. The analysis revealed that the most influential nodes in the network are primarily structural and cultural. The highest EI was observed for `HomeTypes` and `Religion`, followed by `Employment` and `FoodSources`. A secondary tier of influence was observed for `EatingDisorderParents`, `ConcernDoubts`, `HealthPerception`, and `Gender`. This suggests that the overall "energy" or state of the network is most strongly governed by these environmental and cultural anchors.



Figure 3: The Stabilized Network of Non-Clinical Eating Behaviors. The network visualizes edges with high stability as determined by a non-parametric bootstrapping procedure. Node colors and layout are identical to Figure 2. In this visualization, green edges represent both stable positive-valence associations and stable non-valence associations. Stable negative-valence associations (not observed in this network) would be colored red.



Figure 4: Community Structure of the Biopsychosocial Network. The network identifies a 6-community structure using the Louvain method. Node colors represent their assigned functional modules: Demographic-Labor (C1), Eating Pathology Core (C2), Psychological Resilience & Vulnerability (C3), Socio-Environmental Risk (C4), Cultural-Behavioral Interface (C5), and Social Pressure (C6).

- **Betweenness Centrality:** Betweenness quantifies the degree to which a node lies on the shortest path between other node pairs, identifying the critical "bridges" that integrate disparate modules. A distinct hierarchy emerged for this metric, led by socio-economic and psychological regulators. The highest betweenness was observed for `Employment`, `Education`, and `SelfEsteem`. These were followed by `Caste`, `EmotionRegulation`, `DietaryRestraint`, `Region`, and `Religion`.

In summary, the centrality analysis reveals a dual-layered architecture of integration. While `HomeTypes` and `Religion` serve as the primary sources of structural influence (EI), the global connectivity of the system is maintained by a "regulatory bridge" of socio-economic (`Employment`, `Education`) and psychological (`SelfEsteem`, `EmotionRegulation`) nodes. These brokers provide the pathways through which cultural and environmental factors translate into specific behaviors, such as `DietaryRestraint`.



Figure 5: Standardized Centrality Measures for all 35 Nodes. The plot displays standardized z-scores for Expected Influence (EI) and Betweenness (bridge) centrality. Nodes are ordered by their assigned domains (color-coded at the bottom) for clarity. Key socio-economic and psychological nodes demonstrate the highest centrality across both metrics.

3 Discussion

This study provides a systems-level map of the biopsychosocial landscape of non-clinical eating behaviors in India, revealing a network defined by a fundamental tension between modular segregation and systemic integration. Our central finding is that while the network partitions into distinct, specialized communities—ranging from a Demographic-Labor module to a Cultural-Behavioral Interface—this segregation is bridged by a small set of highly central "brokers."

Specifically, we identify a dual-layered hierarchy of importance. While structural and cultural variables—notably HomeTypes and Religion—exert the highest Expected Influence, serving as the primary drivers of the network's local state, the global integration of the entire system is maintained by Employment, Education, and Self-Esteem. These nodes function as the critical "bridges" (high Betweenness) that link disparate modules. This architecture, characterized by high clustering and a massive small-worldness index (S=54.6), suggests a system optimized for efficient local processing yet highly vulnerable to rapid, system-wide cascades of distress initiated from its key socio-economic integrators.

This finding profoundly reframes the discourse on non-clinical eating behaviors in the Global South. It provides quantitative evidence that these vulnerabilities are not isolated "psychological" problems but are deeply interwoven with the structural scaffolds of an individual's life. The high betweenness of Employment and Education implies they are not merely passive demographic markers; they are the active "highways" through which cultural and environmental pressures translate into behavioral phenotypes. Their role as stable anchors is further reinforced by their high predictability, suggesting they are strongly governed by their neighboring nodes. Similarly, the co-dominance of Self-Esteem and Emotion Regulation as bridges aligns with transdiagnostic models, positioning them as the core regulatory mechanisms that integrate external socio-economic pressures with internal affective states.

