

Autism spectrum disorder traits are associated with empathic abilities in adults with anorexia
nervosa

Jess Kerr-Gaffney^{1*}, Amy Harrison^{2,3}, Kate Tchanturia^{1,3,4}

¹King's College London, Department of Psychological Medicine, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology, and Neuroscience, London, United Kingdom

² University College London, Department of Psychology and Human Development, London, United Kingdom

³South London and Maudsley NHS Trust, National Eating Disorders Service, Psychological Medicine Clinical Academic Group, London, United Kingdom

⁴Department of Psychology, Ilia State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Conflicts of interest: none

Word count: 4998

*Correspondence: jess.kerr-gaffney@kcl.ac.uk, 103 Denmark Hill, King's College London, London, SE5 8AZ

Abstract

1
2 **Background:** Social and emotional difficulties have been identified as key factors in the
3 development and maintenance of anorexia nervosa (AN). However, few studies have
4 investigated the influence of comorbid psychopathology on social cognition. The aim of the
5 current study was to examine perception of nonverbal communication and empathy in AN
6 using ecologically valid, performance-based measures, and to explore associations with
7 comorbid psychopathology (anxiety, depression, autism spectrum disorder (ASD) traits,
8 alexithymia, and social anxiety). **Methods:** In this cross-sectional study, the Multifaceted
9 Empathy Test (MET) and the Mini Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity (MiniPONS) were
10 administered to 51 adults with AN, 51 recovered AN (REC), and 51 healthy controls (HCs).
11 Comorbid psychopathological traits were assessed using self-report questionnaires and the
12 Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule – 2nd edition (ADOS-2). **Results:** Individuals with
13 AN showed reduced affective empathy to positive stimuli compared to HCs, and a trend
14 towards lower vocal prosody recognition scores relative to REC. Around a quarter of AN and
15 REC scored above the clinical cut-off for ASD on the ADOS-2, and high ASD symptoms
16 predicted lower cognitive and affective empathy scores. **Limitations:** The study is cross-
17 sectional, future research would benefit from examining social-cognition performance and
18 comorbid psychopathology longitudinally. **Conclusions:** The findings highlight the
19 importance of ASD symptoms in empathy dysfunction in those with a lifetime history of AN.
20 Future research should explore whether treatment adaptations to accommodate for differences
21 in social-cognitive abilities may be helpful in the treatment of AN.

22 Key words: anorexia nervosa, empathy, emotion recognition, ASD, comorbidity

23

24

Introduction

1
2 Contemporary models of eating disorders (EDs) such as anorexia nervosa (AN)
3 suggest social and emotional difficulties are key factors in the development and maintenance
4 of the disorder (Treasure & Schmidt, 2013). During the illness, a variety of social difficulties
5 are seen, including social anxiety (Kerr-Gaffney et al., 2018), poorer social skills (Rhind et
6 al., 2014; Winecoff et al., 2015), and less social support (Tiller et al., 1997). Given that
7 interpersonal problems are associated with more severe ED psychopathology (Illing et al.,
8 2010; Tasca et al., 2011) and poorer outcomes (Franko et al., 2013; Gillberg et al., 1994;
9 Jones et al., 2015; Zipfel et al., 2000), it is important to understand possible underlying
10 mechanisms. One area that has received considerable attention is emotion recognition, an
11 aspect of theory of mind (ToM). Those with AN show difficulties in recognising emotions
12 and inferring the mental states of others, compared to healthy controls (HCs) (Bora and Kose,
13 2016). Individuals with AN may also have difficulties in other aspects of ToM, such as
14 understanding social interactions and implicit social attribution, however research in this area
15 is lacking (Leppanen et al., 2018).

16 The majority of emotion recognition studies in AN have used static images restricted
17 to the face or eye-region only (Leppanen et al., 2018). Consequently, much of the information
18 that is inherent in everyday social interactions, such as tone of voice, body language, and
19 context is missing from such stimuli. Research has therefore investigated emotion recognition
20 using different modalities of nonverbal communication in order to better understand the
21 mechanisms that may underlie social difficulties in AN. For example, a few studies have
22 examined emotion recognition from body movements or voice only. Individuals with AN
23 were less accurate at recognising sadness but better at recognising anger conveyed through
24 body movements compared to weight-restored AN and HCs (Lang et al., 2015; Zucker et al.,
25 2013). However group differences became non-significant after controlling for BMI in one

1 study (Zucker et al., 2013). AN were also less accurate than HCs at recognising emotions
2 conveyed through voice (Kucharska-Pietura et al., 2004; Oldershaw et al., 2010). Again,
3 group differences were not significant in one study when covariates (age, education,
4 depression) were controlled for. Finally, a few studies have examined perception of
5 nonverbal behaviour more holistically, using paradigms that include facial expression,
6 posture, and vocal prosody together. For example, Gramaglia et al. (2016) used the
7 Awareness of Social Inference Test (TASIT; McDonald et al., 2002), finding no significant
8 differences between individuals with AN and HCs in identifying emotional states from video
9 clips. However, the clips involved speech, therefore the task cannot be considered a pure
10 measure of nonverbal communication only. Thus, the limited research available suggests
11 there may be differences in perception of nonverbal communication in those with AN,
12 however further exploration of the impact of various clinical factors, such as anxiety,
13 depression, and BMI is required.

14 Relatedly, there is some evidence to suggest there are differences in empathy in AN.
15 Empathy is considered a key component of prosocial behaviour and social cognition, as it
16 allows us to make sense of and respond appropriately to others' behaviour (Decety et al.,
17 2016; Eisenberg and Miller, 1987). It comprises two major facets: cognitive and affective
18 empathy. While cognitive empathy refers to the ability to recognise and understand the
19 mental states of others (overlapping with the concept of ToM); affective empathy is the
20 ability to share the feelings of others, without any direct emotional stimulation to oneself
21 (Blair, 2005). Based on longitudinal research in a community sample, Gillberg and
22 colleagues reported on a subgroup of participants with AN with "empathy disorders." This
23 group had severe problems in social understanding and communication, consistent with a
24 diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder (ASD) (Gillberg et al., 1994). Poorer outcomes in
25 terms of recovery and psychosocial functioning were found in this group (Anckarsäter et al.,

1 2012; Wentz et al., 2009). More recently, several studies have used self-report measures to
2 investigate empathy in AN. A meta-analysis of these studies reported that while overall
3 empathy and affective empathy did not differ between AN and HC, those with AN had
4 significantly lower cognitive empathy scores (Kerr-Gaffney et al., 2019). However, self-
5 reported measures of empathy are limited in that they measure how empathetic individuals
6 perceive themselves to be, rather than providing an objective measure of performance.

7 In those with EDs, only two studies have used a performance-based or “online”
8 measure of empathy. Both studies found no significant differences between ED and HC
9 groups in empathic ratings to videos or in an empathy for pain paradigm (Cardi et al., 2015;
10 Brewer et al., 2019). However, the latter study demonstrated that high levels of alexithymia
11 were associated with increased empathic personal distress (Brewer et al., 2019). These
12 studies both used mixed ED samples (AN and BN), limiting the generalisability of the results
13 for either of the two disorders, and only affective empathy was assessed. Importantly, the
14 study by Brewer et al. (2019) demonstrates that comorbid traits such as alexithymia may
15 explain differences in emotion processing, rather than the ED itself. Indeed, other studies in
16 EDs have shown that alexithymia rather than ED diagnosis predicts emotion recognition
17 abilities (Brewer et al., 2015). Thus, it is possible that the mixed results in emotion
18 processing studies in EDs are due to samples differing in their levels of alexithymia, such that
19 when alexithymia is particularly high in the ED group (or low in the HC group) a group
20 difference is found.

