



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.3389/fpsy.2019.00102](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00102)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kerr-Gaffney, J., Harrison, A. K., & Tchanturia, K. (2019). Cognitive and Affective Empathy in Eating Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 10*, [102].
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2019.00102>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Cognitive and Affective Empathy in Eating Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

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

¹King's College London, United Kingdom, ²University College London, United Kingdom, ³South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom, ⁴Illia State University, Georgia

Submitted to Journal:
Frontiers in Psychiatry

Specialty Section:
Social Cognition

Article type:
Systematic Review Article

Manuscript ID:
439223

Received on:
27 Nov 2018

Revised on:
18 Jan 2019

Frontiers website link:
www.frontiersin.org

In review

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest

Author contribution statement

JK performed the search, data extraction, and wrote the manuscript. KT leads the research group within which this work was conducted and is JK lead supervisor for PhD. KT and AH edited the manuscript before submission.

Keywords

Anorexia Nervosa, Eating Disorders, Empathy, Autism (ASD), self-report, Insight

Abstract

Word count: 284

Background: Recent models of eating disorders (EDs) have proposed social and emotional difficulties as key factors in the development and maintenance of the illness. While a number of studies have demonstrated difficulties in theory of mind and emotion recognition, little is known about empathic abilities in those with EDs. Further, few studies have examined the cognitive-affective empathy profile in EDs. The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to provide a synthesis of empathy studies in EDs, and examine whether those with EDs differ from healthy controls (HC) on self-reported total, cognitive, and affective empathy. Methods: Electronic databases were systematically searched for studies using self-report measures of empathy in ED populations. In total, 17 studies were identified, 14 of which could be included in the total empathy meta-analysis. Eight of the 14 studies were included in the cognitive and affective empathy meta-analyses. Results: Meta-analyses showed that while total empathy and affective empathy scores did not differ between those with anorexia nervosa (AN) and HC, those with AN had significantly lower cognitive empathy scores compared to HCs (small effect size). Meta-analyses of Interpersonal Reactivity Index sub-scores revealed that AN had significantly lower Fantasy scores than HC (small effect size), indicating that those with AN have more difficulty in identifying themselves with fictional characters. Only 3 studies examined empathy in those with bulimia nervosa (BN) or binge eating disorder (BED). Conclusions: The lowered cognitive empathy and intact affective empathy profile found in AN is similar to that found in other psychiatric and neurodevelopmental conditions, such as autism spectrum disorder (ASD). These findings add to the literature characterising the socio-emotional phenotype in EDs. Future research should examine the influence of comorbid psychopathology on empathy in EDs.

Funding statement

JK is supported by a studentship from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). KT would like to acknowledge financial support from MRC and MRF Child and Young Adult Mental Health and Prof Tracey Wade and Norman Munn Distinguished Visiting Scholar Award 2017/2018 from Flinders University South Australia. AH would like to acknowledge support from the MRC.

Data availability statement

Generated Statement: No datasets were generated or analyzed for this study.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Cognitive and Affective Empathy in Eating Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

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

²University 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

Correspondence:

Jess Kerr-Gaffney

jess.kerr-gaffney@kcl.ac.uk

Words: 6095

Abstract: 284

Figures: 8

Abstract

Background: Recent models of eating disorders (EDs) have proposed social and emotional difficulties as key factors in the development and maintenance of the illness. While a number of studies have demonstrated difficulties in theory of mind and emotion recognition, little is known about empathic abilities in those with EDs. Further, few studies have examined the cognitive-affective empathy profile in EDs. The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to provide a synthesis of empathy studies in EDs, and examine whether those with EDs differ from healthy controls (HC) on self-reported total, cognitive, and affective empathy. **Methods:** Electronic databases were systematically searched for studies using self-report measures of empathy in ED populations. In total, 17 studies were identified, 14 of which could be included in the total empathy meta-analysis. Eight of the 14 studies were included in the cognitive and affective empathy meta-analyses. **Results:** Meta-analyses showed that while total empathy and affective empathy scores did not differ between those with anorexia nervosa (AN) and HC, those with AN had significantly lower cognitive empathy scores compared to HCs (small effect size). Meta-analyses of Interpersonal Reactivity Index sub-scores revealed that AN had significantly lower Fantasy scores than HC (small effect size), indicating that those with AN have more difficulty in identifying themselves with fictional characters. Only 3 studies examined empathy in those with bulimia nervosa (BN) or binge eating disorder (BED). **Conclusions:** The lowered cognitive empathy and intact affective empathy profile found in AN is similar to that found in other psychiatric and neurodevelopmental conditions, such as autism spectrum disorder (ASD). These findings add to the literature characterising the socio-emotional phenotype in EDs. Future research should examine the influence of comorbid psychopathology on empathy in EDs.

Keywords: empathy, eating disorders, anorexia nervosa, autism, self-report, insight

Introduction

Rationale

Empathy refers to our ability to understand and identify the mental states of others, as well as our ability to share the feelings of others (Singer, 2006). It is considered a key component of social cognition, cooperation and prosocial behaviour, as it allows us to make sense of and respond appropriately to other people's behaviour (Decety et al., 2016). Empathy can be separated into two major facets. Cognitive empathy refers to the ability to recognise and understand another's mental state (part of theory of mind (ToM) or mentalising) while affective empathy is the ability to share the feelings of others, without any direct emotional stimulation to oneself (Warrier et al., 2018). As an illustrative example, sharing the excitement of a close friend's job offer is fundamentally different from understanding that your friend must be having thoughts and feelings, and what these feelings might be. These two aspects of empathy rely on different brain structures and take different developmental pathways, with affective empathy developing much earlier than cognitive empathy (Singer, 2006).

Differences in empathic abilities have been observed in a number of psychiatric disorders including schizophrenia (Bonfils et al., 2017; Lee, et al., 2011), autism spectrum disorder (ASD; Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004; Kok et al., 2016), borderline personality disorder (BPD; Dziobek et al., 2011), and depression (Schreiter et al., 2013). Importantly, far from there being a universal deficit in empathic abilities, research in these psychiatric disorders shows that there is often a difficulty in a specific aspect of empathy, while other empathic abilities remain intact. For example, it has been found that those with ASD have problems with cognitive empathy, but do not differ from neurotypical controls in affective empathy (Dziobek et al., 2008). Reduced attention to informative social information may provide one explanation for the problems in cognitive empathy seen in those with ASD. For example, it is reported that individuals with ASD pay less attention to faces, and especially eyes (Chita-Tegmark, 2016), and this is associated with poorer emotion recognition and ToM ability (Corden et al., 2008; Falkmer et al., 2011; Müller et al., 2016), as well as lower social competence (Klin et al., 2002). Similarly, while healthy controls (HCs) show significantly higher levels of cognitive empathy compared to affective empathy, those with BPD show significantly poorer cognitive empathy than HCs, and slightly increased levels of affective empathy (Harari et al., 2010). In bipolar disorder (BD), this cognitive/affective empathy distinction is further complicated by clinical state. In both manic and depressive phases of illness, there is an impairment in cognitive empathy compared to HCs. However, during the manic phase, affective empathy is significantly higher than in HCs and patients in the depression phase of BD, who did not differ from one another (Bodnar & Rybakowski, 2017). Increased affective empathy in BPD and BD may be related to disturbances in emotion inhibition.

Recent models of eating disorders (EDs) have put forward social and emotional difficulties as key factors in the development and maintenance of the illness (Arcelus et al., 2013; Cardi et al., 2018). However, relatively little is known about the specific empathy profile in those with

1 EDs. Based on longitudinal research in a community sample from Sweden, Gillberg and
2 colleagues published a number of papers reporting a subgroup of AN patients with “empathy
3 disorders” – those that had severe problems in social understanding and communication,
4 consistent with ASD (Gillberg et al., 1994). Poorer outcomes were found in this group
5 (Anckarsater et al., 2012; Wentz et al., 2009). Since then, a growing body of evidence has
6 documented overlap between symptoms in ASD and AN. For example, both groups show
7 high levels of social anxiety (Kerr-Gaffney et al., 2018; Simonoff et al., 2008) and
8 alexithymia (Bird & Cook, 2013; Westwood et al., 2017), differences in social attention
9 (Chita-Tegmark, 2016; Harrison et al., 2010; Watson et al., 2010), and poorer emotion
10 recognition (Bal et al., 2010; Oldershaw, Hambrook, Tchanturia, Treasure, & Schmidt, 2010)
11 and ToM ability (Caglar-Nazali et al., 2014; Leppanen et al., 2018). Reduced social networks
12 have been documented in AN and bulimia nervosa (BN) (Tiller et al., 1997; Westwood et al.,
13 2016), as well as difficulties in understanding the concept of friendship (Doris et al., 2014). It
14 is possible that reduced empathic abilities, along with communication difficulties, may
15 contribute to the diminished social networks and isolation that characterise EDs. Given that
16 interpersonal difficulties are associated with more severe ED psychopathology (Illing et al.,
17 2010; Tasca et al., 2011), understanding mechanisms that may contribute to these problems
18 may be helpful in improving outcomes in those with these EDs.

19 **Objectives**

20 The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to provide a synthesis of empathy
21 research in EDs. Previous reviews on social processes in EDs have ascribed relatively little
22 attention to the topic, and focus on emotion recognition rather than other aspects of empathy
23 such as affect sharing (e.g., Caglar-Nazali et al., 2014). In addition, new studies have been
24 published in the intervening years. An additional aim is to examine potential differences
25 between those with EDs and HCs in the specific types of empathy (self-reported cognitive
26 and affective empathy), to permit better comparisons with other psychiatric populations. Self-
27 reported empathy measures will be the focus of this review, in order to elicit patients’ views
28 and self-assessment of their skills.