Our results in part support, and in part critically extend, the existing literature. The network's small-world property (Table 2) is consistent with findings in clinical psychopathology, suggesting that non-clinical behaviors also operate with high local clustering and high global efficiency [Watts and Strogatz, 1998]. However, our works offers a critical, culturally-specific corrective to "universalist" models derived from Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) populations [Henrich et al., 2010, Portingale et al., 2024]. While Western literature identifies body image concerns as the primary engine of eating pathology [Fairburn et al., 2003b, Rosen, 2013, Ahrberg et al., 2011], our Indian network suggests a different hierarchy. Although Shape Concern and Weight Concern were highly predictable and influential within their local community, they did not function as the primary integrators of the global system. Instead, their influence was subordinate to the overwhelming centrality of structural factors. This implies that in a developing economy, foundational stressors related to socio-economic stability and living conditions form the primary scaffold upon which psychological and eating-related distress is built. In this context, "downstream" concerns like body image can only be fully understood when accounted for by these "upstream" social determinants of health.

Several limitations warrant consideration. The cross-sectional nature of the data precludes causal inference; we cannot determine, for instance, if the stable link between Emotion Regulation and Self-Esteem represents self-esteem building regulation skills or vice versa. Longitudinal studies are required to untangle these dynamic feedback loops [Borsboom, 2017]. Furthermore, while the bootstrapping procedure confirmed the robust "backbone" of structural edges (e.g., the links between Religion, Diet, and Purging), many weaker edges were sample-dependent. Finally, while the inclusion of Caste was a vital step toward cultural specificity, the psychometric properties of Western-derived measures in this diverse Indian sample require ongoing validation.

These limitations notwithstanding, our findings open several clear avenues for future research. The most pressing is the need for longitudinal studies to map the temporal evolution of this network, especially during key life transitions such as entering or exiting the educational system or the workforce. A second, more exciting, avenue lies in intervention. Our results provide a clear empirical rationale for a two-pronged approach. Public health strategies may be most effective not by narrowly targeting 'eating behaviors,' but by addressing the structural integrators: `Education` (13) and `Employment` (14). This could involve programs that integrate mental health support into educational institutions or vocational training centers. Concurrently, at the individual level, our findings strongly advocate for transdiagnostic, resilience-building interventions focused on the `SelfEsteem` (10) hub. Such interventions could theoretically act as a "firewall," buffering the individual from network-wide cascades of distress. Future research could also use our model for comparative network analysis—for example, contrasting the network structures of urban versus rural, or male versus female populations, to understand differential vulnerabilities.

In conclusion, this analysis demonstrates how a complex biopsychosocial system self-organizes in the Indian context. By moving beyond a simple list of risk factors, we show that eating behaviors are part of a structured ecosystem linked by powerful socio-economic and psychological hubs. This work challenges the primacy of body-image-centric models in the Global South and provides a data-driven blueprint for designing more effective, culturally-attuned, and systemic interventions in India.

4 Methods

4.1 Sample and Data Integrity

Participants ($N = 1,508$) were recruited from a geographically diverse Indian cohort via an online panel (Zoho Survey). To ensure high data fidelity, we implemented a four-stage attention-check protocol; failure to pass all four checks resulted in immediate exclusion. The cohort was screened for non-clinical status (no self-reported history of psychiatric or neurological disorders). Ethics approval was granted by the Institutional Review Board of Ashoka University. Detailed demographic and psychometric scale characteristics are provided in the SI Appendix.

4.2 Analytical Framework: Mixed Graphical Models (MGM)

To investigate the conditional dependencies between variables of mixed measurement types (Gaussian, Categorical, and Poisson), we estimated a Mixed Graphical Model (MGM) using the `mgm` package in `R`. The MGM estimates the joint probability distribution by combining different exponential families. Pairwise interaction potentials represent the conditional dependency between two nodes, controlling for all other variables in the system Haslbeck and Waldorp [2020].

Regularization and Tuning: To ensure model sparsity and minimize Type 1 errors, we employed the Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO). The optimal tuning parameter (λ) was selected via **10-fold cross-validation** to minimize the objective function. We applied the ***'OR'*** rule for edge inclusion, where an edge is retained if a dependency is detected in either neighborhood regression. Node predictability was quantified using R^2 for continuous variables and Classification Correctness (CC) for categorical ones Haslbeck and Waldorp [2018].

