Supplementary material – The effect of body image preoccupation on decision making in eating disorders

Decision-making task and questionnaires

Exclusion criteria

A range of measures were implemented to exclude participant not taking part in the study in good faith.

Firstly, we excluded any participants that took shorter than 1 minute to familiarise themselves with the instruction part of the task. We also excluded any participants, who despite selecting “female” in the pre-screening on Prolific, selected “male”, we allowed three subjects with answers “Other” or “Gender-fluid”. Furthermore, to be included in the study, the participant could only miss a maximum of 9 trials in each condition. The total reward received at the end of the task had to be higher than two standard deviations subtracted from the average total reward across all participants. At the end of the study, understanding of the structure of the task was tested. We excluded any participant that to the question “If you picked the pirate ship (with skull and cross bones on sails, on the right), which island would you most likely sail to?”, incorrectly answered “blue”. Lastly, we excluded one HC participant with low questionnaire scores, whose model-based parameter was strongly characteristic of an ED group, suspecting completing the questionnaires in bad-faith. Applying the above criteria amounted to including 72 participants in total, 34 in the HC and 38 in the ED group.

Body types



Figure S1. 18 different types of body that participants could select as most similar to their own.

Computational modelling

Model fitting – negative log-likelihood

Usually, we do not know the values of model parameters so they have to be estimated. This is done by minimising the negative log-likelihood (NLL) of the parameters for a sequence of choices the agent makes (C), by extension this method finds the parameters that maximise the likelihood. We calculate the NLL as below:

$$\mathrm{NLL} = -\sum_{c \in C} \log\left(p(c)\right)$$

Using various available numerical optimisers, for example a gradient-based *fminunc* in MATLAB, we can find a set of model parameters that minimise the NLL for each participant.

Fitting methods – Expectation Maximisation

To fit the model parameters to the collected data, Expectation-Maximisation (EM) algorithm was used (Bishop, 2006; MacKay, 2003). The fitting procedure is inspired by the Huys et al. paper (2011), while the necessary tools were generously provided by Nathaniel Daw (2011). In summary, the parameters for each participant, and each condition were estimated by maximising the likelihood for the choice sequence. They were estimated accounting for the group-level distribution over ED or HC using the EM algorithm (Foerde et al., 2019; Gillan, Kosinski, Whelan, Phelps, & Daw, 2016).

There are a few steps that make up the whole fitting procedure, as described below.

Step 1 – Define parameter prior distribution and the likelihood.

What we are looking for is the best-fitting set of five parameters (as in the Methods). For each subject i, we can write such set as a vector $\mathbf{m}_i$.To find this, we first need to describe some general set of parameters $\mathbf{h}_i$, which forms our Gaussian prior distribution $\mathrm{p}(\mathbf{h}_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta} =$

$\{\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\}$ specify the group-level hyper-parameters of the Gaussian prior (mean, and covariance matrix). Moreover, we define the likelihood of a general set of parameters $\mathbf{h}_i$, given a sequence of choices $\mathbf{C}_i$ for each participant i as: $p(\mathbf{C}_i|\mathbf{h}_i)$.

The likelihood assumes that actions are independent and can be factorised. The prior regularises the estimates to prevent the parameters from taking on extreme values.

Step 2 – Maximum a posteriori estimate (MAP) of the parameters.

Given the likelihood function and the prior of general set of parameters $\mathbf{h}_i$, we compute maximum a posteriori estimate $\mathbf{m}_i$:

$$\mathbf{m}_i = \text{argmax}\, p(\mathbf{C}_i|\mathbf{h}_i)p(\mathbf{h}_i|\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

which gives the best fitting set of parameters $\mathbf{m}_i$ given some general set of hyper-parameters, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, of the prior $p(\mathbf{h}_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and data of choices. This is usually done with a use of an optimiser, in this case an $optimize$ function from *Optim.jl* Julia package (Julia, n.d.) was used, based on an *LBFGS* algorithm. We minimise the *NLL* for the sequence of actions as in the previous section, and we minimise the *NLL* of the Gaussian distribution (see in the below EM steps).

Step 3 - Find the hyper-parameters of the prior.

The key step is to also find the hyper-parameters, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, of the prior that would provide an even better fit. This is achieved by setting the parameters of the prior to the maximum likelihood estimate given the choices from all the subjects ($\mathbb{C}$):

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \text{argmax}\, p(\mathbb{C}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \text{argmax}(\prod_{i=1}^{N} \int p(\mathbf{C}_i|\mathbf{h}_i)p(\mathbf{h}_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})d^N\, \mathbf{h}_i$$

Here, an EM algorithm was used to iteratively compute $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ estimate. The algorithm consists in two main steps, Step E (Expectation), and Step M (Maximisation).