21 Several other comorbid traits may influence socio-emotional cognition in AN in this
22 way. For example, between 4 and 50% of individuals with AN show high ASD traits –
23 scoring above clinical thresholds on diagnostic interviews for ASD (Anckarsäter et al., 2012;
24 Vagni et al., 2016; Westwood et al., 2018, 2017). Individuals with ASD show difficulties in
25 ToM (Happé, 1994; Kleinman et al., 2001), emotion recognition (Bal et al., 2010; Harms et

1 al., 2010; Hubert et al., 2007), empathy (Baron-Cohen and Wheelwright, 2004; Kok et al.,
2 2016), and social attention (Chita-Tegmark, 2016). Further, ASD traits in the general
3 population are associated with more difficulties in these areas (Blain et al., 2017; Halliday et
4 al., 2014; Luo et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2018). Therefore, it is possible that high levels of ASD
5 traits co-occur with socio-emotional processing difficulties in a proportion of those with AN.
6 Although a few studies have found associations between high ASD traits and more severe
7 socio-emotional difficulties, such as alexithymia (Westwood et al., 2017), social anhedonia
8 (Adamson et al., 2018), and flattened facial affect (Lang et al., 2016), research exploring the
9 effect of ASD traits on social cognition performance in AN is lacking. Anckarsäter et al.
10 (2012) assessed ToM performance using the Happe cartoon task, comparing those with AN
11 who also met criteria for ASD (AN+ASD) to those who did not (AN-ASD), as well as HCs.
12 HCs were significantly more accurate on the mental cartoons task than AN+ASD, whereas
13 performance in the AN-ASD group did not significantly differ from either of the other two
14 groups, lying in the middle.

15 The aim of this experimental study was to examine cognitive and affective empathy
16 and perception of nonverbal communication in AN, recovered AN (REC), and HCs. A
17 secondary aim was to explore potential relationships between comorbid psychopathological
18 traits and performance on social cognition tasks. As well as including measures of the
19 aforementioned ASD traits and alexithymia, we included depression, anxiety, and social
20 anxiety, due to their high co-occurrence with AN (Kerr-Gaffney et al., 2018; Pollice et al.,
21 1997; Swinbourne and Touyz, 2007) and potential effects on social cognition (Attwood et al.,
22 2017; Bourke et al., 2010; Demenescu et al., 2010; Hezel and McNally, 2014; Schreiter et al.,
23 2013; Washburn et al., 2016).

24 Based on previous literature documenting difficulties in self-reported cognitive
25 empathy (Kerr-Gaffney et al., 2019), we hypothesised that individuals with AN would show

1 poorer cognitive empathy performance compared to HCs, but no differences in affective
2 empathy. We expected an intermediate cognitive empathy profile in REC (scores lying
3 between that of AN and HC). Regarding perception of nonverbal communication, we
4 hypothesised that AN would show lower overall performance compared to HCs. We did not
5 make any prediction on the specific modalities affected, due to a lack of research in this area.

6

7

Methods

8 **Participants**

9 Ethical approval was obtained from the National Health Service Research Ethics
10 Committee (Camberwell St Giles, 17/LO/1960). All participants were required to be between
11 18 and 55 years old and fluent in English. Exclusion criteria were a history of brain trauma or
12 learning disability. HC participants were recruited through a King's College London email
13 circular and posters around campuses. Before taking part, HC participants were screened
14 using the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 Disorders, research version (SCID-5-RV;
15 First et al., 2015), to ensure they did not meet criteria for any psychiatric disorders. HCs were
16 required to have a body mass index (BMI) between 19 and 27.

17 In addition to the university advertisements, participants with AN or REC were
18 recruited through online advertisements (B-eat, call for participants, MQ mental health).
19 Participants with AN were also recruited through two specialist NHS ED services in London.
20 AN and REC were screened using the SCID-5-RV to confirm a current or past diagnosis of
21 AN. Participants with AN were required to have a BMI ≤ 18.5 , and REC participants a BMI
22 between 19 and 27. Further, REC participants were required to have maintained a BMI within
23 this range for at least 1 year prior to testing.

24

1 **Materials**

2 The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence - Second Edition (WASI-II; Wechsler, 2011)
3 measures verbal intelligence and perceptual reasoning, as well as full-scale IQ. The two
4 subtest version was used (vocabulary and matrix reasoning).

5 The Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire (EDE-Q; Fairburn and Beglin, 1994)
6 measures severity of ED psychopathology. Global scores are calculated by averaging
7 responses across items, with higher scores indicating more severe symptoms (max 6). HCs
8 with a score of >2.7 were excluded to ensure those with possible sub-threshold ED symptoms
9 were not included (Lang et al., 2016). Cronbach's alpha was 0.98.

10 The Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule – 2nd edition (ADOS-2), Module 4 (Lord et
11 al., 2012) is a standardised semi-structured interview for the assessment of ASD. It includes a
12 range of questions and activities designed to evoke behaviours and cognitions associated with
13 ASD. The revised algorithm, which was designed to more closely reflect the DSM-5 criteria
14 for ASD was used for scoring (Hus and Lord, 2014). The algorithm has two subscales: social
15 affect and restrictive and repetitive behaviours, and total scores of 8 or more indicate possible
16 ASD. The ADOS-2 was used in this study to provide an observational measure of ASD traits,
17 which is recommended in the assessment of ASD (NICE, 2012). Interviews were
18 administered and scored by the first author, who received ADOS-2 training and met
19 requirements for research reliability.

20 The Social Responsiveness Scale-2nd Edition, adult self-report form (SRS-2; Constantino
21 and Gruber, 2005) measures symptoms associated with ASD, with higher scores (max 195)
22 indicating more autistic symptoms. There are 5 sub-scales: social awareness, social cognition,
23 social communication, social motivation, and restrictive interests and repetitive behaviour.
24 Cronbach's alpha was 0.97.

1 The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS; Zigmond and Snaith, 1983) is a 14 item
2 scale with two subscales: anxiety and depression. Subscale scores are interpreted as: normal
3 (0-7), mild (8-10), moderate (11-14), and severe (15-21). Cronbach's alpha was 0.94.

4 The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale (LSAS; Liebowitz, 1987) has two subscales: fear and
5 avoidance of social situations. A score of 30 has been established as a cut-off indicative of
6 SAD (Rytwinski et al., 2009). Cronbach's alpha was 0.97.

7 The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20; Bagby et al., 1994) has three
8 subscales: difficulty identifying feelings, difficulty describing feelings, and externally
9 oriented thinking. Total scores range from 0 to 100, and cut-offs are as follows: ≤ 51 = no
10 alexithymia; 52-60 = borderline alexithymia; and ≥ 61 = alexithymia (Parker et al., 1993).
11 Cronbach's alpha was 0.90.

12 The Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS; Mundt et al., 2002) is a brief measure of
13 functional impairment in five domains: work, home management, social leisure, private
14 leisure, and ability to form and maintain close relationships. Scores range from 0 to 40, with a
15 score of 20 or more indicating clinical significance. Cronbach's alpha was 0.93.

16 The Multifaceted Empathy Test (MET; Dziobek et al., 2008) is a performance-based measure
17 of cognitive and affective empathy, using photo-realistic, context-embedded stimuli. Forty
18 photographs of people in various emotional states (20 positive and 20 negative) are presented
19 twice. In 40 trials participants are asked to identify which emotion the person is feeling out of
20 a choice of four emotions (cognitive empathy), and in a further 40 trials they are asked to
21 indicate how much they empathise with the person depicted on a scale of one (not at all) to
22 nine (a lot) (affective empathy). The outcome measure for cognitive empathy is a total correct
23 score out of 40 (although note that scores in normative samples do not reach ceiling, e.g.,
24 Drimalla et al., 2019; Kuypers et al., 2017), while affective empathy is a mean score out of 9.