4.3 Global Topology and Small-Worldness

We characterized the global architecture of the network via the **Small-Worldness Index** (S), which identifies systems that combine high local clustering with short global communication distances Humphries and Gurney [2008].

$$S = \frac{C/C_{rand}}{L/L_{rand}} \tag{1}$$

where C is the Global Clustering Coefficient and L is the Average Weighted Distance. In the MGM context, L represents the average weighted shortest path (cost) between node pairs. Benchmark values (C_{rand}, L_{rand}) were generated from 100 degree-preserved random graphs.

4.4 Integration, Segregation, and Stability

Centrality (Integration): We identified functional "hubs" and "bridges" using Expected Influence (EI) and Betweenness Centrality. EI identifies nodes with the strongest net activating or inhibiting effects, while Betweenness identifies critical "brokers" connecting disparate modules.

Community Detection (Segregation): To identify functional modules, we utilized the Louvain modularity-maximization algorithm. This iterative process identifies a partition that maximizes the modularity score (Q), revealing the functional neighborhoods of the Indian eating behavior landscape.

Stability: Network reliability was evaluated using non-parametric bootstrapping ($1,000$ iterations). We calculated 95% confidence intervals for edge weights and the Centrality Stability (CS) coefficient using the `bootnet` package Epskamp et al. [2018].

Table 3: Network Measures Used in the Analysis

Measure	Description and Relevance	Reference
Network Model Estimation		
Edge Weight (MGM)	Represents the conditional association (partial correlation) between two variables, controlling for all other variables in the network. Estimated for mixed data types (Gaussian, categorical).	Haslbeck and Waldorp [2018]
Node Predictability (R^2)	The proportion of a node's variance that is explained by its direct neighbors. Indicates how strongly a node is embedded and influenced by the network.	Haslbeck and Waldorp [2018]
Global Topology		
Global Clustering Coefficient	The overall tendency of nodes to form clusters. A high value indicates a network with tightly connected local neighborhoods.	Watts and Strogatz [1998]
Average Path Length	The average number of steps along the shortest paths for all possible pairs of network nodes. A low value indicates high global efficiency.	Watts and Strogatz [1998]
Small-worldness Index	A ratio of the network's clustering coefficient and path length relative to random networks. Values > 1 indicate a "small-world" structure.	Humphries and Gurney [2008]
Node-level (Integration)		
Expected Influence (EI)	The sum of all edge weights (both positive and negative) connected to a node. Identifies nodes expected to have the strongest activating or inhibiting effect on the system.	Robinaugh et al. [2016]
Betweenness Centrality	Number of shortest paths that pass through a node. Identifies critical "bridge" or "broker" nodes that connect disparate communities.	Freeman [1977]
Meso-level (Segregation)		
Community Detection (Louvain)	A modularity-maximization algorithm that iteratively groups nodes to find a community structure with the highest modularity score.	Blondel et al. [2008]

Author Contributions

DR and AR conceived and designed the project. MD performed the data analysis. DR provided overall supervision for the study. DR and MD drafted the initial manuscript. AR contributed to the critical revision and editing of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Data and Code Availability

The dataset analyzed during the current study is not publicly available due to privacy and ethical restrictions regarding sensitive eating behavior and psychological data, but is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. The complete R scripts used for data preprocessing, Mixed Graphical Model (MGM) estimation, and network analysis are openly available in the GitHub repository at `https://github.com/dipanjan-neuroscience/EatingBehaviorNetwork/`.

Declaration of Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Funding Statement

D.R.'s research was made possible through the financial support provided by Ashoka University, Koita Centre for Digital Health at Ashoka, and Axis Bank. M.D.'s contribution to this research was made possible by research funding from the Indian Institute of Management Udaipur (IIM-U).

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the 1,508 participants across India for their time and contribution to this study. For the purpose of Open Access, we have applied a CC BY public copyright license to this manuscript.