29 **Research questions**

30 The research questions are as follows: (1) do levels of self-reported empathy differ in those
31 with EDs compared to HCs? (2) do levels of cognitive and affective empathy differ between
32 EDs and HCs? (3) are empathy levels associated with any psychopathological or clinical
33 variables?

34

35

35 **Methods**

36

37 **Systematic review protocol**

38 The review and meta-analysis was conducted using the Preferred Reporting Items for
39 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (Liberati et al., 2009).

1 **Eligibility criteria**

2 Studies using a self-report measure of empathy were included. Inclusion criteria were: (1)
3 means and standard deviations reported for empathy scores in at least one clinical ED group
4 and a HC group (2) the clinical ED group met criteria for any ED diagnosis, according to
5 DSM or ICD criteria (3) full article available in English (4) published in a peer reviewed
6 journal. Articles that examined disordered eating samples rather than a clinical ED were not
7 included.

8 **Data sources and search strategy**

9 The electronic databases SCOPUS, Web of Science, PsycInfo, and PubMed were searched
10 for papers up to September 2018. The following search terms were used: anorexia nervosa
11 OR bulimia nervosa OR eating disorder AND empathy OR emotional empathy OR empathic
12 concern OR interpersonal reactivity. No other search limits were applied, with the exception
13 of Web of Science, where results were filtered by the ED term for relevance. Reference lists
14 were also searched for relevant papers.

15 **Study selection**

16 The selection process for studies is displayed in Figure 1. In total, the search generated 644
17 records. After removing duplicates, 122 records were assessed for relevance based on article
18 titles. If titles were ambiguous or potentially relevant, records were retained and their
19 abstracts screened against the eligibility criteria. This resulted in 61 abstracts being screened,
20 19 of which were excluded as they did not meet eligibility criteria. After screening of
21 abstracts, 42 potentially eligible full-text articles were identified. One study included a
22 sample of participants with BN, however at the time of publication, BN was not yet included
23 in the DSM. The study was included in the review as participants had a clinical diagnosis of
24 BN. If means and standard deviations for individual groups were not reported, study authors
25 were contacted. If no response was received, studies were excluded. Evaluation of these full
26 texts resulted in 25 studies being excluded, and 17 studies being included in the review.

27 **Data extraction**

28 The following data was extracted from each paper that met all eligibility criteria: number of
29 participants in each group, mean age, mean body mass index (BMI), percentage of female
30 participants, empathy measure used, mean empathy scores, and any subscale scores, if they
31 were reported. Where studies reported sub-scale scores only, total, cognitive, and affective
32 empathy scores were calculated so that studies could be included in meta-analyses.

33 **Data analysis**

34 All analyses were performed using R Studio (R Core Team, 2017) using the metafor package
35 (Viechtbauer, 2010). Cohen's *d* was used to estimate effect sizes and is reported with 95%
36 confidence intervals (CIs). Effect sizes are interpreted using Cohen's (1988) definitions of
37 small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8). Negative effect sizes indicate lower empathy
38 scores in the ED group compared to HC. Separate meta-analyses were performed for different
39 components of empathy. Where two measures of empathy were used in the same study (and
40 therefore on the same group of participants), a multivariate meta-analysis was performed
41 using the `rma.mv` command. Between-study heterogeneity was calculated using Cochran's *Q*

1 test. Where heterogeneity was found ($p < 0.05$), meta-regressions were performed using age
2 and empathy measure as moderators.

3 **Risk of bias**

4 Publication bias was assessed through visual inspection of funnel plots, where the absence of
5 studies in the bottom right corner indicates publication bias. The symmetry of the funnel plots
6 was formally assessed using Begg's rank correlation test (Begg & Mazumdar, 1994).

7 Publication bias was also assessed using Rosenthal's fail-safe N (Rosenthal, 1979), which
8 estimates the number of unpublished studies required to change the significant effect size into
9 a non-significant one.

10 Risk of bias in individual studies was assessed using the Clinical Appraisal Skills Programme
11 checklist for case-control studies (CASP, 2013). The checklist considers how methodological
12 features of studies may have impacted the results, e.g., exclusion and inclusion criteria,
13 recruitment sources, and whether potential confounding variables were included in analyses.
14 Studies can receive a maximum score of 17.

15

16

17

18 **Results**

18 **Study characteristics**

19 Study characteristics are shown in Table 1. Fourteen of the included studies compared AN
20 and HC groups. Of these studies, one study also included a recovered AN group, two
21 included an ASD group, and one included a group with BPD. Two studies compared those
22 with binge eating disorder (BED) to HC, and one study compared participants with BN to
23 HC.

24 In total, 6 different self-report measures were used across studies, with the Interpersonal
25 Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1983) being used most often (9 studies). The IRI comprises of
26 four subscales: perspective taking (PT; the tendency to spontaneously adopt the
27 psychological viewpoint of others), fantasy (FS; the tendency to identify oneself with
28 fictional characters in books, plays and movies), empathic concern (EC; assesses 'other-
29 oriented' feelings of sympathy and concern for others), and personal distress (PD; assesses
30 'self-oriented' feelings of anxiety and unease in tense interpersonal settings). Cognitive and
31 affective empathy scores can be calculated by taking the sum of PT and FS, and EC and PD
32 respectively. The Empathy Quotient (EQ; Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004), and the EQ-
33 short (Wakabayashi et al., 2006) were used in seven studies, and both have three subscales:
34 cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and social skills. Other measures used were: the
35 empathy subscale of the Impulsiveness, Venturesomeness, and Empathy questionnaire (I₇;
36 (Eysenck et al., 1985) (2 studies), the empathy subscale of the Socio-Emotional
37 Questionnaire (SEQ; (Bramham et al., 2009) (1 study), and the Basic Empathy Scale (BES;
38 Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006) (1 study). One study used two different versions of the EQ
39 depending on participants' age; the parent reported version for younger adolescents, and the
40 self-report version for older adolescents (Baron-Cohen et al., 2013). Only the self-report
41 scores are included in the meta-analysis, as this was the focus of the present review.

1 Methodological quality of the studies varied considerably (range: 7 - 16). None of the studies
 2 reported a power calculation, and sample sizes were generally small (ranging from 11 to 66 in
 3 ED groups). All but one study (Aloi et al., 2017) matched participants on at least one
 4 characteristic, most often sex. The mean age of participants ranged from 14.02 to 50.60 years,
 5 although three studies did not report the mean age of at least one participant group (Duchesne
 6 et al., 2011; Feldman & Eysenck, 1986; Redondo & Herrero-Fernández, 2018). Seven studies
 7 did not report mean BMI or percentage IBW in at least one participant group (Baron-Cohen
 8 et al., 2013; Butler & Montgomery, 2005; Calderoni et al., 2013; Feldman & Eysenck, 1986;
 9 Guttman & Laporte, 2000; Jermakow & Brzezicka, 2016; Redondo & Herrero-Fernández,
 10 2018). Most studies used exclusively female samples, however three studies included male
 11 participants (Aloi et al., 2017; Courty et al., 2013; Jermakow & Brzezicka, 2016).

12 **Synthesized findings**

13 Only studies comparing AN and HC could be included in meta-analyses, due to too few
 14 studies with other ED groups (2 BED, 1 BN). The number of studies in each meta-analysis is
 15 displayed in Figure 2.

16 *Total empathy*

17 Fourteen studies were included in a meta-analysis comparing total empathy scores in AN and
 18 HCs. The random effects model with a total sample size of 2165 participants (AN = 379, HC
 19 = 1746) revealed that total empathy scores in AN did not differ from those of HCs [$d = -0.11$,
 20 (95% CI -0.36, 0.13) $z = -0.92$, $p = 0.36$] (Figure 3).

21 There was evidence of significant heterogeneity across studies [$Q(15) = 79.61$, $p < .001$],
 22 therefore meta-regressions with age and empathy measure as moderator variables were
 23 performed. The moderators explained a significant amount of the variance [$QM(6) = 27.88$, p
 24 $= < .001$], however no single factor had a significant influence on the size of the effect. The
 25 test for residual heterogeneity was significant [$QE(8) = 65.08$, $p = < .001$].

26 *Cognitive empathy*

27 Eight studies were included in a meta-analysis comparing cognitive empathy scores in AN
 28 and HC. The random effects model with at total sample size of 773 participants (AN = 227,
 29 HC = 546) revealed that cognitive empathy scores in AN were significantly lower than HCs
 30 [$d = -0.34$, (95% CI -0.58, -0.11) $z = -2.86$, $p = 0.004$] (Figure 4). There was no evidence of
 31 significant heterogeneity [$Q(7) = 12.27$, $p = 0.09$].

32 *Affective empathy*

33 Eight studies were included in a meta-analysis comparing affective empathy scores in AN
 34 and HC. The random effects model with a total sample size of 773 participants (AN = 227,
 35 HC = 546) revealed that affective empathy scores in AN did not differ from those of HCs [d
 36 $= 0.18$, (95% CI -0.17, 0.52) $z = 1.01$, $p = 0.31$] (Figure 5).

37 There was evidence of significant heterogeneity across studies [$Q(7) = 26.99$, $p < .001$],
 38 therefore meta-regressions with age and empathy measure as moderator variables were
 39 performed. The moderators did not explain a significant amount of the variance
 40 [$QM(3) = 0.64$, $p = 0.88$], and the test for residual heterogeneity was significant [$Q(4) = 17.6$, p
 41 $= 0.002$].