1 Positive and negative empathy scores can be calculated for affective and cognitive empathy.
2 The MET was presented on a 14” monitor using Psychopy (Pierce, 2009).
3 The Mini-Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity (MiniPONS; Bänziger et al., 2011) measures the
4 ability to recognise emotions, interpersonal attitudes, and intentions from different modes of
5 nonverbal communication (face only, body only, voice only, face and voice together). The
6 task consists of 64 clips (2s each), depicting the same actor in different interpersonal
7 situations. Respondents are required to indicate the correct answer from a choice of two after
8 each clip. The short version used here correlates highly with the full version, which has been
9 validated in a number of populations (Rosenthal et al., 1979). A total score out of 64 is
10 calculated, as well as scores out of 16 for each of the 4 channels. Accuracy in a normative
11 sample in the original validation study was 80% for total scores (Bänziger et al., 2011).

12

13 **Procedure**

14 Participants attended a testing session at the Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology &
15 Neuroscience, however where participants were inpatients (N = 11), testing took place at
16 their place of treatment. Written informed consent was obtained. The first author
17 administered the WASI-II, followed by the MET and the MiniPONS, and then conducted the
18 ADOS-2. Finally the participant completed the questionnaires. At the end of the session,
19 participants' heights and weights were taken to calculate BMI (weight/height²). The session
20 took around 2 hours, and all participants were reimbursed £20 for their time.

21

22 **Data analysis**

1 was significantly older in individuals with AN compared to REC, and they were more likely
2 to be taking a psychiatric medication. Seventy-eight percent of participants with AN had a
3 diagnosis of AN restricting sub-type (AN-R), the rest had AN binge-purge subtype (AN-BP).
4 AN-R and AN-BP did not differ on any demographic variable or performance on social-
5 cognitive tasks, however AN-BP had significantly higher HADS depression scores, $t(49)=-$
6 $2.08, p=.043$ and TAS-20 scores, $t(31.55)=-2.16, p=.038$.

7 TABLE 1 HERE

8 **Psychopathology**

9 Scores on self-report questionnaires assessing dimensions of psychopathology and
10 functional impairment are presented in Table 2, as well as ADOS-2 total and subscale scores.
11 On each self-report scale, all three groups significantly differed from one another, with AN
12 showing the highest levels of psychopathology, REC an intermediate profile, and HC the
13 lowest scores. Regarding the ADOS-2, AN had significantly higher total, SA, and RRB
14 scores than HCs (all $p<.01$). A significantly higher proportion of AN and REC participants
15 scored above the clinical cut-off for ASD compared to HC (both $p<.05$).

16 TABLE 2 HERE

17 **Social cognition**

18 Results from the MET and MiniPONS are presented in Table 3. Groups did not
19 significantly differ in their total cognitive empathy scores or mean affective empathy.
20 However, AN had significantly lower positive affective empathy scores compared to HC
21 ($p=.004$). Groups did not differ on total MiniPONS scores, however an ANOVA revealed
22 perception of nonverbal communication through voice significantly differed between groups.
23 Post hoc tests indicated a trend towards AN scoring lower than REC, $p=.057$.

TABLE 3 HERE

Associations between psychopathology and social cognition

Cognitive empathy scores were significantly positively associated with IQ ($r=.29$, $p<.001$) and age ($r=.22$, $p=.009$), and negatively correlated with ADOS-2 ($r=-.29$, $p<.001$), SRS-2 ($r=-.23$, $p=.005$), and TAS-20 scores ($r=-.20$, $p=.02$). A hierarchical multiple regression was run to determine if the addition of ADOS-2 and TAS-20 scores would improve the prediction of cognitive empathy scores over group membership, age, and IQ.¹ The full model was significant, $R^2=.20$, $F(6, 132)=5.37$, $p<.001$, adjusted $R^2=.16$. Details of each regression model are displayed in Table 4. The addition of ADOS-2 scores to the prediction of cognitive empathy (Model 2) led to a significant increase in R^2 of .04, $F(1,133)= 6.48$, $p=.012$. The addition of TAS-20 scores (model 3) did not significantly add to the prediction.

TABLE 4 HERE

Mean affective empathy was significantly positively correlated with BMI ($r=.17$, $p=.042$), and negatively correlated with WSAS ($r=-.23$, $p=.006$), HADS anxiety ($r=-.24$, $p=.004$), HADS depression ($r=-.26$, $p=.002$), LSAS ($r=-.22$, $p=.009$), TAS-20 ($r=-.35$, $p<.001$), SRS-2 ($r=-.37$, $p<.001$), and ADOS-2 total scores ($r=-.30$, $p<.001$). A hierarchical multiple regression was run to determine if the addition of ASD symptoms, HADS anxiety and depression, LSAS, and TAS-20 scores would improve the prediction of affective empathy scores over group membership and BMI.² The full model was significant, $R^2=.18$, $F(7, 132) = 4.03$, $p<.001$, adjusted $R^2=.13$. Details of each regression model are displayed in Table 5. The addition of ADOS-2 scores to the prediction of cognitive empathy (Model 2) led

¹ SRS-2 scores were not included in the regression due to the correlation with ADOS-2 scores

² WSAS scores were not included in the regression due to the hypothesised direction of causality between variables

1 to a significant increase in R^2 of .08, $F(1,135)=12.42$, $p=.012$. The addition of HADS (model
2 3), TAS-20 (Model 4), and LSAS scores (Model 5) did not significantly add to the prediction.

3 TABLE 5 HERE

4 Total MiniPONS scores were positively correlated with BMI ($r=.21$, $p=.01$) and IQ
5 ($r=.27$, $p=.001$), and negatively correlated with WSAS ($r=-.19$, $p=.026$), HADS depression
6 ($r=-.20$, $p=.019$), SRS-2 ($r=-.29$, $p=.001$), and ADOS-2 ($r=-.21$, $p=.011$). A hierarchical
7 multiple regression was run to determine if the addition of ADOS-2 scores and HADS
8 depression would improve the prediction of MiniPONS scores over group membership, BMI,
9 and IQ. The full model was significant, $R^2=.12$, $F(6, 134)=2.90$, $p=.011$, adjusted $R^2=.08$. See
10 Table 6 for details of each regression model. The addition of ADOS-2 scores (model 2) and
11 HADS depression (model 3) did not significantly add to the prediction of MiniPONS scores.

12 TABLE 6 HERE

13 Associations between ASD symptoms and cognitive and affective empathy were
14 explored further by grouping individuals with lifetime AN (REC and current AN) based on
15 whether they met the clinical cut-off for ASD on the ADOS-2, and comparing their scores
16 with HCs. The two HCs who scored above cut-off on the ADOS-2 were excluded, due to
17 their being too few cases to assess group differences. Thus, 44 HC, 26 lifetime AN scoring
18 above ADOS-2 cut-off (AN+ASD), and 75 lifetime AN scoring below the ADOS-2 cut off
19 (AN-ASD) were included in analyses. Results are displayed in Figure 1. One-way ANOVAs
20 with Tukey's post-hoc tests indicated that AN+ASD had significantly lower total cognitive
21 empathy and positive cognitive empathy scores compared to AN-ASD ($p=.015$ and $p=.019$
22 respectively). AN+ASD also had significantly lower mean affective empathy scores than AN-
23 ASD ($p=.011$) and HC ($p=.003$), and lower positive affective empathy scores than AN-ASD

1 ($p=.049$) and HC ($p<.001$). AN-ASD and HC did not significantly differ on any of the MET
2 outcome measures.

3 FIGURE 1 HERE

5 Discussion

6 The primary aim of the current study was to compare performance across socio-
7 emotional cognition tasks in individuals with AN, recovered AN, and HCs. To our
8 knowledge, this is the first study to use a performance-based measure of cognitive and
9 affective empathy in AN. Contrary to our hypothesis, there were no differences in cognitive
10 empathy across groups. Instead, those with AN showed significantly lower affective empathy
11 performance when stimuli were positively valenced, compared to HC. Performance in the
12 REC group reflected an intermediate profile and did not significantly differ from that of the
13 other two groups. Regarding perception of nonverbal behaviour, no significant group
14 differences in total MiniPONS scores were found. However, there was a trend towards lower
15 vocal prosody perception scores in AN relative to REC. In addition, associations between
16 social cognition performance, dimensions of psychopathology, and demographic variables
17 were found. Each of these findings will be discussed in turn.