Supplementary Information (SI) Appendix

S1 Measures

S1.1 Disordered Eating Behaviors and Cognitions

The **Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire 6.0 (EDE-Q 6.0)** was used to assess both behavioral and psychological features of disordered eating [Fairburn and Beglin, 1994]. Behavioral markers—including episodes of overeating, loss of control, binge eating, laxative misuse, purging, and over-exercise—were measured via frequency-based items (e.g., "Over the past 28 days, on how many days have episodes of overeating occurred?"). Psychological symptoms were captured through four subscales: Restraint, Eating Concern, Weight Concern, and Shape Concern. Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (No days) to 6 (Every day).

S1.2 Emotion Regulation

The **Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS-16)** assessed participants' capacity to manage emotional distress across five dimensions: Clarity, Goals, Impulse, Strategies, and Non-acceptance [Bjureberg et al., 2016]. Items (e.g., "When I am upset, I have difficulty thinking about anything else") were rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Almost Never) to 5 (Almost Always). Higher total scores indicate greater emotional dysregulation.

S1.3 Perfectionism

Aspects of perfectionism were measured using two subscales of the **Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS)** [Frost et al., 1990]: *Perfectionistic Concerns* (e.g., "People will probably think less of me if I make a mistake") and *Perfectionistic Standards* (e.g., "If I do not set the highest standards for myself, I am likely to end up a second-rate person"). Items utilized a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

S1.4 Self-Esteem

Global self-worth was assessed using the **Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES-10)** [Rosenberg, 1965]. The scale consists of 10 items (e.g., "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself" and "At times I think I am no good at all"). Respondents rated items on a 4-point scale from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 4 (Strongly Disagree).

S1.5 Social and Sociocultural Factors

- **Loneliness:** The 6-item **De Jong Gierveld Social Isolation Scale (DJGS)** measured emotional and social loneliness [De Jong Gierveld and Van Tilburg, 1999]. Items (e.g., "I experience a general sense of emptiness") were scored categorically (Yes, More or Less, or No).
- **Sociocultural Pressure:** The **SATAQ-4** evaluated perceived pressure from Family, Peers, and Media to conform to appearance ideals [Schaefer et al., 2015]. Items were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = Definitely Disagree to 5 = Definitely Agree).
- **Food Insecurity:** Access to food was measured using the **Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS)**, where low scores indicate stable physical and economic access to food [Coates et al., 2007].

S1.6 Health and Behavioral Indicators

Self-perceived health was assessed via a single item ("What is your perception of your current state of health?"), with responses ranging from Excellent to Poor. Additionally, food sourcing was captured by identifying the primary method of daily food preparation (e.g., self-prepared, restaurants, or canteen).

S2 Formal Mathematical Specification of the MGM

Mixed Graphical Model (MGM)

Let $X = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_p)$ be a random vector where each variable X_s follows a univariate exponential family distribution with sufficient statistic $\phi_s(\cdot)$ and base measure $C_s(\cdot)$. The pairwise mixed graphical model is defined by the joint distribution

$$P(X) = \exp\left\{\sum_{s\in V}\theta_s\phi_s(X_s) + \sum_{(s,t)\in E}\theta_{st}\phi_s(X_s)\phi_t(X_t) + \sum_{s\in V}C_s(X_s) - \Phi(\theta)\right\},$$

where:

- $V = \{1, 2, \ldots, p\}$ is the set of nodes (variables),
- $E \subseteq V \times V$ is the set of undirected edges,
- θ_s is the node potential,
- θ_{st} is the edge potential,
- $\Phi(\theta)$ is the log-normalizing constant.

The conditional distribution of X_s given all other variables $X_{\setminus s}$ is

$$P(X_s \mid X_{\setminus s}) \propto \exp\left\{\theta_s\phi_s(X_s) + \sum_{t\in N(s)}\theta_{st}\phi_s(X_s)\phi_t(X_t) + C_s(X_s)\right\},$$

where $N(s) = \{t : (s,t) \in E\}$ is the neighborhood of node s.