Step 4a - Initialise EM algorithm.

Firstly, we need to create a design matrix of explanatory variables, in this case we do not have any extra variables, but a list of subjects. Therefore, the design matrix, X, takes a form: $\mathrm{X} = [1, \dots, 1]^{\mathrm{T}}$, with the $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ where N is the number of subjects.

Before we iterate the algorithm, we need to initialise the hyper-parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$: $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)} = \left\{\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \Sigma^{(1)}\right\} = \{[0.01, \dots, 0.01], 0.01 \times \mathbb{I}_p\}$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}$ is of size $1 \times p$ (number of parameters, $p = 5$) and $\mathbb{I}_p$ is an identity matrix of size $p \times p$. We also initialise, for each subject, the model parameters that we want to find the optimum of: $\mathbf{m}_{\mathrm{i}}^{(1)}$.

Step 4b - Expectation, Step E.

Using a group-level $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)}$ we perform Step 2 as above to compute MAP estimate $\mathbf{m}_{\mathrm{i}}$ for each subject. For the data likelihood, NLL_{data}, we follow the instructions from the previous section. For the prior part, we compute the NLL of the Gaussian (Bishop, 2006):

$$\mathrm{NLL}_{prior} = -\frac{p}{2} \times \log(2\pi) - \frac{\log\left(\det\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(1)}\right)\right)}{2} - \left(\boldsymbol{m}_i^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}\right)^T \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(1)}\right)^{-1} \left(\boldsymbol{m}_i^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}\right),$$

to then obtain the MAP estimate, $\boldsymbol{m}_i^{(2)}$, by minimising the total $\mathrm{NLL}_{total} = \mathrm{NLL}_{data} + \mathrm{NLL}_{prior}$. We also calculate the inverse hessian $(\boldsymbol{H}_i^{(2)})^{-1}$ for each subject to approximate the variance of the model parameters such that the posterior distribution of the model parameters $\mathrm{p}(\mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{i}}|\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{i}})$ has approximately Gaussian distribution with the mean $\boldsymbol{m}_i^{(2)}$ and covariance matrix $(\boldsymbol{H}_i^{(2)})^{-1}$.

Step 4c - Maximisation, Step M.

In this step, we estimate the hyper-parameters, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)}$, of the prior distribution as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)} = (\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathrm{X})^{-1}\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{m}^{(2)}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(2)} = \mathbf{m}^{(2)}(\mathbb{I}_N - X(X^TX)^{-1}X^T)\mathbf{m}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\boldsymbol{H}_i^{(2)})^{-1}$$

Now, with new $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)} = \left\{\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}, \Sigma^{(2)}\right\}$, we repeat the steps 4b-c iteratively k times, until the relative difference between $\left[\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(k)}, \left\{\Sigma_{j,j}^{(k)}\right\}_{j=1}^{p}\right]$ and $\left[\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(k-1)}, \left\{\Sigma_{j,j}^{(k-1)}\right\}_{j=1}^{p}\right]$ is < 0.001.

Alternative models

Two other models were considered before collecting the data. In the model reliability procedure, we compared model 2 from the paper by Gillan et al. (2016) and model 3 from the paper by Daw et al. (2011). The alternative models follow a similar structure to model 1 in order to capture model-based and model-free contribution, but differ in the parametrisation.

Model 2 has an extra parameter β_{MF0} that breaks down the model free component as: $\beta_{MF} = \beta_{MF0} + \alpha\beta_{MF1}$, where β_{MF1} corresponds to β_{MF} in model 1. Similarly to model 1, increased/decreased β_{MF} indicate increased/decreased contribution of model-free learning. In total, model 2 has six parameters: $\beta_{MB}, \beta_{MF0}, \beta_{MF1}, \beta_2, \alpha, \rho$.

Model 3 re-parametrises the model-based and model-free contribution with a single parameter $w \in (0,1)$, such that $\beta_{MB} = \beta_1 w$ and $\beta_{MF} = \beta_1(1-w)$, where β_1 is the inverse temperature for the *softmax* at stage one. This setup captures the trade-off between model-based and model-free learning. Moreover, model 3 has two learning rates α_i, each for a different stage $i \in \{1,2\}$. Finally, an extra parameter λ is used to carry reward information from second stage to the first stage (eligibility trace). Higher values of the parameter w indicates using more model-based learning at the expense of model-free learning, which is noted as $(1-w)$. In total, model 3 has seven parameters: $w, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \lambda, \beta_1, \beta_2, \rho$.