18 The lack of group differences in cognitive empathy contrasts with findings from a
19 recent meta-analysis, which found that individuals with AN had lower self-reported cognitive
20 empathy scores (small effect size) compared to HC (Kerr-Gaffney et al., 2019).
21 Discrepancies between self-report and performance-based measures of empathy have been
22 found in other psychiatric disorders, such as schizophrenia (Bonfils et al., 2016; Derntl et al.,
23 2009). Self-reporting one's own empathic abilities may be particularly difficult in those with
24 high levels of alexithymia, as was the case in our AN group. Our results also contrast with

1 previous studies showing emotion recognition difficulties in AN (Caglar-Nazali et al., 2014).
2 There are a number of possible explanations for this. The MET, while showing relatively
3 complex emotional states, also includes contextual information (e.g., a woman looking tired
4 in a hospital bed). Thus, the cognitive empathy test in the MET does not measure pure
5 emotion recognition ability from isolated facial expressions. A tentative conclusion may be
6 that while individuals with AN have some difficulties in recognising emotions from faces
7 alone, they are able to attend to other cues in the environment that facilitate understanding
8 and empathising ability.

9 Another explanation for the lack of group differences in cognitive empathy (and
10 overall affective empathy) scores concerns another of our findings: ASD symptoms predicted
11 empathic abilities, rather than AN diagnosis. The correlation analysis showed that higher
12 cognitive empathy scores were associated with higher IQ and older age, and lower levels of
13 alexithymia and ASD symptoms (measured by both the ADOS-2 and SRS-2). When entered
14 into regression models, IQ, age, and ADOS-2 scores remained as significant predictors of
15 cognitive empathy scores. Higher affective empathy scores were correlated with higher BMI,
16 and lower levels of anxiety, depression, social anxiety, alexithymia, ASD symptoms
17 (measured by both the SRS-2 and ADOS-2) and work and social adjustment difficulties.
18 However, when entered into the regression model, only ADOS-2 scores significantly
19 predicted affective empathy scores. Further, individuals with lifetime AN who scored above
20 the clinical cut-off on the ADOS-2 (AN+ASD) had lower overall and positive cognitive
21 empathy scores, compared to those who scored below the cut-off (AN-ASD). AN+ASD also
22 had lower overall affective empathy and positive affective empathy scores than both AN-
23 ASD and HCs, who did not differ from one another on any empathy measure. Thus, it is
24 possible that variations in ASD symptoms across study samples contribute to the mixed
25 findings in emotion recognition and empathy studies in AN. It must be noted that R^2 was

1 rather small in our regression analyses, suggesting other unmeasured factors also contributed
2 to empathic abilities.

3 Despite ASD symptoms being a better predictor of overall affective empathy,
4 individuals with AN had lower positive affective empathy scores compared to HCs. This is in
5 agreement with a few studies investigating facial expressivity – a component of empathy that
6 has been termed “motor empathy” (Blair, 2005). Two studies found that those with AN
7 produced fewer positive facial expressions in response to a positive film clip compared to
8 HC, whereas there was no difference between groups while watching negatively valenced
9 clips (Cardi et al., 2014; Lang et al., 2016). Although not included in our study, previous
10 research using the MET has found that affective empathy scores are strongly associated with
11 degree of facial expressivity during the task (Drimalla et al., 2019). Difficulties in
12 empathising with positive emotions in others in AN may be related to higher levels of social
13 anhedonia – a lack of pleasure and reward from social interaction (Tchanturia et al., 2012). If
14 individuals with AN are less able to share the positive emotions of others, they may be less
15 likely to seek out social interactions, leading to further isolation and difficulties with
16 relationships. Further, a lack of expression of positive empathic responses during social
17 interactions is likely to signal disinterest or rejection. This finding may be important in
18 developing interventions that aim to increase positive emotions and develop social skills to
19 improve social life in AN (Lyubomirsky and Layous, 2013).

20 In addition to intact cognitive empathy performance, the results from the MiniPONS
21 generally do not support the hypothesis that individuals with AN have difficulties in
22 understanding emotions and intentions through nonverbal communication. This is consistent
23 with findings of a previous study, which did not find significant differences in performance
24 on the TASIT in individuals with AN compared to HCs (Gramaglia et al., 2016). Considering
25 predictors of MiniPONS performance, IQ was found to be the only significant predictor in

1 regression models. The association between IQ and interpersonal sensitivity has been
2 reported in several studies previously (Murphy and Hall, 2011). This might be due to some
3 common variable involved in both understanding others and performance on IQ tests, such as
4 attention. However the results from the regression model in this study would suggest a causal
5 relationship – higher intelligence may allow for a better understanding of meaning from
6 nonverbal cues. This would also explain the association found between IQ and cognitive but
7 not affective empathy performance.

8 In the current study 27.5% of AN and 24% of REC met the clinical cut-off for ASD
9 on the ADOS-2, a significantly greater proportion than in the HC group (4.3%). Past research
10 has reported similar findings, although few studies have included a REC group (Anckarsäter
11 et al., 2012; Bentz et al., 2017; Vagni et al., 2016; Westwood et al., 2017). It has been argued
12 that high levels of ASD traits seen in AN are a consequence of starvation, or some other
13 factor associated with the ill state (Hiller and Pellicano, 2013). Given that almost the same
14 proportion of individuals in our REC group scored above the clinical cut-off, starvation is
15 unlikely to be the major contributor to elevated ASD traits in our study. Similarly, it could be
16 that psychomotor agitation (e.g., tapping, restlessness, fidgeting) associated with high levels
17 of anxiety and/or depression (Zbozinek et al., 2012) in AN and REC groups is being
18 interpreted as sensory motivated autistic behaviours on the ADOS-2. However, a recent study
19 using the new scoring algorithm found that anxiety, depression, and BMI were not associated
20 with ADOS-2 scores in REC or AN (Sedgewick et al., 2019). Thus, our study supports the
21 view that ASD symptoms are stable traits in a proportion in those with AN.

22 **Limitations**

23 A limitation of the current study is the cross-sectional design. It is possible that
24 differences in social-cognitive functioning or psychological resources contributed to the

1 recovery of the REC group. Future research would benefit from following the same group of
2 individuals with AN before and after recovery. Further, our study only examined a limited
3 range of socio-emotional skills. Future studies could examine associations between comorbid
4 psychopathology and other aspects of socio-emotional cognition in order to provide a more
5 complete picture of the nature of social dysfunction in AN. Another limitation relates to the
6 assessment of ASD symptoms. Although the ADOS-2 is considered a 'gold-standard' tool for
7 assessing current ASD symptoms, it does not provide enough information to give a diagnosis
8 of ASD. Research using developmental measures in addition to assessing current symptoms
9 would be informative in further defining social cognition in the AN+ASD sub-group. Further,
10 the interviewer administering the ADOS-2 was not blind to the diagnostic status of the
11 groups, potentially introducing bias into the scoring. Finally, a history of psychiatric
12 disorders was an exclusion criteria for HCs, therefore this group may not be representative of
13 the broader population.

14 **Conclusions**

15 Our data show that the presence of AN alone does not lead to lower empathy
16 performance overall, with the exception of positive affective empathy. Rather, those with a
17 previous or current diagnosis of AN plus high ASD symptoms demonstrated lower cognitive
18 and affective empathy compared to those with low ASD symptoms. Individuals with AN and
19 high ASD traits may require different treatment approaches or adaptations. For example,
20 previous research has shown that patients with ASD and AN and their clinicians report
21 difficulties in communicating with one another and a lack of understanding of each other's
22 perspective (Kinnaird et al., 2019, 2017). While a number of interventions have been
23 developed to target facets of social cognition in adults with ASD, improvements tend to be
24 specific to the cognitive task in question, rather than extending to wider aspects of social life

- 1 (Pallathra et al., 2019). Such interventions might be worth exploring in individuals with AN
- 2 and high ASD traits who show difficulties in empathy and emotion recognition.