Nodewise Estimation with Cross-Validation

The graph $G = (V, E)$ is recovered by estimating, for each node s, its neighborhood $N(s)$. This is done by solving an ℓ_1-regularized generalized linear model where X_s is the response and the predictors are all other variables and their pairwise interactions (up to a prespecified order d). Let $Z^{(s)}$ denote the design matrix constructed from the observations of the other variables and their interactions. For node s, we minimize

$$\min_{(\theta_{0s},\beta_s)\in\mathbb{R}^{q_s}}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\ell\big(y_{i,s},\, \theta_{0s} + (Z_i^{(s)})^\top\beta_s\big) + \lambda\|\beta_s\|_1\right],$$

where:

- $y_{i,s}$ is the i-th observation of X_s,
- $\ell(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the negative log-likelihood (deviance) corresponding to the exponential family of X_s,
- q_s is the number of predictors (depends on d and the levels of categorical variables),
- $\lambda \geq 0$ is the regularization parameter.

Selection of λ by Cross-Validation

The optimal λ is chosen via K-fold cross-validation:

1. Partition the n observations into K folds.
2. For each candidate λ and each fold k:
   - Fit the model on the $K-1$ training folds.
   - Compute the average deviance (prediction error) on the held-out fold k.
3. Average the deviance over the K folds to obtain the cross-validated error curve $CV(\lambda)$.
4. Select λ^* that minimizes $CV(\lambda)$ (or the largest λ within one standard error of the minimum).

Thresholding and Edge Selection

After obtaining the estimated coefficient vector $\hat{\beta}_s(\lambda^*)$, a hard threshold τ_n is applied:

$$\hat{\beta}_{s,t} = 0 \quad if|\hat{\beta}_{s,t}| < \tau_n,$$

where τ_n scales as $\tau_n \asymp \sqrt{d}\|\beta_s\|_2\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$. This step enforces sparsity beyond the lasso.

The final graph is constructed by combining the nodewise estimates. Let $\hat{E}_s$ be the set of neighbors of s indicated by nonzero entries in $\hat{\beta}_s$. Then an edge (s,t) is declared present if:

- **AND-rule:** $t \in \hat{E}_s$ and $s \in \hat{E}_t$,
- **OR-rule:** $t \in \hat{E}_s$ or $s \in \hat{E}_t$ (more liberal).

S3 Node Predictability Measures

After estimating the network structure, we can assess the predictability of each node—i.e., how well it can be predicted by its neighboring nodes in the graph. Because the graph is estimated via nodewise regressions (each node regressed on all others), the fitted model directly provides a measure of the node's dependence on the rest of the network.

To quantify the extent to which each node is determined by its neighborhood, we calculated predictability. For continuous (Gaussian) nodes, we utilized the R^2 (coefficient of determination):

$$R_j^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum(x_{ij} - \hat{x}_{ij})^2}{\sum(x_{ij} - \bar{x}_j)^2}$$

For categorical and count nodes, we reported Classification Correctness (CC), which measures the accuracy of the neighborhood regression in predicting the node's state, normalized against the baseline marginal distribution. This node-wise predictability offers insight into how strongly each variable is embedded in the network.

S4 Network Topology and Centrality

To evaluate the structural importance of nodes within the biopsychosocial system, we calculated the following metrics (Table 3):

1. **Expected Influence (EI):** Unlike traditional Strength centrality, EI accounts for the sign of the edges. It is defined as the sum of the absolute values of the edge weights, retaining the original sign of the association:

$$EI_i = \sum_{j \in V} \omega_{ij} \tag{2}$$

   Nodes with high EI are considered the most influential "activators" or "inhibitors" of the network.

2. **Betweenness Centrality (C_B):** This measures the extent to which a node lies on the shortest paths between other nodes:

$$C_B(v) = \sum_{s \neq v \neq t} \frac{\sigma_{st}(v)}{\sigma_{st}} \tag{3}$$

   where σ_{st} is the total number of shortest paths from node s to node t. This identifies "bridge nodes" that connect disparate clusters (e.g., connecting SES to Eating Behavior).