1 **Risk of bias**

2 The funnel plots for total empathy, cognitive empathy, and affective empathy scores are
3 displayed in Figures 6-8. There was no evidence of publication bias in the total empathy
4 meta-analysis (Begg's test $p = .45$), however there was evidence of publication bias in the
5 studies included in the cognitive empathy meta-analysis (Begg's test $p = 0.03$, Rosenthal's
6 fail safe $N = 38$). Studies included in the affective empathy meta-analysis did not show any
7 evidence of publication bias (Begg's test $p = 0.40$).

8 **Additional analyses**

9 Because several studies reported on the PT, FS, EC, and PD subscales of the IRI, additional
10 meta-analyses were performed to test for differences between AN and HC. Six studies
11 reported scores for all four subscales, while one additional study reported PT scores only. The
12 results are shown in Table 2. AN had significantly lower FS scores compared to HC, however
13 there were no significant differences in the other sub-scales. There was no evidence of
14 significant heterogeneity in any of the subscale meta-analyses, nor was there significant
15 evidence of publication bias (Begg's test all $p > .05$) (see Supplementary material for subscale
16 forest and funnel plots).

17 **Qualitative findings**

18 *Studies in AN*

19 Studies using the EQ or the EQ-short reported very mixed findings. Adenzato et al. (2012)
20 found that those with AN had significantly lower total EQ scores compared to HCs. In
21 adolescents, this was only found to be true for those aged 12-15 years, using the parent report
22 version of the EQ (Baron-Cohen et al., 2013). The older AN group did not differ from age-
23 matched HC on the self-report EQ. Redondo and Herrero-Fernández (2018) found that while
24 total EQ-short scores in those with AN and HCs did not differ, those with AN scored
25 significantly lower than HCs on the social skills subscale. Three studies found no differences
26 in EQ scores between AN and HC, however both groups scored significantly higher than
27 those with ASD (Courty et al., 2013; Hambrook et al., 2008; Jermakow & Brzezicka, 2016).

28 Results from studies using the IRI were similarly mixed. Only two studies tested for group
29 differences in total IRI scores, with one reporting significantly lower scores in those with AN
30 than HCs (Jermakow & Brzezicka, 2016) and the other reporting no differences (Lulé et al.,
31 2014). Two studies tested for group differences in cognitive and affective empathy sub-scores
32 of the IRI. Cognitive empathy scores are calculated by summing the F and PT subscale scores
33 together, while the EC and PD subscale scores are summed to calculate affective empathy
34 scores. Calderoni et al. (2013) found that those with AN had significantly lower cognitive
35 empathy scores, whereas Peres et al. (2018) reported significantly higher emotional empathy
36 scores in AN compared to HC.

37 Six studies reported on group differences between AN and HCs on IRI EC, PD, FS, and PT
38 (with one additional study included the PT subscale only). Regarding EC, there were no
39 significant differences between AN and HC across all six studies (Calderoni et al., 2013;
40 Courty et al., 2013; Gramaglia et al., 2016; Guttman & Laporte, 2000; Jermakow &
41 Brzezicka, 2016; Peres et al., 2018). However, those with AN had significantly higher EC

1 scores compared to those with ASD (Courty et al., 2013), and significantly lower scores than
2 women with BPD (Guttman & Laporte, 2000). Two studies found that those with AN scored
3 higher on PD than HC (Gramaglia et al., 2016; Peres et al., 2018), while one reported that AN
4 and ASD groups had lower scores than HCs (Jermakow & Brzezicka, 2016). Three studies
5 reported no differences in PD scores between AN and HC, however those with BPD had
6 higher scores than both AN and HC groups (Calderoni et al., 2013; Courty et al., 2013;
7 Guttman & Laporte, 2000). Regarding the FS subscale, it was found that those with AN had
8 significantly lower scores than HC, similar to those with ASD (Calderoni et al., 2013; Courty
9 et al., 2013). However, four studies did not find significant differences between groups
10 (Gramaglia et al., 2016; Guttman & Laporte, 2000; Jermakow & Brzezicka, 2016; Peres et
11 al., 2018). Calderoni et al. (2013) and Redondo and Herrero-Fernandez (2018) reported that
12 AN had significantly lower PT scores compared to HCs, however the remaining five studies
13 found no significant differences (Courty et al., 2013; Gramaglia et al., 2016; Guttman &
14 Laporte, 2000; Jermakow & Brzezicka, 2016; Peres et al., 2018).

15 The remaining AN studies used the I₇, the empathy subscale of the SEQ, and the BES. Morris
16 et al. (2014) found that AN scored significantly lower on the SEQ than HC. Scores in the
17 recovered AN group did not differ from either group, lying between the two. The remaining
18 two studies found no significant differences between AN and HCs (Butler & Montgomery,
19 2005; Nandrino et al., 2017). However, both studies were limited in their sample sizes (15 and
20 23 participants in the clinical groups respectively), and therefore there may not be sufficient
21 power to detect group differences.

22 *Studies in other EDs*

23 Only three studies involved participants with BED or BN. Feldman and Eysenck (1986)
24 reported no differences in empathy scores between women with BN and HCs. However, this
25 study had the poorest methodological quality rating of all studies include in the review,
26 mainly because it included little information about the HC group, and did not control for any
27 confounding variables. In BED, total empathy scores did not significantly differ across those
28 with BED, subthreshold BED, and HCs (Aloi et al., 2017). However, Duchesne et al. (2011)
29 reported that women with BED scored significantly higher than obese and HC women on the
30 PD subscale of the IRI. Further, a logistic regression revealed that lower PT and higher PD
31 scores were associated with BED. Unfortunately, this study did not control for confounding
32 variables such as depression, which has been found to be associated with PD (Schreiter et al.,
33 2013).

34 *Associations with psychopathology and clinical variables*

35 Few studies examined associations between empathy and clinical variables or other measures
36 of psychopathology. In BED and AN, negative correlations were found between EQ and
37 alexithymia scores on the twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale (TAS-20; Bagby et al.,
38 1994), such that lower levels of empathy were associated with higher alexithymia (Adenzato
39 et al., 2012; Aloi et al., 2017). The latter study also found that higher EQ scores were
40 associated with more social support in AN, as measured by the Multidimensional Scale of
41 Perceived Social Support (MSPSS; Dahlem et al., 1991). Only two studies examined whether
42 empathy was associated with ED psychopathology and illness severity in AN. Baron-Cohen

1 et al. (2013) reported that EQ scores were not associated with scores on the Eating Disorder
2 Examination Questionnaire (EDEQ; Fairburn & Beglin, 1994), and Calderoni et al. (2013)
3 found that cognitive empathy scores were not associated with BMI, disease duration, or
4 general psychopathology in AN. Finally, Peres et al. (2018) reported that IRI, AE and PD
5 subscale scores were positively associated with anxiety, but not depression, as measured by
6 the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS; Zigmond & Snaith, 1983). However,
7 linear regressions revealed that anxiety did not explain the differences in empathy between
8 AN and HC better than group membership.

9

10 **Discussion**

11

12 *Summary of main findings*

13 The aim of this review was to examine group differences in empathy in those with EDs
14 compared to HC, and provide a qualitative synthesis of the literature. Meta-analyses were run
15 for total empathy, cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and four further sub-components of
16 empathy: PT, FS, EC, and PD. There were no significant differences between those with AN
17 and HC in overall empathy (14 studies) or affective empathy scores (8 studies). However, it
18 was found that those with AN had significantly lower cognitive empathy scores compared to
19 HC (8 studies), with a small effect size. Further, it those with AN had significantly lower FS
20 scores than HC (6 studies), with a small effect size, but did not significantly differ from HC
21 on any of the other IRI subscores.

22 The finding that AN have lower cognitive empathy abilities compared to HC is in accordance
23 with studies examining related, performance-based measures of empathy, such as ToM
24 (Leppanen et al., 2018), emotion recognition (Caglar-Nazali et al., 2014), and emotional
25 intelligence (Hambrook et al., 2012). Affective empathy has been less well studied in EDs,
26 although it appears from this review, and a few experimental studies, that individuals with
27 ED are not impaired in affective empathy. For example, one study found that those with BN
28 reported higher levels of sadness than restrained eaters and HCs in response to video clip,
29 during which they were asked to identify themselves with the protagonist whose boyfriend
30 leaves them for an attractive woman (Tuschen-Caffier & Vögele, 1999). Another study
31 examined individuals' own emotional reactions to video clips depicting an individual
32 displaying emotion, finding that the intensity of the emotions experienced by those with EDs
33 (AN and BN) did not differ from HC (Cardi et al., 2015). However, those with EDs did show
34 less facial expressivity while watching the clips – a component of empathy that has been
35 termed 'motor empathy' (Blair, 2005). Studies that utilise physiological measurements of
36 empathy, such as facial electromyographic activity (EMG), skin conductance, and heart rate
37 may be useful in further understanding affective empathy in EDs.

38 There are a number of possible explanations for the dissociation between cognitive and
39 affective empathic abilities found here. Distinct brain systems for cognitive and affective
40 empathy have been described: the ventromedial prefrontal cortex is involved in cognitive
41 empathy, while the inferior frontal gyrus is involved in affective empathy (Decety & Meyer,

1 2008). Neuroimaging studies have reported differences in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex
2 in those with AN (Uher et al., 2003; 2004), thus providing a possible explanation for lowered
3 cognitive empathy abilities. fMRI studies utilising performance-based measures of empathy
4 could be useful in testing this hypothesis. Relatedly, difficulties in executive functioning are
5 reported in those with AN and BN (Hirst et al., 2017). Since executive functions contribute to
6 the development of cognitive empathy (Decety & Jackson, 2004), it would be of interest to
7 determine whether there is a relation between empathy abilities and executive functioning in
8 those with EDs. Relatedly, it might be that reduced attention to faces and eyes found in AN
9 (Fujiwara et al., 2017; Harrison et al., 2018; Watson et al., 2010) leads to decreased cognitive
10 empathy abilities.