The exact model details can be found in the original papers (Daw et al., 2011; Gillan et al., 2016).

Model reliability analysis

Model reliability analysis was performed (Wilson & Collins, 2019). This consists of pre-hoc: parameter recovery and model recovery, but also of post-hoc: model-comparison, parameter recovery and model recovery. Pre-hoc analysis uses parameter values based on past studies (Daw et al., 2011; Gillan et al., 2016), while the post-hoc analysis uses parameter values fitted to the collected data in the neutral condition across both groups. Such an analysis ensures that the best model is selected as well as that the results are meaningful.

Apart from the model described above, eventually used in the study (model 1), different models were considered: model 2 (Gillan et al., 2016) and model 3 (Daw et al., 2011) in the model reliability analysis. These are briefly described above.

Parameter recovery.

To ensure reliable parameter estimates, it is advisable to perform parameter recovery before actually collecting data (Wilson & Collins, 2019). In parameter recovery, we first simulate some fake data using our model and a set of parameters drawn from a distribution. Then, we try to recover the parameters that generated the fake data using our model fitting technique. To see how reliable the modelling process is, we compare the original parameters (X) with the recovered Y ones by calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC), ρ: $\rho = \frac{cov(X,Y)}{\sigma_X,\sigma_Y}$, where $cov(X,Y)$ is the covariance between two sets of parameters and σ is the standard deviation. The higher ρ, the better and more reliable our methods are.

Model recovery.

To ensure that the model comparison is reliable and meaningful, model recovery is performed. This involves generating the task dataset using each model and then trying to fit each dataset using each model and see which model fits data the best (based on AIC or BIC). Ideally,

if we generate data with model 1, we want model 1 to best fit the data (Wilson & Collins, 2019). The process is repeated multiple times. Hence, if we create a confusion matrix that records a frequency of best fits of data from each model, we would want to achieve a diagonal matrix of ones, as below in Table S1. The procedure ensures that model fitting and model comparison yield meaningful results.

Table S1

A perfect confusion matrix.

		Fit model		
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Simulated	Model 1	1	0	0
	Model 2	0	1	0
	Model 3	0	0	1

Note. Data generated by model X is always best fit by model X where $X \in \{1,2,3\}$.

Model comparison.

In post-hoc analysis, an extra step involves comparing models to find the best-fitting one. We used a whole dataset (HC&ED) from the neutral condition to estimate the parameters with three models. Having estimated the three different sets of best fitting parameters from each model, we calculated a Laplace approximation to the log marginal likelihood LML in Eq. S1, marginalised over the subject level parameters (Ruli, Sartori, & Ventura, 2016), which is further corrected in the calculation of AIC and BIC criterions.

$$\mathrm{LML} = -\frac{p}{2} \times \log(2\pi) \times N + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathrm{NLL}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\log(\det(\boldsymbol{H}_i))}{2} \qquad (S1)$$

where N is the number of subjects and p is the number of parameters in the model. The best fitting model is the one with lowest AIC or BIC scores (Wilson & Collins, 2019).

Gaussian random walk

The reward probabilities evolved according to a Gaussian random walk. In the first condition the participants were faced with, the reward probabilities were initialised in a range (for each chest from left to right: $p_{11}, p_{12}, p_{21}, p_{22}$):

$$[0.58,0.72], [0.31,0.45], [0.31,0.45], [0.58,0.72].$$

In the second condition, the initialisation of reward probabilities was:

$$[0.31,0.45], [0.58,0.72], [0.58,0.72], [0.31,0.45].$$

The practice stage was initialised differently as:

$$[0.31,0.45], [0.58,0.72], [0.31,0.45], [0.58,0.72].$$

The general formula of a Gaussian random walk takes a form:

$$p^{(t+1)} = p^{(t)} + \sigma \times \mathcal{N}(0,1),$$

where $p^{(t)}$ is a reward probability at a current trial t, σ is the standard deviation of the random walk, $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ is a random variable from a standard normal distribution.

To make sure the reward probabilities always stay within a $(0.25,0.75)$ range, any resulting value that was above or below the range was transformed:

$$p^{(t)} = 2 \times r_{hi/lo} - p^{(t)},$$

where $r_{hi/lo}$ 0.25 or 0.75.

Random effects linear regression and AIC

Condition and group (model $m1$) (with age and BMI as a larger model $m2$) were taken as fixed effects per subject in an intercept random effects linear regression model using R's *lmer* package as below.

$$m1\text{: lmer}(\beta_{MB} \sim \text{group}\times\text{condition+age+bmi+(1|sub)})$$

$$m2\text{: lmer}(\beta_{MB} \sim \text{group}\times\text{condition}+(1|\text{sub}))$$

Akaike information criterion (AIC) was calculated for each model to estimate an out-of-sample prediction error to see which model is better (Akaike, 1974). Lower AIC indicates a better fitting model.

