Obesity and Eating Disorders: Evidences for Differentiation

Amelia. Rizzo[1]*, Elisabetta. Costantino[2], Domy. Peronace[3], Rossella. Alfa[4], Daniele. Di Pauli[5]

[1] Adjunct Professor in Clinical Psychology, Social Psychology and Organizational Psychology. Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine; Department of Cognitive Sciences, Psychological, Educational, and Cultural Studies, University of Messina, Italy
[2] Master Degree Doctor in Clinical and Health Psychology in the life cycle. Department of Clinical and Ex-perimental Medicine, University of Messina, Italy
[3] Junior Doctor in Clinical and Preventive Psychological Sciences and Techniques. Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, University of Messina, Italy
[4] Psychologist, Psychotherapist, PhD. CRPG Center for Group Psychoanalytic Research, IIPG Italian Institute of Group Psychoanalysis, Messina, Italy
[5] Psychologist, CBT Psychotherapist. Trainer at the Specialistic School of Cognitive Psychotherapy, Verona, Italy

* Corresponding author email address: amrizzo@unime.it

Editor	Reviewers
John S. Carlson Distinguished Professor of the Department of Educational Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, United carlsoj@msu.edu	**Reviewer 1:** Sara Nejatifar Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir **Reviewer 2:** Kamdin. Parsakia Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The recruitment process via social media needs more detail. Specify which social media platforms were used and the exact demographic form used for ensuring participant criteria. This will enhance the reproducibility of the study.

The description of the sample's educational attainment and employment status is vague. Provide more detailed statistics, including percentages for different education levels and employment categories, to give a clearer picture of the sample.

The contingency table is useful but could benefit from clearer labeling and an explanation of how the categories (first-class and second-class obesity) were defined and distinguished.

The statement that "weight does not have a statistically significant impact on any of the eating behavior dimensions" needs further elaboration. Discuss potential reasons for this finding and its implications for the study's hypotheses.

Clearly state the null hypotheses for H1 and H2. This will help readers understand the specific statistical tests and comparisons being made.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The use of a non-probability convenience sampling method should be justified. Discuss the potential biases this sampling method introduces and how they were mitigated.

The psychometric properties of the BSQ are briefly mentioned. It would be beneficial to include information on the validation process of the Italian version of BSQ to strengthen the reliability of the study findings.

The use of Pearson's correlation and Chi-square tests is appropriate. However, consider discussing any other statistical methods explored and the rationale for choosing the ones used. This adds depth to the statistical analysis section.

The role of social stigma is acknowledged but could be expanded. Include more recent studies that support or refute your findings and discuss how social stigma specifically impacts the psychological dimensions measured by the EDI.

The limitations section is thorough but could be improved by discussing the potential impact of COVID-19 on participant recruitment and data collection, given the timeline of the study.

The literature review effectively sets the stage for your study but would benefit from a more detailed discussion of recent findings on the differentiation between obesity and EDs, especially in non-Western populations.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.