11 There was evidence of significant heterogeneity in the overall empathy and affective empathy
12 studies. While age and empathy measurement did explain some of the variance in total
13 empathy scores, no single factor had a significant influence on the size of the effect. Due to a
14 lack of studies reporting on factors such as BMI and illness duration, it was not possible to
15 include these indicators of illness severity as moderators. The two studies that did examine
16 potential associations between ED severity and empathy did not find any significant
17 relationships (Baron-Cohen et al., 2013; Calderoni et al., 2013). Research examining the
18 relationship between illness severity and constructs related to empathy such as mentalizing
19 (the ability to understand the mental states of oneself or others, and how such states might
20 influence behaviour) have been mixed. While some have reported independence from BMI
21 and illness length (Gillberg et al., 2010), a meta-analysis found that poorer performance on
22 the RMET was associated with longer illness duration (Bora & Kose, 2016). Examining
23 whether cognitive or affective empathy are state or trait variables will be important in
24 characterising the socio-emotional phenotype proposed for EDs (Treasure & Schmidt, 2013).

25 Relatedly, it would be of interest to examine whether other psychopathological variables may
26 have influenced the effect sizes reported in this review. One candidate is ASD symptoms.
27 Support for this idea comes from a longitudinal population-based study which examined
28 mentalizing abilities in those with AN and HCs (Anckarsäter et al., 2012), in which 29% of
29 the AN group also met criteria for a diagnosis of ASD. They found that when mentalizing
30 ability was compared between AN+ASD, AN only, and HCs, only the AN+ASD group had
31 significantly lower scores than HC. Thus, it is possible that there is a sub-group of individuals
32 with AN who display the most severe difficulties in socio-emotional measures, whose
33 difficulties are missed when assessing group differences. While ASD symptoms could not be
34 included as moderators in the meta-analyses presented here, it would be important to
35 ascertain whether reduced empathy in AN is a characteristic of the ED, or some other
36 comorbid psychopathology.

37 Alternatively, it could be the case that the heterogenous results in AN might be explained by
38 alexithymia. Indeed, a few studies included in this review found that lower levels of empathy
39 in AN and BED were associated with higher alexithymia (Adenzato et al., 2012; Aloï et al.,
40 2017). Alexithymia is a subclinical phenomenon characterised by difficulties in describing
41 and recognising one's own emotions, and distinguishing feelings from bodily sensations of
42 emotional arousal. 'Shared network' models of empathy propose that the networks in the

1 brain responsible for processing one's own emotions are the same networks used to represent
2 the emotions of others (Carr et al., 2003; Jackson et al., 2006; Jackson et al., 2005). Thus, it is
3 possible that the high levels of alexithymia experienced by those with AN might be
4 responsible for lower levels of empathy compared to HCs. In support of this hypothesis, an
5 fMRI study in ASD showed that the strength of empathic brain responses in the left anterior
6 insula were predictive of degree of alexithymia in both ASD and HCs, but did not vary as a
7 function of group (Bird et al., 2010). The potential contribution of alexithymia to reduced
8 empathy, and indeed other aspects of socio-emotional functioning in EDs, should be
9 explored.

10 Only two studies examined empathy in BED, finding no difference in total empathy scores,
11 but significantly higher PD scores compared to HCs (Aloi et al., 2017; Duchesne et al.,
12 2011). The finding that those with BED experience more stress and unease in tense social
13 settings is consistent with literature documenting emotion regulation difficulties in those with
14 BED, and it is hypothesised that binge eating may be a strategy to deal with increased
15 negative emotions (Gianini et al., 2013). It would therefore be of interest to examine whether
16 higher PD scores in BED are associated with more severe ED psychopathology. The only
17 study that measured empathy in BN found no significant differences in empathy compared to
18 HCs (Feldman & Eysenck, 1986). This study used the I₇ to measure empathy, and therefore
19 no study has yet examined cognitive and affective components of empathy in BN. Clearly,
20 the lack of studies in BN and BED prevent any conclusions being made regarding empathy in
21 these groups. Given that problems with interpersonal functioning are a prominent feature in
22 BN (Arcelus et al., 2013; Fairburn et al., 2003), research using multidimensional measures of
23 empathy in this population are needed.

24 The findings from the current review have implications for treatment of AN. Socio-
25 communicative and interpersonal problems are associated with poorer outcomes (Anckarsäter
26 et al., 2012; Gillberg et al., 2010; Gillberg et al., 1994; Jones et al., 2015; Zipfel et al., 2000)
27 and more severe ED psychopathology (Illing et al., 2010; Tasca et al., 2011), therefore socio-
28 emotional functioning may be a potential target for the development of new, more holistic
29 treatment approaches. For example, group social skills interventions are effective in
30 improving communication, social anxiety, and social functioning in those with ASD (Spain &
31 Blainey, 2015; Spain et al., 2017). There is also evidence to suggest that Cognitive
32 Remediation and Emotion Skills Training (CREST), an intervention designed to improve
33 emotion processing, is effective in decreasing alexithymia and social anhedonia, while
34 increasing motivation in those with AN (Adamson et al., 2018; Tchanturia et al., 2015).
35 Recently, there has also been interest in exploring the effect of oxytocin, a hormone
36 implicated in prosocial behaviour, on socio-emotional functioning (Leppanen et al., 2017;
37 Van IJzendoorn & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2012). In ASD, administration of intranasal
38 oxytocin has been found to increase interactions with socially cooperative peers, and enhance
39 feelings of trust (Andari et al., 2010). Oxytocin also increased participants' attention to the
40 eyes of pictures of faces, avoidance of which is a core feature of ASD (Frazier et al., 2017). A
41 few studies have examined the effect of oxytocin on socio-emotional cognition in those with
42 EDs. One study found intranasal oxytocin increased emotion recognition and decreased
43 calorie consumption in those with BN, however no effects were seen in AN (Kim et al.,

1 2015). Another found no effect of oxytocin on RMET performance in AN (Leppanen, Cardi,
2 et al., 2017). However, whether oxytocin has an effect on real-life social behaviour in those
3 with EDs has yet to be examined.

4 *Limitations*

5 Several limitations of this review should be noted. Firstly, many studies did not report
6 empathy subscale scores, and therefore could not be included in affective and cognitive
7 empathy meta-analyses. Secondly, although this method has been employed in previous
8 reviews of this type (Bonfils et al., 2016; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004), it could be questioned
9 whether it is appropriate to compare different scales that purport to measure the same
10 empathy constructs. For example, the affective subscales of the IRI have been criticised as
11 more closely reflecting sympathy, as they focus on reactions to others, rather than emotion
12 matching (Michaels et al., 2014). However, studies in this review generally included the most
13 widely used measures of empathy (e.g., the EQ and the IRI), and as previously noted,
14 empathy measure did not significantly influence effect sizes in moderator analyses.

15 It is also important to note the limitations of self-report empathy measures generally. Socially
16 desirable responding may be an issue with self-report measures, as they do not objectively
17 measure empathic abilities, but rather how empathetic individuals perceive themselves to be.
18 In other psychiatric disorders, a discrepancy between performance-based empathy tasks and
19 self-report measures has been reported. For example, a meta-analysis found that people with
20 schizophrenia display greater affective empathy deficits in performance-based tasks than on
21 self-report measures (Bonfils et al., 2016). If affective empathy partly relies on one's ability
22 to report on their own emotional reactions, this might be especially difficult in populations
23 with high levels of alexithymia, such as AN (Parling et al., 2010).

24 The number of studies in other EDs, such as BN and BED, was greatly lacking. Therefore,
25 meta-analyses for group differences between these groups and HCs could not be carried out.
26 Furthermore, only three studies included males with EDs, thus the results from this review
27 cannot be generalised to this population. Interestingly, it is reported that while males with
28 EDs (AN, BN, or eating disorder not otherwise specified) show the same difficulties in
29 cognitive flexibility and weak central coherence often found in women with EDs, they do not
30 differ from HC men in terms of ToM performance or sensitivity to social threat (Goddard et
31 al., 2014). Future work should therefore examine performance in a broader range of socio-
32 emotional tasks in order to understand possible similarities and differences in the male and
33 female presentations of EDs.

34 Finally, there was evidence of publication bias in the cognitive empathy meta-analysis,
35 indicating that studies with non-significant results may have been missing from analyses.
36 However, the fact that the affective empathy meta-analysis, which included the same studies
37 as the cognitive meta-analysis, did not show any evidence of publication bias and showed a
38 non-significant result, perhaps lends support to the validity of our findings. Nonetheless, the
39 results should be interpreted with caution.