AIC and BIC

To select best models, Akaike information criterion (AIC) (Akaike, 1974) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC) (Schwarz, 1978) criteria were used defined as below:

$$\text{AIC} = 2 \times \text{NLL} + 2 \times p$$

$$\text{BIC} = 2 \times \text{NLL} + p \times \log(n),$$

where NLL is the negative log likelihood (or negative marginalised log-likelihood LML can be used instead), p is the number of parameters in the model, n is the number of data points.

Supplementary results

Task performance

Table S2

Summary of model-independent task performance measures for two groups (HC and ED)

	HC (n=34) Mean ±SD	ED (n=38) Mean ±SD	t value	p value
reward: neutral	82.15 ± 9.23	77.66 ± 9.50	2.03	**0.0463***
reward: BID	76.94 ± 9.38	78.26 ± 9.38	-0.60	0.5524
total reward	159.09 ± 12.56	155.92 ± 14.35	0.99	0.3251
RT1: all	0.28 ± 0.09	0.3 ± 0.09	-1.02	0.3117
RT2: all	0.39 ± 0.12	0.41 ± 0.14	-1.00	0.3226
RT: all	0.34 ± 0.10	0.36 ± 0.11	-1.08	0.2824
RT1: neutral	0.29 ± 0.08	0.30 ± 0.07	-0.76	0.4523
RT2: neutral	0.39 ± 0.11	0.42 ± 0.13	-1.12	0.2656
RT: neutral	0.34 ± 0.09	0.36 ± 0.10	-1.05	0.2952
RT1: BID	0.29 ± 0.08	0.31 ± 0.08	-1.05	0.2987

	HC (n=34) Mean ±SD	ED (n=38) Mean ±SD	t value	p value
RT2: BID	0.38 ± 0.12	0.42 ± 0.15	-0.70	0.4869
RT: BID	0.34 ± 0.10	0.36 ± 0.11	-0.91	0.3660

Note. Average total reward during the neutral and BID conditions, average total reward after a whole task, mean reaction time in the first and second stage and overall (RT1, RT2, RT) in the neutral, BID, and across both conditions. T- and p-values of the two-sample t-tests for difference in performance between groups are included.

Model reliability

Before data was collected we performed pre-hoc parameter recovery and model recovery procedures using parameter values based on a previous studies (Daw et al., 2011; Gillan et al., 2016). Pre-hoc analysis revealed that data can be safely collected. Further, we performed post-hoc analysis, using newly estimated parameters, to select the best fitting and most reliable model. The results of the reliability analysis can be found below.

Pre-hoc parameter recovery.

To compare the reliability of the model fitting before data was collected, pre-hoc parameter recovery was performed for all three models. We allowed for 100 iterations of the EM algorithm and 10 runs of the procedure, each with a different seed. The results can be found in Tables S3-S5.

Model 1.

Table S3

Model 1 pre-hoc parameter recovery with a mean and standard deviation (SD) PCC

mean ±SD	β_{MB}	β_{MF}	β_2	α	ρ
PCC (model 1)	0.74±0.07	0.65± 0.12	0.68±0.11	0.99±0.00	0.56±0.13

Model 2.

Table S4

Model 2 pre-hoc parameter recovery with a mean and standard deviation (SD) PCC

mean ±SD	β_{MB}	β_{MF0}	β_{MF1}	β_2	α	ρ
PCC (model 2)	0.67 ± 0.07	0.53 ± 0.12	0.68 ± 0.12	0.73 ± 0.08	0.99 ± 0.00	0.49 ± 0.1

Model 3.

Table S5

Model 3 pre-hoc parameter recovery with a mean and standard deviation (SD) PCC

mean ±SD	w	β_1	β_2	α_1	α_2	λ	ρ
PCC (model 3)	0.67 ± 0.10	0.59 ± 0.16	0.63 ± 0.16	0.64 ± 0.10	0.91 ± 0.05	0.58 ± 0.10	0.93 ± 0.08

Parameter are recovered fairly well, therefore, the models could be used to fit the data.

Pre-hoc model recovery.

To ensure a meaningful comparison of models before data collection, we first performed a pre-hoc model recovery to see how well the models are recovered. Results can be found Table S6.