1 **References**

- 2 Adamson, J., Leppanen, J., Murin, M., Tchanturia, K., 2018. Effectiveness of emotional skills
3 training for patients with anorexia nervosa with autistic symptoms in group and
4 individual format. *Eur. Eat. Disord. Rev.* 26, 367–375. <https://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2594>
- 5 Anckarsäter, H., Hofvander, B., Billstedt, E., Gillberg, I.C., Gillberg, C., Wentz, E., Råstam,
6 M., 2012. The sociocommunicative deficit subgroup in anorexia nervosa: Autism
7 spectrum disorders and neurocognition in a community-based, longitudinal study.
8 *Psychol. Med.* 42, 1957–1967. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002881>
- 9 Attwood, A.S., Easey, K.E., Dalili, M.N., Skinner, A.L., Woods, A., Crick, L., Ilett, E.,
10 Penton-Voak, I.S., Munafò, M.R., 2017. State anxiety and emotional face recognition in
11 healthy volunteers. *R. Soc. open Sci.* 4, 160855. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160855>
- 12 Bagby, R.M., Parker, J.D.A., Taylor, G.J., 1994. The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia
13 scale—I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *J. Psychosom. Res.*
14 38, 23–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3999\(94\)90005-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3999(94)90005-1)
- 15 Bal, E., Harden, E., Lamb, D., Van Hecke, A.V., Denver, J.W., Porges, S.W., 2010. Emotion
16 recognition in children with autism spectrum disorders: Relations to eye gaze and
17 autonomic state. *J. Autism Dev. Disord.* 40, 358–370. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-009-0884-3)
18 [009-0884-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-009-0884-3)
- 19 Bänziger, T., Scherer, K.R., Hall, J.A., Rosenthal, R., 2011. Introducing the MiniPONS: A
20 short multichannel version of the Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity (PONS). *J. Nonverbal*
21 *Behav.* 35, 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-011-0108-3>
- 22 Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., 2004. The Empathy Quotient: An investigation of adults
23 with Asperger syndrome or high functioning autism, and normal sex differences. *J.*

- 1 Autism Dev. Disord. 34, 163–175.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JADD.0000022607.19833.00>
- 3 Bentz, M., Jepsen, J.R.M., Pedersen, T., Bulik, C.M., Pedersen, L., Pagsberg, A.K., Plessen,
4 K.J., 2017. Impairment of social function in young females with recent-onset anorexia
5 nervosa and recovered individuals. *J. Adolesc. Heal.* 60, 23–32.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2016.08.011>
- 7 Blain, S.D., Peterman, J.S., Park, S., 2017. Subtle cues missed: Impaired perception of
8 emotion from gait in relation to schizotypy and autism spectrum traits. *Schizophr. Res.*
9 183, 157–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.11.003>
- 10 Blair, R.J.R., 2005. Responding to the emotions of others: Dissociating forms of empathy
11 through the study of typical and psychiatric populations. *Conscious. Cogn.* 14, 698–718.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2005.06.004>
- 13 Bonfils, K.A., Lysaker, P.H., Minor, K.S., Salyers, M.P., 2016. Affective empathy in
14 schizophrenia: a meta-analysis. *Schizophr. Res.* 175, 109–117.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCHRES.2016.03.037>
- 16 Bora, E., Kose, S., 2016. Meta-analysis of theory of mind in anorexia nervosa and bulimia
17 nervosa: A specific impairment of cognitive perspective taking in anorexia nervosa? *Int.*
18 *J. Eat. Disord.* 49, 739–740. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22572>
- 19 Bourke, C., Douglas, K., Porter, R., 2010. Processing of facial emotion expression in major
20 depression: A review. *Aust. New Zeal. J. Psychiatry* 44, 681–696.
21 <https://doi.org/10.3109/00048674.2010.496359>
- 22 Brewer, R., Cook, R., Cardi, V., Treasure, J., Bird, G., 2015. Emotion recognition deficits in
23 eating disorders are explained by co-occurring alexithymia. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* 2,

- 1 140382–140382. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.140382>
- 2 Brewer, R., Cook, R., Cardi, V., Treasure, J., Catmur, C., Bird, G., 2019. Alexithymia
3 explains increased empathic personal distress in individuals with and without eating
4 disorders. *Q. J. Exp. Psychol.* 72, 1827–1836.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747021818816051>
- 6 Caglar-Nazali, H.P., Corfield, F., Cardi, V., Ambwani, S., Leppanen, J., Olabintan, O.,
7 Deriziotis, S., Hadjimichalis, A., Scognamiglio, P., Eshkevvari, E., Micali, N., Treasure,
8 J., 2014. A systematic review and meta-analysis of “Systems for Social Processes” in
9 eating disorders. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 42, 55–92.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.12.002>
- 11 Cardi, V., Corfield, F., Leppanen, J., Rhind, C., Deriziotis, S., Hadjimichalis, A., Hibbs, R.,
12 Micali, N., Treasure, J., 2015. Emotional processing, recognition, empathy and evoked
13 facial expression in eating disorders: An experimental study to map deficits in social
14 cognition. *PLoS One* 10, e0133827. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0133827>
- 15 Cardi, V., Corfield, F., Leppanen, J., Rhind, C., Deriziotis, S., Hadjimichalis, A., Hibbs, R.,
16 Micali, N., Treasure, J., 2014. Emotional processing of infants displays in eating
17 disorders. *PLoS One* 9. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0113191>
- 18 Cardi, V., Tchanturia, K., Treasure, J., 2018. Premorbid and illness-related social difficulties
19 in eating disorders: An overview of the literature and treatment developments. *Curr.*
20 *Neuropharmacol.* 16, 1122–1130.
21 <https://doi.org/10.2174/1570159X16666180118100028>
- 22 Chita-Tegmark, M., 2016. Social attention in ASD: A review and meta-analysis of eye-
23 tracking studies. *Res. Dev. Disabil.* 48, 79–93.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2015.10.011>

- 1 Constantino, J.N., Gruber, C.P., 2012. Social Responsiveness Scale–Second Edition (SRS-2).
2 Torrance, CA: Western Psychological Services
- 3 Decety, J., Bartal, I.B.A., Uzefovsky, F., Knafo-Noam, A., 2016. Empathy as a driver of
4 prosocial behaviour: Highly conserved neurobehavioural mechanisms across species.
5 *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 371. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0077>
- 6 Demenescu, L.R., Kortekaas, R., den Boer, J.A., Aleman, A., 2010. Impaired attribution of
7 emotion to facial expressions in anxiety and major depression. *PLoS One* 5, e15058.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0015058>
- 9 Derntl, B., Finkelmeyer, A., Toygar, T.K., Hülsmann, A., Schneider, F., Falkenberg, D.I.,
10 Habel, U., 2009. Generalized deficit in all core components of empathy in
11 schizophrenia. *Schizophr. Res.* 108, 197–206.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2008.11.009>
- 13 Drimalla, H., Landwehr, N., Hess, U., Dziobek, I., 2019. From face to face: The contribution
14 of facial mimicry to cognitive and emotional empathy. *Cogn. Emot.* 33, 1672–1686.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2019.1596068>
- 16 Dziobek, I., Rogers, K., Fleck, S., Bahnemann, M., Heekeren, H.R., Wolf, O.T., Convit, A.,
17 2008. Dissociation of cognitive and emotional empathy in adults with Asperger
18 syndrome using the Multifaceted Empathy Test (MET). *J. Autism Dev. Disord.* 38, 464–
19 473. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-007-0486-x>
- 20 Eisenberg, N., Miller, P.A., 1987. The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors.
21 *Psychol. Bull.* 101, 91–119. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.91>
- 22 Fairburn, C.G., Beglin, S.J., 1994. Assessment of eating disorders: Interview or self-report
23 questionnaire? *Int. J. Eat. Disord.* 16, 363–70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/1098->