1 *Conclusions*

2 Although there is an extensive literature documenting difficulties in ToM and emotion
3 recognition in those with EDs, relatively little is known about empathic abilities in this
4 population. This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to examine whether those with
5 EDs differed from HCs on several dimensions of self-reported empathy, and provide a
6 qualitative synthesis of the literature. While those with AN did not differ from HCs in overall
7 empathy, a meta-analysis of 8 studies found that AN had significantly lower levels of
8 cognitive empathy compared to HC, with a small effect size. It was also found that AN had
9 significantly lower levels of fantasy, a subdivision of cognitive empathy. AN did not differ
10 from HC in affective empathy. This profile of intact affective empathy and lowered cognitive
11 empathy mirrors that of those with ASD, a disorder that shares a number of
12 neuropsychological and socio-cognitive traits with AN. Conclusions regarding the empathic
13 profiles of those with other EDs are not possible, given the lack of studies in these groups.
14 Future research should investigate empathic abilities in other EDs, and examine the influence
15 of comorbid psychopathological traits.

In review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Acknowledgements

JK is supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). KT would like to acknowledge support from MRC and MRF Child and Young Adult Mental Health and Prof Tracey Wade and Norman Munn Distinguished Visiting Scholar Award 2017/2018 from Flinders University South Australia. AH would like to acknowledge support from the MRC.

Author Contributions

JK performed the search, data extraction, and wrote the manuscript. KT leads the research group within which this work was conducted and is JK lead supervisor for PhD. KT and AH edited the manuscript before submission.

Conflicts of Interest

None.

In review

References

- 1
2 Adamson, J., Leppanen, J., Murin, M., Tchanturia, K. (2018). Effectiveness of emotional
3 skills training for patients with anorexia nervosa with autistic symptoms in group and
4 individual format. *European Eating Disorders Review*, 26(4), 367–375. doi:
5 10.1002/erv.2594
- 6 Adenzato, M., Todisco, P., Ardito, R. B. (2012). Social cognition in anorexia nervosa:
7 Evidence of preserved theory of mind and impaired emotional functioning. *PLoS ONE*,
8 7(8), 3–10. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0044414
- 9 Aloï, M., Rania, M., Caroleo, M., De Fazio, P., Segura-Garcia, C. (2017). Social cognition
10 and emotional functioning in patients with binge eating disorder. *European Eating*
11 *Disorders Review*, 25(3), 172–178. doi: 10.1002/erv.2504
- 12 Anckarsäter, H., Hofvander, B., Billstedt, E., Gillberg, I. C., Gillberg, C., Wentz, E. et al.
13 (2012). The sociocommunicative deficit subgroup in anorexia nervosa: Autism spectrum
14 disorders and neurocognition in a community-based, longitudinal study. *Psychological*
15 *Medicine*, 42(9), 1957–1967. doi: 10.1017/S0033291711002881
- 16 Andari, E., Duhamel, J.R., Zalla, T., Herbrecht, E., Leboyer, M., Sirigu, A. (2010).
17 Promoting social behavior with oxytocin in high-functioning autism spectrum disorders.
18 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(9), 4389–4394. doi:
19 10.1073/pnas.0910249107
- 20 Arcelus, J., Haslam, M., Farrow, C., Meyer, C. (2013). The role of interpersonal functioning
21 in the maintenance of eating psychopathology: A systematic review and testable model.
22 *Clinical Psychology Review*, 33(1), 156–167. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2012.10.009
- 23 Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D. A., Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia
24 scale—I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *Journal of*
25 *Psychosomatic Research*, 38(1), 23–32. doi: 10.1016/0022-3999(94)90005-1
- 26 Bal, E., Harden, E., Lamb, D., Van Hecke, A. V., Denver, J. W., Porges, S. W. (2010).
27 Emotion recognition in children with autism spectrum disorders: relations to eye gaze
28 and autonomic state. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 40(3), 358–370.
29 doi: 10.1007/s10803-009-0884-3
- 30 Baron-Cohen, S., Jaffa, T., Davies, S., Auyeung, B., Allison, C., Wheelwright, S. (2013). Do
31 girls with anorexia nervosa have elevated autistic traits? *Molecular Autism*, 4(24). doi:
32 10.1186/2040-2392-4-24
- 33 Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The Empathy Quotient: An investigation of
34 adults with Asperger Syndrome or High Functioning Autism, and normal sex
35 differences. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 34(2), 163–175. doi:
36 10.1023/B:JADD.0000022607.19833.00
- 37 Begg, C.B., Mazumdar, M. (1994) Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for
38 publication bias. *Biometrics* 50, 1088–1101.

- 1 Bird, G., Cook, R. (2013). Mixed emotions: The contribution of alexithymia to the emotional
2 symptoms of autism. *Translational Psychiatry*, 3(7), e285–e285. doi: 10.1038/tp.2013.61
- 3 Bird, G., Silani, G., Brindley, R., White, S., Frith, U., Singer, T. (2010). Empathic brain
4 responses in insula are modulated by levels of alexithymia but not autism. *Brain*, 133(5),
5 1515–1525. doi: 10.1093/brain/awq060
- 6 Blair, R. J. R. (2005). Responding to the emotions of others: Dissociating forms of empathy
7 through the study of typical and psychiatric populations. *Consciousness and Cognition*,
8 14(4), 698–718. doi: 10.1016/j.concog.2005.06.004
- 9 Bodnar, A., Rybakowski, J. K. (2017). Mentalization deficit in bipolar patients during an
10 acute depressive and manic episode: Association with cognitive functions. *International*
11 *Journal of Bipolar Disorders*, 5(1), 38. doi: 10.1186/s40345-017-0107-3
- 12 Bonfils, K. A., Lysaker, P. H., Minor, K. S., Salyers, M. P. (2016). Affective empathy in
13 schizophrenia: A meta-analysis. *Schizophrenia Research*, 175(1-3), 109-117. doi:
14 10.1016/j.schres.2016.03.037
- 15 Bonfils, K. A., Lysaker, P. H., Minor, K. S., Salyers, M. P. (2017). Empathy in
16 schizophrenia: A meta-analysis of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index. *Psychiatry*
17 *Research*, 249, 293–303. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2016.12.033
- 18 Bora, E., Kose, S. (2016). Meta-analysis of theory of mind in anorexia nervosa and bulimia
19 nervosa: A specific impairment of cognitive perspective taking in anorexia nervosa?
20 *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 49(8), 739–740. doi: 10.1002/eat.22572
- 21 Bramham, J., Morris, R. G., Hornak, J., Bullock, P., Polkey, C. E. (2009). Social and
22 emotional functioning following bilateral and unilateral neurosurgical prefrontal cortex
23 lesions. *Journal of Neuropsychology*, 3(1), 125–143. doi: 10.1348/174866408X293994
- 24 Butler, G. K. L., Montgomery, A. M. J. (2005). Subjective self-control and behavioural
25 impulsivity coexist in anorexia nervosa. *Eating Behaviors*, 6(3), 221–227. doi:
26 10.1016/j.eatbeh.2004.11.002
- 27 Caglar-Nazali, H. P., Corfield, F., Cardi, V., Ambwani, S., Leppanen, J., Olabintan, O. et al.
28 (2014). A systematic review and meta-analysis of “Systems for Social Processes” in
29 eating disorders. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 42, 55–92. doi:
30 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.12.002
- 31 Calderoni, S., Fantozzi, P., Maestro, S., Brunori, E., Narzisi, A., Balboni, G. et al. (2013).
32 Selective cognitive empathy deficit in adolescents with restrictive anorexia nervosa.
33 *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, 9, 1583–1589. doi: 10.2147/NDT.S50214
- 34 Cardi, V., Corfield, F., Leppanen, J., Rhind, C., Deriziotis, S., Hadjimichalis, A. et al. (2015).
35 Emotional processing, recognition, empathy and evoked facial expression in eating
36 disorders: An experimental study to map deficits in social cognition. *PLoS ONE*, 10(8),
37 e0133827. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0133827
- 38 Cardi, V., Tchanturia, K., Treasure, J. (2018). Premorbid and illness-related social difficulties

- 1 in eating disorders: An overview of the literature and treatment developments. *Current*
2 *Neuropharmacology*, 16(8), 1122–1130. doi: 10.2174/1570159X16666180118100028
- 3 Carr, L., Iacoboni, M., Dubeau, M., Mazziotta, J. C., Lenzi, G. L. (2003). Neural mechanisms
4 of empathy in humans: A relay from neural systems for imitation to limbic areas. *PNAS*,
5 100(9), 5497–5502. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0935845100
- 6 CASP Programme (2013). CASP Case Control Study Checklist. Retrieved from [https://casp-](https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/)
7 [uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/](https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/)
- 8 Chita-Tegmark, M. (2016). Social attention in ASD: A review and meta-analysis of eye-
9 tracking studies. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 48, 79–93. doi:
10 10.1016/j.ridd.2015.10.011
- 11 Cohen, J. (1988) *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edn. London:
12 Laurence Erlbaum Associates.
- 13 Corden, B., Chilvers, R., Skuse, D. (2008). Avoidance of emotionally arousing stimuli
14 predicts social–perceptual impairment in Asperger’s syndrome. *Neuropsychologia*,
15 46(1), 137–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.08.005>
- 16 Courty, A., Maria, A. S., Lalanne, C., Ringuenet, D., Vindreau, C., Chevallier, C. et al.
17 (2013). Levels of autistic traits in anorexia nervosa: A comparative psychometric study.
18 *BMC Psychiatry*, 13, 222. doi: 10.1186/1471-244X-13-222
- 19 Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, G. D., Walker, R. R. (1991). The Multidimensional Scale of
20 Perceived Social Support: A confirmation study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47(6),
21 756–761. doi: 10.1002/1097-4679(199111)47:6<756::AID-
22 JCLP2270470605>3.0.CO;2-L
- 23 Decety, J., Barta, I. B. A., Uzefovsky, F., Knafo-Noam, A. (2016). Empathy as a driver of
24 prosocial behaviour: Highly conserved neurobehavioural mechanisms across species.
25 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371(1686),
26 20150077. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2015.0077
- 27 Decety, J., Jackson, P. L. (2004) The functional architecture of human empathy. *Behavioural*
28 *and Cognitive Neuroscience Reviews*, 3(2), 71–100. doi: 10.1177/1534582304267187
- 29 Decety, J., Meyer, M. (2008). From emotion resonance to empathic understanding: a social
30 developmental neuroscience account. *Development and Psychopathology*, 20(4), 1053–
31 1080. doi: 10.1017/S0954579408000503
- 32 Doris, E., Westwood, H., Mandy, W., Tchanturia, K. (2014). A qualitative study of friendship
33 in patients with anorexia nervosa and possible autism spectrum disorder. *Psychology*,
34 5(11), 13381349. doi: 10.4236/psych.2014.511144
- 35 Duchesne, M., De Oliveira Falcone, E. M., De Freitas, S. R., D’Augustin, J. F., Marinho, V.,
36 Appolinario, J. C. (2011). Assessment of interpersonal skills in obese women with binge
37 eating disorder. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 17(7), 1065–1075. doi:
38 10.1177/1359105311432326