Table S6

Confusion matrix from a pre-hoc model recovery procedure for model 1-3

		Fit model		
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Simulated	Model 1	1	0	0
	Model 2	0	1	0
	Model 3	0	0	1

Note. Y-axis indicates which model the data was generated with, while the x-axis shows which model best fits the data based both on AIC and BIC. Cells indicate the frequency of best fits after 10 runs of the procedure, with 100 EM iterations.

The results suggest that model comparison will be meaningful, as each model is well recovered.

Post-hoc parameter recovery.

To compare the reliability of the model fitting after data was collected, testing the actual parameter range, post-hoc parameter recovery was performed for all three models. We allowed for 100 iterations of the EM algorithm and 10 runs of the procedure, each with a different seed. The results can be found in Tables S7-S9.

Model 1.

Table S7

Model 1 post-hoc parameter recovery with a mean and standard deviation (SD) PCC

mean ±SD	β_{MB}	β_{MF}	β_2	α	ρ
PCC (model 1)	0.71±0.07	0.81± 0.07	0.90±0.03	0.93±0.03	0.89±0.03

Model 2.

Table S8

Model 2 post-hoc parameter recovery with a mean and standard deviation (SD) PCC

mean ±SD	β_{MB}	β_{MF0}	β_{MF1}	β_2	α	ρ
PCC (model 2)	0.70 ± 0.12	0.45 ± 0.11	0.86 ± 0.07	0.87 ± 0.05	0.89 ± 0.07	0.93 ± 0.04

Model 3.

Table S9

Model 3 post-hoc parameter recovery with a mean and standard deviation (SD) PCC

mean ±SD	w	β_1	β_2	α_1	α_2	λ	ρ
PCC (model 3)	0.56 ± 0.09	0.41 ± 0.19	0.74 ± 0.09	0.56 ± 0.14	0.75 ± 0.12	0.51 ± 0.13	0.93 ± 0.08

Model 1-2 have a fairly good parameter recovery, whereas model 3 parameter recovery results suggest some issues in the modelling procedure. Hence model 3 could be excluded.

Post-hoc model recovery.

In addition, to ensure a meaningful comparison of all models once they are fitted to the actual data, we performed a post-hoc model recovery to see how well the models are recovered within the actual parameter range from the dataset. Results can be found Table S10.

Table S10

Confusion matrix from a post-hoc model recovery procedure for model 1-3

		Fit model		
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Simulated	Model 1	1	0	0
	Model 2	0	1	0
	Model 3	0	0	1

Note. Y-axis indicates which model the data was generated with, while the x-axis shows which model best fits the data based both on AIC and BIC. Cells indicate the frequency of best fits after 10 runs of the procedure, using 100 EM iterations.

The results suggest that model comparison will be meaningful, as each model is well recovered.

Post-hoc model comparison.

Finally, model comparison procedure was performed to find the model that best fits the data from the two step decision-making task used in this study (Table S11). We used a combined dataset over groups in the neutral condition to compare models. We allowed for sufficient number of EM iterations to achieve a complete fit. As a result, we identified that the best fit to the data is provided by model 1 as it has lowest combined BIC that corrects for the number of data points (which we place more significance on than the AIC results) as well as relatively low AIC score (compared to model 3).

Table S11

Results of model comparison with AIC and BIC scores

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
BIC	**9930.83**	9933.97	10160.17
AIC	9894.43	**9890.28**	10109.20

Choosing the best model.

The results from the pre- and post-hoc parameter recovery shows that model 1 provides the most reliable parameter estimates. Moreover, the overall good pre- and post-hoc model recovery suggests that the model comparison provides meaningful results. Finally, when comparing models as in Table S11, model 1 provides the best fit to the data based on BIC. As such, model 1 is chosen for further data analysis.

Comparison of ρ between groups and conditions

Results from two-sample t-tests.

Table S12

Comparison of estimated model parameter, ρ, in HC between two conditions

HC (n=34)				
	neutral Mean ±SD	BID Mean ±SD	t value	p value
ρ	0.76 ± 0.40	0.64 ± 0.37	1.25	0.2165

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

Table S13

Comparison of estimated model parameter, ρ, in ED between two conditions

ED (n=38)				
	neutral Mean ±SD	BID Mean ±SD	t value	p value
ρ	0.89 ± 0.94	0.78 ± 1.05	0.50	0.6203

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

Table S14

Difference in model parameter, ρ, 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
ρ	0.80	0.4284	0.75	0.4577

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

Results from two-sample t-tests Δρ.

Table S15

Comparison of model parameter difference Δρ between groups

	HC (n=34)		ED (n=38)	
	Mean ± SD	Mean ±SD	t value	p value
Δρ	0.12 ± 0.36	0.11 ± 0.59	0.98	-0.0211

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