- 1 108X(199412)16:4<363::AID-EAT2260160405>3.0.CO;2-%23
- 2 First, M.B., Williams, J.B., Karg, R.S., Spitzer, R.L., 2015. Structured Clinical Interview for
3 DSM-5 Disorders, Research Version (SCID-5-RV). Arlington, VA: American
4 Psychiatric Association
- 5 Franko, D.L., Keshaviah, A., Eddy, K.T., Krishna, M., Davis, M.C., Keel, P.K., Herzog,
6 D.B., 2013. A Longitudinal Investigation of Mortality in Anorexia Nervosa and Bulimia
7 Nervosa. *Am. J. Psychiatry* 170, 917–925.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2013.12070868>
- 9 Gillberg, I.C., Råstam, M., Gillberg, C., 1994. Anorexia nervosa outcome: Six-Year
10 controlled longitudinal study of 51 cases including a population cohort. *J. Am. Acad.*
11 *Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 33, 729–739. [https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199406000-](https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199406000-00014)
12 [00014](https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-199406000-00014)
- 13 Gramaglia, C., Ressico, F., Gambaro, E., Palazzolo, A., Mazzarino, M., Bert, F., Siliquini, R.,
14 Zeppegno, P. 2016. Alexithymia, empathy, emotion identification and social inference
15 in anorexia nervosa: A case-control study. *Eating Behaviors*, 22, 46-50.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2016.03.028>
- 17 Halliday, D.W.R., MacDonald, S.W.S., Sherf, S.K., Tanaka, J.W., 2014. A reciprocal model
18 of face recognition and autistic traits: Evidence from an individual differences
19 perspective. *PLoS One* 9, e94013. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094013>
- 20 Happé, F.G.E., 1994. An advanced test of theory of mind: Understanding of story characters'
21 thoughts and feelings by able autistic, mentally handicapped, and normal children and
22 adults. *J. Autism Dev. Disord.* 24, 129–154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02172093>
- 23 Harms, M.B., Martin, A., Wallace, G.L., 2010. Facial emotion recognition in autism

- 1 spectrum disorders: A review of behavioral and neuroimaging studies. *Neuropsychol.*
2 *Rev.* 20, 290–322. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-010-9138-6>
- 3 Hezel, D.M., McNally, R.J., 2014. Theory of mind impairments in social anxiety disorder.
4 *Behav. Ther.* 45, 530–540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2014.02.010>
- 5 Hubert, B., Wicker, B., Moore, D.G., Monfardini, E., Duverger, H., Da Fonséca, D.,
6 Deruelle, C., 2007. Brief report: Recognition of emotional and non-emotional biological
7 motion in individuals with autistic spectrum disorders. *J. Autism Dev. Disord.* 37, 1386–
8 1392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-006-0275-y>
- 9 Hus, V., Lord, C., 2014. The Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, module 4: Revised
10 algorithm and standardized severity scores. *J. Autism Dev. Disord.* 44, 1996–2012.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2080-3>
- 12 Illing, V., Tasca, G.A., Balfour, L., Bissada, H., 2010. Attachment Insecurity Predicts Eating
13 Disorder Symptoms and Treatment Outcomes in a Clinical Sample of Women. *J. Nerv.*
14 *Ment. Dis.* 198, 653–659. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e3181ef34b2>
- 15 Jones, A., Lindekilde, N., Lübeck, M., Clausen, L., 2015. The association between
16 interpersonal problems and treatment outcome in the eating disorders: A systematic
17 review. *Nord. J. Psychiatry* 9488, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3109/08039488.2015.1019924>
- 18 Kerr-Gaffney, J., Harrison, A., Tchanturia, K., 2019. Cognitive and affective empathy in
19 eating disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Psychiatry* 10, 102.
20 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00102>
- 21 Kerr-Gaffney, J., Harrison, A., Tchanturia, K., 2018. Social anxiety in the eating disorders: A
22 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychol. Med.* 48, 2477–2491.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291718000752>

- 1 Kinnaird, E., Norton, C., Stewart, C., Tchanturia, K., 2019. Same behaviours, different
2 reasons: what do patients with co-occurring anorexia and autism want from treatment?
3 *Int. Rev. Psychiatry* 31, 308–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540261.2018.1531831>
- 4 Kinnaird, E., Norton, C., Tchanturia, K., 2017. Clinicians' views on working with anorexia
5 nervosa and autism spectrum disorder comorbidity: A qualitative study. *BMC*
6 *Psychiatry* 17, 292. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1455-3>
- 7 Kleinman, J., Marciano, P.L., Ault, R.L., 2001. Advanced theory of mind in high-functioning
8 adults with autism. *J. Autism Dev. Disord.* 31, 29–36.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005657512379>
- 10 Kok, F.M., Groen, Y., Becke, M., Fuermaier, A.B.M., Tucha, O., 2016. Self-reported
11 empathy in adult women with autism spectrum disorders – a systematic mini review.
12 *PLoS One* 11, e0151568. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151568>
- 13 Kucharska-Pietura, K., Nikolaou, V., Masiak, M., Treasure, J., 2004. The recognition of
14 emotion in the faces and voice of anorexia nervosa. *Int. J. Eat. Disord.* 35, 42–47.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.10219>
- 16 Kuypers, K.P.C., Dolder, P.C., Ramaekers, J.G., Liechti, M.E., 2017. Multifaceted empathy
17 of healthy volunteers after single doses of MDMA: A pooled sample of placebo-
18 controlled studies. *J. Psychopharmacol.* 31, 589–598.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269881117699617>
- 20 Lang, K., Dapelo, M.M., Khondoker, M., Morris, R., Surguladze, S., Treasure, J., Tchanturia,
21 K., 2015. Exploring emotion recognition in adults and adolescents with anorexia nervosa
22 using a body motion paradigm. *Eur. Eat. Disord. Rev.* 23, 262–268.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2358>

- 1 Lang, K., Larsson, E., Mavromara, L., Simic, M., Treasure, J., Tchanturia, K., 2016.
2 Diminished facial emotion expression and associated clinical characteristics in anorexia
3 nervosa. *Psychiatry Res.* 236, 165–172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2015.12.004>
- 4 Leppanen, J., Sedgewick, F., Treasure, J., Tchanturia, K., 2018. Differences in the Theory of
5 Mind profiles of patients with anorexia nervosa and individuals on the autism spectrum:
6 A meta-analytic review. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 90, 146–163.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.04.009>
- 8 Liebowitz, M.R., 1987. Social phobia. *Mod Probl Pharmacopsychiatry* 22, 141–173.
- 9 Luo, C., Burns, E., Xu, H., 2017. Association between autistic traits and emotion adaptation
10 to partially occluded faces. *Vision Res.* 133, 21–36.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2016.12.018>
- 12 Lyubomirsky, S., Layous, K., 2013. How do simple positive activities increase well-being?
13 *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 22, 57–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721412469809>
- 14 McDonald, S., Flanagan, S., Rollins, J. 2002. The awareness of social inference test. Suffolk,
15 UK: Thames Valley Test Company
- 16 Mennin, D.S., Fresco, D.M., Heimberg, R.G., Schneier, F.R., Davies, S.O., Liebowitz, M.R.,
17 2002. Screening for social anxiety disorder in the clinical setting: Using the Liebowitz
18 Social Anxiety Scale. *J. Anxiety Disord.* 16, 661–673. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0887-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0887-6185(02)00134-2)
19 [6185\(02\)00134-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0887-6185(02)00134-2)
- 20 Mundt, J.C., Marks, I.M., Shear, M.K., Greist, J.M., 2002. The Work and Social Adjustment
21 Scale: A simple measure of impairment in functioning. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 180, 461–464.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.180.5.461>
- 23 Murphy, N.A., Hall, J.A., 2011. Intelligence and interpersonal sensitivity: A meta-analysis.