- 1 Dziobek, I., Preißler, S., Grozdanovic, Z., Heuser, I., Heekeren, H. R., Roepke, S. (2011).
2 Neuronal correlates of altered empathy and social cognition in borderline personality
3 disorder. *NeuroImage*, 57(2), 539–548. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.05.005
- 4 Dziobek, I., Rogers, K., Fleck, S., Bahnemann, M., Heekeren, H. R., Wolf, O. T. et al.
5 (2008). Dissociation of cognitive and emotional empathy in adults with Asperger
6 syndrome using the Multifaceted Empathy Test (MET). *Journal of Autism and
7 Developmental Disorders*, 38(3), 464–473. doi: 10.1007/s10803-007-0486-x
- 8 Eysenck, S. B. G., Pearson, P. R., Easting, G., Allsopp, J. F. (1985). Age norms for
9 impulsiveness, venturesomeness and empathy in adults. *Personality and Individual
10 Differences*, 6(5), 613–619. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(85)90011-X
- 11 Fairburn, C. G., Beglin, S. J. (1994). Assessment of eating disorders: Interview or self-report
12 questionnaire? *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 16(4), 363–70. doi:
13 10.1002/1098-108X(199412)16:4<363::AID-EAT2260160405>3.0.CO;2-#
- 14 Fairburn, C. G., Cooper, Z., Shafran, R. (2003). Cognitive behaviour therapy for eating
15 disorders: A “transdiagnostic” theory and treatment. *Behav Res Ther*, 41, 509–528. doi:
16 10.1016/S0005-7967(02)00088-8
- 17 Falkmer, M., Bjällmark, A., Larsson, M., Falkmer, T. (2011). Recognition of facially
18 expressed emotions and visual search strategies in adults with Asperger syndrome.
19 *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 5(1), 210–217.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2010.03.013>
- 21 Feldman, J., Eysenck, S. (1986). Addictive personality traits in bulimic patients. *Personality
22 and Individual Differences*, 7(6), 923–926. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(86)90097-8
- 23 Frazier, T. W., Strauss, M., Klingemier, E. W., Zetzer, E. E., Hardan, A. Y., Eng, C. et al.
24 (2017). A meta-analysis of gaze differences to social and nonsocial information between
25 individuals with and without autism. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and
26 Adolescent Psychiatry*, 56(7), 546–555. doi: 10.1016/j.jaac.2017.05.005
- 27 Fujiwara, E., Kube, V. L., Rochman, D., Macrae-Korobkov, A. K., Peynenburg, V. (2017).
28 Visual attention to ambiguous emotional faces in eating disorders: Role of alexithymia.
29 *European Eating Disorders Review*, 25(6), 451–460. doi: 10.1002/erv.2535
- 30 Gianini, L. M., White, M. A., Masheb, R. M. (2013). Eating pathology, emotion regulation,
31 and emotional overeating in obese adults with binge eating disorder. *Eating Behaviors*,
32 14(3), 309–313. doi: 10.1016/j.eatbeh.2013.05.008
- 33 Gillberg, I. C., Billstedt, E., Wentz, E., Anckarsäter, H., Råstam, M., Gillberg, C. (2010).
34 Attention, executive functions, and mentalizing in anorexia nervosa eighteen years after
35 onset of eating disorder. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 32(4),
36 358–365. doi: 10.1080/13803390903066857
- 37 Gillberg, I. C., Råstam, M., Gillberg, C. (1994). Anorexia nervosa outcome: Six-year
38 controlled longitudinal study of 51 cases including a population cohort. *Journal of the*

- 1 American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 33(5), 729-739. doi:
2 10.1097/00004583-199406000-00014
- 3 Goddard, E., Carral-Fernández, L., Denny, E., Campbell, I. C., Treasure, J. (2014).
4 Cognitive flexibility, central coherence and social emotional processing in males with an
5 eating disorder. *The World Journal of Biological Psychiatry*, 15(4), 317-326. doi:
6 10.3109/15622975.2012.750014
- 7 Gramaglia, C., Ressico, F., Gambaro, E., Palazzolo, A., Mazzarino, M., Bert, F., et al. (2016).
8 Alexithymia, empathy, emotion identification and social inference in anorexia nervosa:
9 A case-control study. *Eating Behaviors*, 22, 46–50. doi: 10.1016/j.eatbeh.2016.03.028
- 10 Guttman, H. A., Laporte, L. (2000). Empathy in families of women with borderline
11 personality disorder, anorexia nervosa, and a control group. *Family Process*, 39(3), 345–
12 358. doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2000.39306.x
- 13 Hambrook, D., Brown, G., Tchanturia, K. (2012). Emotional intelligence in anorexia nervosa:
14 Is anxiety a missing piece of the puzzle? *Psychiatry Research*, 200(1), 12–19. doi:
15 10.1016/j.psychres.2012.05.017
- 16 Hambrook, D., Tchanturia, K., Schmidt, U., Russell, T., Treasure, J. (2008). Empathy,
17 systemizing, and autistic traits in anorexia nervosa: A pilot study. *British Journal of*
18 *Clinical Psychology*, 47(3), 335–339. doi: 10.1348/014466507X272475
- 19 Harari, H., Shamay-Tsoory, S. G., Ravid, M., Levkovitz, Y. (2010). Double dissociation
20 between cognitive and affective empathy in borderline personality disorder. *Psychiatry*
21 *Research*, 175(3), 277–279. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2009.03.002
- 22 Harrison, A., Sullivan, S., Tchanturia, K., Treasure, J. (2010). Emotional functioning in
23 eating disorders: Attentional bias, emotion recognition and emotion regulation.
24 *Psychological Medicine*, 40(11), 1887–1897. doi: 10.1017/S0033291710000036
- 25 Harrison, A., Watterson, S. V., Bennett, S. D. (2018). An experimental investigation into the
26 use of eye-contact in social interactions in women in the acute and recovered stages of
27 anorexia nervosa. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*. Advance online publication.
28 doi: 10.1002/eat.22993
- 29 Hirst, R. B., Beard, C. L., Colby, K. A., Quittner, Z., Mills, B. M., Lavender, J. S. (2017).
30 Anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa: A meta-analysis of executive functioning.
31 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioural Reviews*, 83, 678-690. doi:
32 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.08.011
- 33 Illing, V., Tasca, G. A., Balfour, L., Bissada, H. (2010). Attachment insecurity predicts eating
34 disorder symptoms and treatment outcomes in a clinical sample of women. *The Journal*
35 *of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 198(9), 653–659. doi:
36 10.1097/NMD.0b013e3181ef34b2
- 37 Jackson, P. L., Brunet, E., Meltzoff, A. N., Decety, J. (2006). Empathy examined through the
38 neural mechanisms involved in imagining how I feel versus how you feel pain.

- 1 Neuropsychologia, 44(5), 752–761. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2005.07.015
- 2 Jackson, P. L., Meltzoff, A. N., Decety, J. (2005). How do we perceive the pain of others? A
3 window into the neural processes involved in empathy. *NeuroImage*, 24(3), 771–779.
4 doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.09.006
- 5 Jermakow, N., Brzezicka, A. (2016). How autistic are anorectic females? Similarities and
6 differences between anorexia nervosa and autism spectrum disorders. *Clinical*
7 *Neuropsychiatry*, 13(4-5), 53–58.
- 8 Jolliffe, D., Farrington, D. P. (2004). Empathy and offending: A systematic review and meta-
9 analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 9(5), 441-476. doi:
10 10.1016/j.avb.2003.03.001
- 11 Jolliffe, D., Farrington, D. P. (2006). Development and validation of the Basic Empathy
12 Scale. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29(4), 589–611. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2005.08.010
- 13 Jones, A., Lindekilde, N., Lübeck, M., Clausen, L. (2015). The association between
14 interpersonal problems and treatment outcome in the eating disorders: A systematic
15 review. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 69(8), 563-573. doi:
16 10.3109/08039488.2015.1019924
- 17 Kerr-gaffney, J., Harrison, A., Tchanturia, K. (2018). Social anxiety in the eating disorders: A
18 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Medicine*, 48(15), 2477-2491. doi:
19 10.1017/S0033291718000752
- 20 Kim, Y. R., Eom, J. S., Yang, J. W., Kang, J., Treasure, J. (2015). The impact of oxytocin on
21 food intake and emotion recognition in patients with eating disorders: A double blind
22 single dose within-subject cross-over design. *PLoS ONE*, 10(9), e0137514. doi:
23 10.1371/journal.pone.0137514
- 24 Klin, A., Jones, W., Schultz, R., Volkmar, F., Cohen, D. (2002). Visual fixation patterns
25 during viewing of naturalistic social situations as predictors of social competence in
26 individuals with autism. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 59(9), 809.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.59.9.809>
- 28 Kok, F. M., Groen, Y., Becke, M., Fuermaier, A. B. M., Tucha, O. (2016). Self-reported
29 empathy in adult women with autism spectrum disorders – a systematic mini review.
30 *Plos One*, 11(3), e0151568. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0151568
- 31 Lee, J., Zaki, J., Harvey, P.-O., Ochsner, K., Green, M. F. (2011). Schizophrenia patients are
32 impaired in empathic accuracy. *Psychological Medicine*, 41(11), 2297–2304. doi:
33 10.1017/S0033291711000614
- 34 Leppanen, J., Cardi, V., Ng, K. W., Paloyelis, Y., Stein, D., Tchanturia, K., et al. (2017).
35 Effects of intranasal oxytocin on interpretation and expression of emotions in anorexia
36 nervosa. *Journal of Neuroendocrinology*, 29, 125–144. doi: 10.1111/jne.12458
- 37 Leppanen, J., Ng, K. W., Tchanturia, K., Treasure, J. (2017). Meta-analysis of the effects of
38 intranasal oxytocin on interpretation and expression of emotions. *Neuroscience &*