S5 Community detection: Louvain algorithm

To identify functional modules, we employed the **Louvain algorithm**, which maximizes the modularity Q:

$$Q = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{ij} \left[\omega_{ij} - \frac{k_i k_j}{2m} \right] \delta(c_i, c_j) \tag{4}$$

Where:

- ω_{ij} represents the weight of the edge between nodes i and j.
- k_i and k_j are the sums of the weights of the edges attached to nodes i and j, respectively.
- m is the total weight of all edges in the network ($m = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij}\omega_{ij}$).
- c_i and c_j are the community assignments of nodes i and j.
- $\delta(c_i, c_j)$ is the Kronecker delta function, which equals 1 if $c_i = c_j$ and 0 otherwise.

The Louvain method operates through an iterative two-phase process:

1. **Modularity Optimization:** Initially, each node is assigned to its own community. Nodes are then iteratively reassigned to neighboring communities that yield the maximum increase in Q.
2. **Community Aggregation:** Nodes belonging to the same community are consolidated into a single "super-node," creating a new, coarse-grained network.

These phases repeat until no further increase in modularity is possible, revealing the optimal hierarchical community structure.

S6 Data Pre-processing and Stability

Data Pre-processing and Management Data preparation and statistical analyses were conducted in `R` (v4.3.0). Prior to model estimation, the following steps were implemented:

- **Variable Transformation:** Socio-economic and demographic variables were mapped to numeric factors. `FamilyIncome` underwent a $log(1 + x)$ transformation to account for heavy right-skewness.
- **Outlier Handling:** To prevent extreme values from inflating partial correlations, we applied manual Winsorization to behavioral variables (e.g., `LossOfControl`, `BingeDays`), capping values at the 99th percentile ($x_{capped} = \min(x, P_{99})$).
- **Cleaning:** BMI values outside the physiological range (< 10 or > 100) were treated as missing. We utilized listwise deletion for missing values, as the MGM algorithm requires a complete case matrix for cross-validation.

Stability Analysis: We performed 1,000 non-parametric bootstrap iterations. The Centrality Stability (CS) coefficient was calculated to ensure the reliability of node rankings. A CS-coefficient > 0.50 indicates that node rankings are stable even when a significant portion of the sample is dropped Epskamp et al. [2018].

References

Thomas Insel, Bruce Cuthbert, Marjorie Garvey, Robert Heinssen, Daniel S Pine, Kevin Quinn, Charles Sanislow, and Philip Wang. Research domain criteria (rdoc): toward a new classification framework for research on mental disorders, 2010.

Denny Borsboom. A network theory of mental disorders. *World psychiatry*, 16(1):5–13, 2017.

Edward B Harper. Cultural factors in food consumption: An example from india. *Economic Botany*, 15(4):289–295, 1961.

Mervat Nasser. Eating disorders: The cultural dimension. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 23(3): 184–187, 1988.

Sivapriya Vaidyanathan, Pooja Patnaik Kuppili, and Vikas Menon. Eating disorders: An overview of indian research. *Indian journal of psychological medicine*, 41(4):311–317, 2019.

Denny Borsboom and Angélique OJ Cramer. Network analysis: an integrative approach to the structure of psychopathology. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 9(1):91–121, 2013.

Eiko I Fried, Claudia D van Borkulo, Angélique OJ Cramer, Lynn Boschloo, Robert A Schoevers, and Denny Borsboom. Mental disorders as networks of problems: a review of recent insights. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 52(1):1–10, 2017.

Omid V Ebrahimi. Systems-based thinking in psychology and the mental health sciences. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 2(6):332–332, 2023.

Jonas MB Haslbeck and Lourens J Waldorp. mgm: Estimating time-varying mixed graphical models in high-dimensional data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 93:1–46, 2020.

Eiko I Fried, S Von Stockert, JMB Haslbeck, F Lamers, RA Schoevers, and BWJH Penninx. Using network analysis to examine links between individual depressive symptoms, inflammatory markers, and covariates. *Psychological Medicine*, 50(16):2682–2690, 2020.