- 1 Intelligence 39, 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2010.10.001>
- 2 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), 2012. Autism: Recognition,
3 Referral, Diagnosis and Management of Adults on the Autism Spectrum (CG142).
4 London: NICE
- 5 Oldershaw, A., Hambrook, D., Tchanturia, K., Treasure, J., Schmidt, U., 2010. Emotional
6 Theory of Mind and Emotional Awareness in Recovered Anorexia Nervosa Patients.
7 *Psychosom. Med.* 72, 73–79. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181c6c7ca>
- 8 Pallathra, A.A., Cordero, L., Wong, K., Brodtkin, E.S., 2019. Psychosocial interventions
9 targeting social functioning in adults on the autism spectrum: A literature review. *Curr.*
10 *Psychiatry Rep.* 21, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-019-0989-0>
- 11 Parker, J.D.A., Taylor, G.J., Bagby, R.M., 1993. Alexithymia and the processing of
12 emotional stimuli: An experimental study. *New Trends Exp. Clin. Psychiatry* 9, 9–14.
- 13 Peirce, J.W., 2009. Generating stimuli for neuroscience using PsychoPy. *Front Neuroinform*
14 2, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/neuro.11.010.2008>
- 15 Pollice, C., Kaye, W.H., Greeno, C.G., Weltzin, T.E., 1997. Relationship of depression,
16 anxiety, and obsessionality to state of illness in anorexia nervosa. *Int. J. Eat. Disord.* 21,
17 367–376. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-108X\(1997\)21:4<367::AID-
18 EAT10>3.0.CO;2-W](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(1997)21:4<367::AID-EAT10>3.0.CO;2-W)
- 19 Rhind, C., Bonfioli, E., Hibbs, R., Goddard, E., Macdonald, P., Gowers, S., Schmidt, U.,
20 Tchanturia, K., Micali, N., Treasure, J., 2014. An examination of autism spectrum traits
21 in adolescents with anorexia nervosa and their parents. *Mol. Autism* 5, 56.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1186/2040-2392-5-56>
- 23 Rosenthal, R., Hall, J.A., DiMatteo, M.R., Rogers, P.L., Archer, D., 1979. Sensitivity to

- 1 nonverbal communication: The PONS test. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins
2 University Press
- 3 Rytwinski, N.K., Fresco, D.M., Heimberg, R.G., Coles, M.E., Liebowitz, M.R., Cissell, S.,
4 Stein, M.B., Hofmann, S.G., 2009. Screening for social anxiety disorder with the self-
5 report version of the liebowitz social anxiety scale. *Depress. Anxiety* 26, 34–38.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.20503>
- 7 Schreiter, S., Pijnenborg, G.H.M., aan het Rot, M., 2013. Empathy in adults with clinical or
8 subclinical depressive symptoms. *J. Affect. Disord.* 150, 1–16.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JAD.2013.03.009>
- 10 Sedgewick, F., Kerr-Gaffney, J.E., Leppanen, J., Tchanturia, K., 2019. Anorexia nervosa,
11 autism, and the ADOS: How appropriate is the new algorithm in identifying cases?
12 *Front Psychiatry* 10, 507.
- 13 Swinbourne, J., Touyz, S., 2007. The co-morbidity of eating disorders and anxiety disorders:
14 A review. *Eur. Eat. Disord. Rev.* 15, 215–221. <https://doi.org/10.1002/erv>
- 15 Tasca, G.A., Presniak, M.D., Demidenko, N., Balfour, L., Krynski, V., Trinneer, A.,
16 Bissada, H., 2011. Testing a maintenance model for eating disorders in a sample seeking
17 treatment at a tertiary care center: A structural equation modeling approach. *Compr.*
18 *Psychiatry* 52, 678–687. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPPSYCH.2010.12.010>
- 19 Tchanturia, K., Davies, H., Harrison, A., Fox, J.R.E., Treasure, J., Schmidt, U., 2012. Altered
20 social hedonic processing in eating disorders. *Int. J. Eat. Disord.* 45, 962–969.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22032>
- 22 Tiller, J.M., Sloane, G., Schmidt, U., Troop, N., Power, M., Treasure, J.L., 1997. Social
23 support in patients with anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa. *Int. J. Eat. Disord.* 21,

- 1 31–8. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-108X\(199701\)21:1<31::AID-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(199701)21:1<31::AID-)
2 [EAT4>3.0.CO;2-4](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(199701)21:1<31::AID-EAT4>3.0.CO;2-4)
- 3 Treasure, J., Schmidt, U., 2013. The cognitive-interpersonal maintenance model of anorexia
4 nervosa revisited: A summary of the evidence for cognitive, socio-emotional and
5 interpersonal predisposing and perpetuating factors. *J. Eat. Disord.* 1, 13.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1186/2050-2974-1-13>
- 7 Vagni, D., Moscone, D., Travaglione, S., Cotugno, A., 2016. Using the Ritvo Autism
8 Asperger Diagnostic Scale-Revised (RAADS-R) disentangle the heterogeneity of
9 autistic traits in an Italian eating disorder population. *Res. Autism Spectr. Disord.* 32,
10 143–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2016.10.002>
- 11 Washburn, D., Wilson, G., Roes, M., Rnic, K., Harkness, K.L., 2016. Theory of mind in
12 social anxiety disorder, depression, and comorbid conditions. *J. Anxiety Disord.* 37, 71–
13 77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2015.11.004>
- 14 Wechsler, D., 2011. Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence, Second Edition (WASI-II).
15 San Antonio, TX: NCS Pearson
- 16 Wentz, E., Gillberg, I.C., Anckarsäter, H., Gillberg, C., Råstam, M., 2009. Adolescent-onset
17 anorexia nervosa: 18-year outcome. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 194, 168–174.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.107.048686>
- 19 Westwood, H., Mandy, W., Simic, M., Tchanturia, K., 2018. Assessing ASD in Adolescent
20 Females with Anorexia Nervosa using Clinical and Developmental Measures: a
21 Preliminary Investigation. *J. Abnorm. Child Psychol.* 46, 183–192.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-017-0301-x>
- 23 Westwood, H., Mandy, W., Tchanturia, K., 2017. Clinical evaluation of autistic symptoms in

- 1 women with anorexia nervosa. *Mol. Autism* 8, 12. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13229-017-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13229-017-0128-x)
2 0128-x
- 3 Winecoff, A.A., Ngo, L., Moskovich, A., Merwin, R., Zucker, N., 2015. The functional
4 significance of shyness in anorexia nervosa. *Eur. Eat. Disord. Rev.* 23, 327–32.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2363>
- 6 Zbozinek, T.D., Rose, R.D., Wolitzky-Taylor, K.B., Sherbourne, C., Sullivan, G., Stein,
7 M.B., Roy-Byrne, P.P., Craske, M.G., 2012. Diagnostic overlap of generalized anxiety
8 disorder and major depressive disorder in a primary care sample. *Depress. Anxiety* 29,
9 1065–71. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.22026>
- 10 Zhao, X., Li, X., Song, Y., Shi, W., 2018. Autistic traits and prosocial behaviour in the
11 general population: Test of the mediating effects of trait empathy and state empathic
12 concern. *J. Autism Dev. Disord.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-018-3745-0>
- 13 Zigmond, A.S., Snaith, R.P., 1983. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr.*
14 *Scand.* 67, 361–70.
- 15 Zipfel, S., Löwe, B., Reas, D.L., Deter, H.-C., Herzog, W., 2000. Long-term prognosis in
16 anorexia nervosa: lessons from a 21-year follow-up study. *Lancet* 355, 721–722.
17 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(99\)05363-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(99)05363-5)
- 18 Zucker, N., Moskovich, A., Bulik, C.M., Merwin, R., Gaddis, K., Losh, M., Piven, J.,
19 Wagner, H.R., Labar, K.S., 2013. Perception of affect in biological motion cues in
20 anorexia nervosa. *Int. J. Eat. Disord.* 46, 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22062>
21