- 1 Biobehavioral Reviews, 78, 125–144. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.04.010
- 2 Leppanen, J., Sedgewick, F., Treasure, J. L., Tchanturia, K. (2018). Differences in the Theory
3 of Mind profiles of patients with anorexia nervosa and individuals on the autism
4 spectrum : a meta-analytic review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*, 90, 146-163. doi:
5 S0149763417307923
- 6 Liberati, A., Altman, D. G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gøtzsche, P. C., Ioannidis, J. P. A. et al.
7 (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of
8 studies that evaluate health care interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *PLoS*
9 *Medicine*, 6(7). doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100
- 10 Lulé, D., Schulze, U. M. E., Bauer, K., Schöll, F., Müller, S., Fladung, A. K. et al. (2014).
11 Anorexia nervosa and its relation to depression, anxiety, alexithymia and emotional
12 processing deficits. *Eating and Weight Disorders*, 19(2), 209–216. doi: 10.1007/s40519-
13 014-0101-z
- 14 Michaels, T. M., Horan, W. P., Ginger, E. J., Martinovich, Z., Pinkham, A. E., Smith, M. J.
15 (2014). Cognitive empathy contributes to poor social functioning in schizophrenia:
16 evidence from a new self-report measure of cognitive and affective empathy. *Psychiatry*
17 *Research*, 220(3), 803–810. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2014.08.054
- 18 Morris, R., Bramham, J., Smith, E., Tchanturia, K. (2014). Empathy and social functioning in
19 anorexia nervosa before and after recovery. *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry*, 19(1), 47–57.
20 doi: 10.1080/13546805.2013.794723
- 21 Müller, N., Baumeister, S., Dziobek, I., Banaschewski, T., Poustka, L. (2016). Validation of
22 the movie for the assessment of social cognition in adolescents with ASD: Fixation
23 duration and pupil dilation as predictors of performance. *Journal of Autism and*
24 *Developmental Disorders*, 46(9), 2831–2844. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-016-2828-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-016-2828-z)
25 [z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-016-2828-z)
- 26 Nandrino, J. L., Ducro, C., Iachini, T., Coello, Y. (2017). Perception of peripersonal and
27 interpersonal space in patients with restrictive-type anorexia. *European Eating Disorders*
28 *Review*, 25(3), 179–187. doi: 10.1002/erv.2506
- 29 Oldershaw, A., Hambrook, D., Tchanturia, K., Treasure, J., Schmidt, U. (2010). Emotional
30 theory of mind and emotional awareness in recovered anorexia nervosa patients.
31 *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 72(1), 73–79. doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181c6c7ca
- 32 Parling, T., Mortazavi, M., Ghaderi, A. (2010). Alexithymia and emotional awareness in
33 anorexia nervosa: Time for a shift in the measurement of the concept? *Eating Behaviours*,
34 11(4), 205-210. doi: 10.1016/j.eatbeh.2010.04.001
- 35 Peres, V., Corcos, M., Robin, M., Pham-Scottez, A. (2018). Emotional intelligence, empathy
36 and alexithymia in anorexia nervosa during adolescence. *Eating and Weight Disorders*.
37 Advance online publication. doi: 10.1007/s40519-018-0482-5
- 38 R Core Team (2017). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation

- 1 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available at [https:// www.R-project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/)
- 2 Redondo, I., Herrero-Fernández, D. (2018). Validation of the Reading the Mind in the Eyes
3 Test in a healthy Spanish sample and women with anorexia nervosa. *Cognitive*
4 *Neuropsychiatry*, 23(4), 201–217. doi: 10.1080/13546805.2018.1461618
- 5 Rosenthal, R. (1979). The “file drawer problem” and tolerance for null results. *Psychological*
6 *Bulletin* 86(3), 638–641. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.638
- 7 Schreiter, S., Pijnenborg, G. H. M., aan het Rot, M. (2013). Empathy in adults with clinical or
8 subclinical depressive symptoms. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 150(1), 1–16. doi:
9 10.1016/J.JAD.2013.03.009
- 10 Simonoff, E., Pickles, A., Charman, T., Chandler, S., Loucas, T., Baird, G. (2008).
11 Psychiatric disorders in children with autism spectrum disorders: Prevalence,
12 comorbidity, and associated factors in a population-derived sample. *Journal of the*
13 *American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 47(8), 921–929. doi:
14 10.1097/CHI.0B013E318179964F
- 15 Singer, T. (2006). The neuronal basis and ontogeny of empathy and mind reading: Review of
16 literature and implications for future research. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral*
17 *Reviews*, 30(6), 855–863. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2006.06.011
- 18 Spain, D., Blainey, S. H. (2015). Group social skills interventions for adults with high-
19 functioning autism spectrum disorders: A systematic review. *Autism*, 19(7), 874–886.
20 doi: 10.1177/1362361315587659
- 21 Spain, D., Blainey, S. H., Vaillancourt, K. (2017). Group cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT)
22 for social interaction anxiety in adults with autism spectrum disorders (ASD). *Research*
23 *in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 41–42, 20–30. doi: 10.1016/J.RASD.2017.07.005
- 24 Tasca, G. A., Presniak, M. D., Demidenko, N., Balfour, L., Kryszanski, V., Trinneer, A. et al.
25 (2011). Testing a maintenance model for eating disorders in a sample seeking treatment
26 at a tertiary care center: A structural equation modeling approach. *Comprehensive*
27 *Psychiatry*, 52(6), 678–687. doi: 10.1016/J.COMPPSYCH.2010.12.010
- 28 Tchanturia, K., Doris, E., Mountford, V., Fleming, C. (2015). Cognitive Remediation and
29 Emotion Skills Training (CREST) for anorexia nervosa in individual format: Self-
30 reported outcomes. *BMC Psychiatry*, 15, 53. doi: 10.1186/s12888-015-0434-9
- 31 Tiller, J. M., Sloane, G., Schmidt, U., Troop, N., Power, M., Treasure, J. L. (1997). Social
32 support in patients with anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa. *International Journal of*
33 *Eating Disorders*, 21(1), 31–8. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(199701)21:1<31::AID-EAT4>3.0.CO;2-4)
34 [108X\(199701\)21:1<31::AID-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)
- 35 Treasure, J., Schmidt, U. (2013). The cognitive-interpersonal maintenance model of anorexia
36 nervosa revisited: A summary of the evidence for cognitive, socio-emotional and
37 interpersonal predisposing and perpetuating factors. *Journal of Eating Disorders*, 1, 13.
38 doi: 10.1186/2050-2974-1-13