Sivapriya Vaidyanathan and Vikas Menon. Research on feeding and eating disorders in india: A narrative review. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 66(1):9–25, 2024.

Sanjana Jain, Hansika Singhal, Renuka Barlingay, and Kamakshi Malhotra. Exploring the association of socioeconomic factors with disordered eating: An empirical study on diverse adults in india. *International Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 18(2):98–103, 2024.

Nicole Darmon and Adam Drewnowski. Does social class predict diet quality? *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, 87(5):1107–1117, 2008.

Alok Bhargava. Socio-economic and behavioural factors are predictors of food use in the national food stamp program survey. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 92(3):497–506, 2004.

Cynthia M Bulik and Ted Reichborn-Kjennerud. Medical morbidity in binge eating disorder. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 34(S1):S39–S46, 2003.

Chrisa Arcan, Nicole Larson, Kate Bauer, Jerica Berge, Mary Story, and Dianne Neumark-Sztainer. Dietary and weight-related behaviors and body mass index among hispanic, hmong, somali, and white adolescents. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 114(3):375–383, 2014.

Michael Strober, Roberta Freeman, Carlyn Lampert, Jane Diamond, and Walter Kaye. Controlled family study of anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa: evidence of shared liability and transmission of partial syndromes. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 157(3):393–401, 2000.

Lisa R Lilenfeld, Walter H Kaye, Catherine G Greeno, Kathleen R Merikangas, Katherine Plotnicov, Christine Pollice, Radhika Rao, Michael Strober, Cynthia M Bulik, and Linda Nagy. A controlled family study of anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa: psychiatric disorders in first-degree relatives and effects of proband comorbidity. *Archives of general psychiatry*, 55(7):603–610, 1998.

F Mora, S Fernandez Rojo, C Banzo, and J Quintero. The impact of self-esteem on eating disorders. *European Psychiatry*, 41(S1):S558–S558, 2017.

Jon Arcelus, Michelle Haslam, Claire Farrow, and Caroline Meyer. The role of interpersonal functioning in the maintenance of eating psychopathology: A systematic review and testable model. *Clinical psychology review*, 33(1): 156–167, 2013.

Jon Arcelus, Ana García Dantas, Milagrosa Sánchez Martin, Carmen Del Río Sánchez, et al. Influence of perfectionism on variables associated to eating disorders in dance students. *Revista de psicología del deporte*, 2(24):293–303, 2015.

Christopher G Fairburn, Zafra Cooper, and Roz Shafran. Cognitive behaviour therapy for eating disorders: A "transdiagnostic" theory and treatment. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 41(5):509–528, 2003a.

Martha Peaslee Levine. Loneliness and eating disorders. *The Journal of psychology*, 146(1-2):243–257, 2012.

Samantha Wilson. The role of doubt in bulimia nervosa. 2017.

Carolyn Black Becker, Keesha Middlemass, Brigitte Taylor, Clara Johnson, and Francesca Gomez. Food insecurity and eating disorder pathology. *International Journal of eating disorders*, 50(9):1031–1040, 2017.

Vivienne M Hazzard, Katie A Loth, Laura Hooper, and Carolyn Black Becker. Food insecurity and eating disorders: A review of emerging evidence. *Current psychiatry reports*, 22(12):74, 2020.

Rachel F Rodgers, Melissa Simone, Debra L Franko, Marla E Eisenberg, Katie Loth, and Dianne Neumark-Sztainer. The longitudinal relationship between family and peer teasing in young adulthood and later unhealthy weight control behaviors: The mediating role of body image. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 54(5):831–840, 2021.

Michael P Levine and Sarah K Murnen. "everybody knows that mass media are/are not [pick one] a cause of eating disorders": A critical review of evidence for a causal link between media, negative body image, and disordered eating in females. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28(1):9–42, 2009.