Table 1. Mean (SD) demographic information

	AN (N = 51)	REC (N = 50)	HC (N = 46)	Test statistics	<i>p</i> -value	η^2/d
Age (years) [†]	27.57 (8.52)	26.33 (8.04)	24.37 (4.43)	F(2, 92.29) = 2.50	.09	.03
% female	92.2	98.0	93.5	Fisher's exact test = 1.89	.44	
BMI	15.72 (1.41) ^a	21.20 (1.95) ^b	21.69 (1.88) ^b	F(2, 143) = 178.44	<.001	.71
Years of education	16.22 (3.15)	16.53 (2.59)	16.63 (2.45)	F(2, 143) = 0.42	.66	.01
IQ	109.69 (13.28)	109.66 (11.28)	113.78 (7.25)	F(2, 143) = 2.16	.12	.03
Age diagnosed [†]	19.64 (7.22) ^a	16.44 (3.53) ^b	-	t(83.56) = 2.70	.01	.56
Illness length (years)	7.19 (7.45)	5.31 (5.62)	-	t(90.92) = 1.63	.11	.28
% on psychiatric medication	54.9 ^a	32.0 ^b	-	X ² = 5.39	.02	

AN, anorexia nervosa; BMI, body mass index; HC, healthy control; IQ, intelligence quotient; REC, recovered anorexia nervosa; SD, standard deviation;

Different superscripts indicate significant differences between groups, significant *p*-values are highlighted in bold.

[†]Variable was log transformed for analyses, original values are displayed.

Table 2. Mean (SD) scores on self-report questionnaires and ADOS-2

	AN (N = 51)	REC (N = 50)	HC (N = 46)	Test statistics	<i>p</i> -value	η^2
EDE-Q	3.85 (1.37) ^a	1.82 (1.51) ^b	0.61 (0.58) ^c	F(2, 80.38) = 118.73	<.001	.54
HADS anxiety	13.92 (4.46) ^a	10.78 (5.07) ^b	5.02 (3.09) ^c	F(2, 93.61) = 71.10	<.001	.42
HADS depression	10.14 (4.31) ^a	5.00 (3.99) ^b	1.54 (1.68) ^c	F(2, 83.47) = 92.50	<.001	.50
LSAS	71.68 (31.41) ^a	56.60 (29.86) ^b	27.91 (18.32) ^c	F(2, 91.43) = 41.29	<.001	.31
SRS-2	85.29 (32.78) ^a	70.04 (31.97) ^b	39.23 (20.18) ^c	F(2, 138) = 30.44	<.001	.30
TAS-20	58.82 (13.28) ^a	49.80 (14.92) ^b	37.47 (11.26) ^c	F(2, 139) = 32.37	<.001	.30
WSAS	23.26 (8.70) ^a	11.10 (8.6) ^b	3.59 (6.23) ^c	F(2, 93.6) = 79.93	<.001	.51
ADOS						
Total	5.47 (4.44) ^a	4.18 (4.46) ^{ab}	2.70 (2.52) ^b	F(2, 91.23) = 7.86	<.001	.88
SA	4.71 (4.03) ^a	3.74 (3.93) ^{ab}	2.50 (2.38) ^b	F(2, 92.34) = 5.95	.004	.78
RRB	0.76 (1.07) ^a	0.44 (0.88) ^{ab}	0.20 (0.58) ^b	F(2, 92.35) = 5.65	.005	.82
% above cut-off	27.5 ^a	24 ^a	4.3 ^b	X ² = 9.58	.008	

ADOS-2, Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule – 2nd edition; AN, anorexia nervosa; EDE-Q, eating disorder examination questionnaire; HADS, hospital anxiety and depression scale; HC, healthy control; LSAS, Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale; REC, recovered anorexia nervosa; RRB, restrictive and repetitive behaviours; SA, social affect; SD, standard deviation; SRS-2, social responsiveness scale-2nd edition; TAS-20, Twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale; WSAS, Work and Social Adjustment Scale

Different superscripts indicate significant differences between groups, significant *p*-values are highlighted in bold.

Table 3. Mean (SD) social cognition scores and analysis of group differences

	AN (N = 51)	REC (N = 50)	HC (N = 46)	Test statistics	<i>p</i> -value	η^2
MET cognitive empathy (max 40)	27.22 (3.55)	28.42 (3.01)	27.72 (3.49)	F(2, 143) = 0.72	.49	.01
Positive (max 20)	15.00 (1.90)	15.15 (2.03)	15.20 (1.98)	F(2, 143) = 0.14	.87	.00
Negative (max 20)	12.72 (2.41)	13.22 (1.84)	12.52 (2.43)	F(2, 143) = 1.26	.28	.02
MET affective empathy (max 9)	4.74 (1.67)	4.90 (1.32)	5.30 (1.66)	F(2, 143) = 1.65	.20	.02
Positive (max 9)	3.84 (1.99) ^a	4.41 (1.68) ^{ab}	5.10 (1.99) ^b	F(2, 143) = 5.34	.006	.07
Negative (max 9)	5.63 (1.93)	5.40 (1.52)	5.50 (2.01)	F(2, 143) = 0.21	.81	.00
MiniPONS total (max 64)	48.27 (7.31)	50.43 (4.21)	49.61 (4.22)	F(2, 92.91) = 1.69	.19	.03
Face only (max 16)	11.53 (1.94)	11.80 (1.50)	11.61 (1.45)	F(2, 143) = 0.34	.71	.01
Body only (max 16)	12.04 (1.97)	12.10 (1.56)	11.72 (1.76)	F(2, 143) = 0.64	.53	.01
Voice only (max 16)	11.88 (2.62)	12.86 (1.49)	12.71 (2.03)	F(2, 143) = 3.13	.047	.04
Face & voice (max 16)	12.82 (2.46)	13.67 (2.01)	13.57 (1.46)	F(2, 92.99) = 1.08	.13	.04

AN, anorexia nervosa; HC, healthy control; MET, multifaceted empathy test; MiniPONS, Mini-Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity; REC, recovered anorexia nervosa; SD, standard deviation

Different superscripts indicate significant differences between groups, significant *p*-values are highlighted in bold.

Table 4. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting cognitive empathy from associated demographic variables and psychopathology scores

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
IQ	.29***	.25**	.24**
Age [†]	.20*	.18*	.16*
ADOS-2		-.21*	-.18*
TAS-20			-.12
R ²	.15	.19	.20

Note: Figures shown are standardised coefficients. Group membership was entered in Model 1, but was not significant and not displayed here

[†]Variable was log transformed for analyses

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 5. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting affective empathy from associated demographic variables and psychopathology scores

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
BMI	.31*	.26	.23	.20	.19
ADOS-2		-.30***	-.26**	-.22*	-.23*
HADS			-.21	-.10	-.14
TAS-20				-.21	-.23
LSAS					.09
R ²	.05	.13	.15	.17	.18

Note: Figures shown are standardised coefficients. Group membership was entered in Model 1, but was not significant and not displayed here

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 6. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting MiniPONS scores from associated demographic variables and psychopathology scores

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
BMI	.26	.26	.25
IQ	.28***	.27**	.26**
ADOS-2		-.04	-.03
HADS depression			-.12
R ²	.11	.11	.12

Note: Figures shown are standardised coefficients. Group membership was entered in Model 1, but was not significant and not displayed here

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$




Figure 1. Mean scores for A) cognitive empathy and B) affective empathy. Error bars indicate standard deviation. HC = healthy controls; AN-ASD = lifetime AN, below cut-off on the ADOS-2; AN+ASD = lifetime AN, above cut-off on the ADOS-2. Significant p -values indicating group differences are marked with an asterisk; * $< .05$, ** $< .01$, *** $< .001$.