Sabrina Mörkl, Attila Varnagy, Jolana Wagner-Skacel, Theresa Lahousen, Daniel Brodtrager, Karl Sallmutter, Susanne A Bengesser, Annamaria Painold, Martin Narrath, Lisa Pieter, et al. Culinary medicine cooking workshops as add-on therapy for inpatients with depression and eating disorders. *Nutrients*, 16(22):3973, 2024.

Mervat Nasser. Eating disorders across cultures. *Psychiatry*, 8(9):347–350, 2009.

Anna M Bardone-Cone, Ellen E Fitzsimmons-Craft, Megan B Harney, Christine R Maldonado, Melissa A Lawson, Roma Smith, and D Paul Robinson. The inter-relationships between vegetarianism and eating disorders among females. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 112(8):1247–1252, 2012.

Mary Story, Karen M Kaphingst, Ramona Robinson-O'Brien, and Karen Glanz. Creating healthy food and eating environments: policy and environmental approaches. *Annu. Rev. Public Health*, 29(1):253–272, 2008.

James I Hudson, Eva Hiripi, Harrison G Pope Jr, and Ronald C Kessler. The prevalence and correlates of eating disorders in the national comorbidity survey replication. *Biological psychiatry*, 61(3):348–358, 2007.

Pamela K Keel. *Eating disorders*. Oxford University Press, 2017.

Duncan J Watts and Steven H Strogatz. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature*, 393(6684):440–442, 1998.

Joseph Henrich, Steven J Heine, and Ara Norenzayan. The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 33(2-3):61–83, 2010.

Jade Portingale, Isabel Krug, and David Butler. Whose body is it anyway? cultural reflections on embodiment illusion research in eating disorders and body dysmorphic disorder. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 15:1433596, 2024.

Christopher G Fairburn, Zafra Cooper, and Roz Shafran. Cognitive behavior therapy for eating disorders: A "transdiagnostic" theory and treatment. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 41(5):509–528, 2003b.

James C Rosen. Body-image disorder: Definition, development, and contribution to eating disorders. In *The etiology of bulimia nervosa*, pages 157–177. Taylor & Francis, 2013.

Merle Ahrberg, Dorothea Trojca, Nadia Nasrawi, and Silja Vocks. Body image disturbance in binge eating disorder: A review. *European Eating Disorders Review*, 19(5):375–381, 2011.

Jonas M B Haslbeck and Lourens J Waldorp. mgm: Estimating time-varying mixed graphical models in high-dimensional data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 83(1):1–40, 2018.

Mark D Humphries and Kevin Gurney. Network 'small-world-ness': a quantitative method for determining canonical network architectures. *PloS one*, 3(4):e0002051, 2008.

Donald J Robinaugh, Alexander J Millner, Richard J McNally, and Matthew K Nock. Identifying and bypassing 'bypasses': a network approach to suicide. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 7:1–6, 2016.

Linton C Freeman. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, 40(1):35–41, 1977.

Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2008(10):P10008, 2008.

Sacha Epskamp, Denny Borsboom, and Eiko I Fried. Estimating psychological networks and their accuracy: A tutorial paper. *Behavior research methods*, 50(1):195–212, 2018.

Christopher G Fairburn and Sarah J Beglin. Assessment of eating disorders: Interview or self-report questionnaire? *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 16(4):363–370, 1994.

Johan Bjureberg, Erik Sahlin, et al. Development and validation of a 16-item version of the difficulties in emotion regulation scale (ders-16). *Psychological Assessment*, 28(10):1266, 2016.

Randy O Frost, Patricia Marten, Catherine Lahart, and Rachel Rosenblate. The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14:449–468, 1990.

Morris Rosenberg. *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press, 1965.

Jenny De Jong Gierveld and Theo Van Tilburg. The de jong gierveld short scales for emotional and social loneliness: A manual. *Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute*, 1999.

Lauren M Schaefer, Natalie L Burke, et al. Development and validation of the sociocultural attitudes towards appearance questionnaire-4 (sataq-4). *Psychological Assessment*, 27(1):54, 2015.

Jennifer Coates, Anne Swindale, and Paula Bilinsky. Household food insecurity access scale (hfias) for measurement of food access: indicator guide: version 3. 2007.