- 1 Tuschen-Caffier, B., Vögele, C. (1999). Psychological and physiological reactivity to stress:
2 an experimental study on bulimic patients, restrained eaters and controls. *Psychotherapy*
3 and *Psychosomatics*, 68(6), 333–340. doi: 10.1159/000012352
- 4 Uher, R., Brammer, M. J., Murphy, T., Campbell, I. C., Ng, V. W., Williams, S. C.,
5 Treasure, J. (2003). Recovery and chronicity in anorexia nervosa: brain activity
6 associated with differential outcomes. *Biological Psychiatry*, 54(9), 934–942. doi:
7 10.1016/S0006-3223(03)00172-0
- 8 Uher, R., Murphy, T., Brammer, M. J., Dalgleish, T., Phillips, M. L., Andrew, C. M., et al.
9 (2004). Medial prefrontal cortex activity associated with symptom provocation in eating
10 disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 161(7), 1238–1246. doi:
11 10.1176/appi.ajp.161.7.1238
- 12 Van IJzendoorn, M. H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2012). A sniff of trust: Meta-analysis
13 of the effects of intranasal oxytocin administration on face recognition, trust to in-group,
14 and trust to out-group. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 37(3), 438–443. doi:
15 10.1016/j.psyneuen.2011.07.008
- 16 Viechtbauer W (2010) Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of*
17 *Statistical Software*, 36(3).
- 18 Wakabayashi, A., Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Goldenfeld, N., Delaney, J., Fine, D. et
19 al. (2006). Development of short forms of the Empathy Quotient (EQ-Short) and the
20 Systemizing Quotient (SQ-Short). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(5), 929–
21 940. doi: 10.1016/J.PAID.2006.03.017
- 22 Warrier, V., Toro, R., Chakrabarti, B., Børghlum, A. D., Grove, J., Agee, M. et al. (2018).
23 Genome-wide analyses of self-reported empathy: Correlations with autism,
24 schizophrenia, and anorexia nervosa. *Translational Psychiatry*, 8, 35. doi:
25 10.1038/s41398-017-0082-6
- 26 Watson, K. K., Werling, D. M., Zucker, N. L., Platt, M. L. (2010). Altered social reward and
27 attention in anorexia nervosa. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1, 36. doi:
28 10.3389/fpsyg.2010.00036
- 29 Wentz, E., Gillberg, I. C., Anckarsäter, H., Gillberg, C., Råstam, M. (2009). Adolescent-onset
30 anorexia nervosa: 18-year outcome. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 194(2), 168–174.
31 <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.107.048686>
- 32 Westwood, H., Kerr-Gaffney, J., Stahl, D., Tchanturia, K. (2017). Alexithymia in eating
33 disorders: Systematic review and meta-analyses of studies using the Toronto
34 Alexithymia Scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 99, 66–81. doi:
35 10.1016/j.jpsychores.2017.06.007
- 36 Westwood, H., Lawrence, V., Fleming, C., & Tchanturia, K. (2016). Exploration of
37 friendship experiences, before and after illness onset in females with anorexia nervosa:
38 A qualitative study. *PLOS ONE*, 11(9), e0163528.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0163528>

- 1 Zigmond, A. S., & Snaith, R. P. (1983). The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta*
2 *Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 67(6), 361–70. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.1983.tb09716.x
- 3 Zipfel, S., Löwe, B., Reas, D. L., Deter, H.-C., Herzog, W. (2000). Long-term prognosis in
4 anorexia nervosa: lessons from a 21-year follow-up study. *The Lancet*, 355(9205), 721–
5 722. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(99)05363-5

6
7

In review

Table 1. Characteristics of studies.

Study	Group	Mean age (SD)	Mean BMI (SD)	% female	Empathy measure	Mean (SD) total empathy	Subscales reported?	
							Mean (SD) cognitive empathy	Mean (SD) affective empathy
Adenzato et al. (2012)	30 AN	19.73 (6.06)	15.06 (1.74)	100	EQ	44.17 (11.47)	NR	NR
	32 HC	20.47 (2.72)	20.21 (1.45)	100		50.72 (8.35)		
Aloi et al. (2017)	22 BED	43.8 (10.7)	36.9 (4.2)	81.4	EQ	41.8 (14.9)	NR	NR
	16 sub-threshold BED	42.5 (11.3)	37.5 (4.5)	68.8		50.5 (11.6)		
	20 obese controls	50.6 (8.6)	38.2 (6.5)	45		50.1 (12.4)		
Baron Cohen et al. (2013)	66 AN	17.85 (0.39)	NR	100	EQ (adult and adolescent versions)†	Younger: 44.7 (16.4) Older: 49.6 (9.7)	NR	NR
	1609 HC	18.56 (3.99)	NR	100		Younger: 51.2 (14.3) Older: 48.0 (11.3)		
Butler & Montgomery (2005)	15 AN	27.9 (9.9)	NR	100	I ₇	15.40 (2.61)	NA	NA
	16 HC	28.4 (8.3)	22.75	100		14.19 (2.74)		
Calderoni et al. (2013)	32 AN	14.78 (1.75)	15.07 (1.54)	100	IRI	5.13 (6.98)	0.44 (6.87)	4.69 (7.08)
	41 HC	14.02 (1.69)	NR	100		9.44 (5.66)	5.24 (6.45)	4.20 (4.75)

Courty et al. (2013)	15 AN	23.9 (4.7)	16.4 (1.7)	93.33	EQ-short	23.0 (6.8)	NR	NR
					IRI	70.8 (4.83)	34.1 (4.85)	36.7 (4.8)
	15 HC	24.0 (4.9)	21.0 (1.8)	93.33	EQ-short	21.1 (7.4)	NR	NR
					IRI	73.09 (3.79)	38.3 (3.31)	35.6 (4.22)
	15 ASD	28.1 (7.5)	23.2 (5.0)	13.33	EQ-short	10.1 (5.7)	NR	NR
					IRI	65.5 (4.77)	32.6 (4.73)	32.9 (4.81)
15 HC	28.1 (7.3)	22.2 (3.0)	13.33	EQ-short	19.9(3.4)	NR	NR	
				IRI	67.0 (3.39)	34.7 (2.75)	32.3 (3.93)	
Duchesne et al. (2011)	60 BED	NR	38.1	100	IRI	81.4 (4.04)	42.4 (4.40)	39.0 (3.65)
	60 obese controls	NR	37.9	100		81.3 (3.95)	42.7 (3.36)	38.6 (4.46)
	54 HC	NR	21.4 (1.6)	100		80.6 (4.02)	43.4 (4.30)	37.2 (3.72)
Feldman & Eysenck (1986)	45 BN	25.13 (6.59)	NR	100	I ₇	14.73 (3.17)	NA	NA
	761 HC	NR	NR	100		14.39 (2.87)		
Gramaglia et al. (2016)	39 AN	30.59 (3.0)	16.3	NR	IRI	82.93 (3.81)	41.19 (4.48)	41.74 (2.99)
	48 HC	33.19 (3.37)	21.82	100		80.48 (3.78)	41.9 (4.15)	38.58 (3.37)
Guttman & Laporte (2000)	28 AN	22	NR	100	IRI	72.7 (5.60)	35.1 (5.51)	37.6 (5.69)
	26 BPD	32	NR	100		78.9 (5.45)	34.7 (5.56)	44.2 (5.35)
	27 HC	21	NR	100		71.9 (4.83)	35.9 (4.61)	36 (5.04)
Hambrook et al. (2008)	22 AN	26.73 (4.77)	15.27 (1.22)	100	EQ	45.9 (12.5)	NR	NR

	45 HC	32.51 (9.63)	23.36 (3.76)	100		46.2 (11.1)		
Jermakow & Brzezicka (2016)	11 AN	26.80 (4.3)	NR	100	EQ	44.60 (8.58)	NR	NR
					IRI	63.10 (3.39)	34.9 (6.22)	28.2 (4.46)
	33 female	21.33 (1.4)	NR	100	EQ	42.42 (9.84)	NR	NR
	HC				IRI	70.03 (2.13)	38.52 (4.40)	31.52 (4.40)
	10 ASD	28.30 (9.5)	NR	0	EQ	30.00 (5.05)	NR	NR
				IRI	57.90 (2.20)	33.5 (5.59)	24.4 (3.64)	
	27 male HC	21.76 (2.0)	NR	0	EQ	32.63 (9.97)	NR	NR
					IRI	62.70 (2.33)	33.38 (5.60)	29.33 (5.21)
Lule et al. (2014)	15 AN	16.2 (1.26)	17.07 (1.44)	100	IRI	121.14 (11.25)	NR	NR
	15 HC	16.5 (1.09)	21.06 (1.57)	100		118.50 (10.20)		
Morris et al. (2014)	28 AN	26.3 (7.9)	15.5 (1.3)	100	SEQ	18.8 (2.5)	NA	NA
	25 AN- REC	29.5 (9.2)	20.1 (1.9)	100		19.8 (3.0)		
	54 HC	29.4 (9.6)	23.1 (3.9)	100		20.4 (2.4)		
Nandrino et al. (2017)	23 AN	19.64 (1.82)	15.2 (1.07)	100	BES	79.57 (6.70)	35.57 (3.45)	44.00 (5.44)
	23 HC	20.65 (1.90)	21.05 (1.78)	100		80.78 (6.04)	36.78 (3.19)	44.00 (4.93)
Peres et al. (2018)	41 AN	16.2 (1.4)	79.78 (8.71)	100	IRI	74.44 (4.30)	35.5 (6.99)	39.0 (6.45)
	38 HC	15.84 (1.83)	100.5 (11.71) %IBW	100		73.1 (4.1)	37.6 (7.18)	35.6 (5.21)

Redondo & Herrero- Fernandez (2018)	38 AN	21.9 (5.30)	NR	100	EQ-short	23.42 (7.25)	11.26 (4.84)	7.11 (2.68)
					IRI††	NR	NR	NR
	321 HC	NR	NR	100	EQ-short	25.79 (7.21)	11.03 (4.63)	7.55 (2.35)
					IRI††	NR	NR	NR

Significant differences between ED and HCs are indicated in bold. Italics indicate where scores were not reported in the study, but could be calculated from subscale scores. Potential significant differences could therefore not be reported for calculated scores. AN = anorexia nervosa; AN-REC = recovered anorexia nervosa; ASD = autism spectrum disorder; BED = binge eating disorder; BES = Basic Empathy Scale; BMI = body mass index; BN = bulimia nervosa; BPD = borderline personality disorder; EQ = Empathy Quotient; HC = healthy control; I₇ = Impulsiveness, Venturesomeness, and Empathy questionnaire; IRI = interpersonal reactivity index; NA = not applicable; NR = not reported; SD = standard deviation; SEQ = Socio-Emotional Questionnaire

†Groups were split into groups depending on age and EQ version used.

††Only the PT subscale of the IRI was used

Table 2. Statistical outcomes for meta-analyses of the four IRI subscales

IRI subscale	N studies	Pooled AN sample N	Pooled HC sample N	Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI	Z	<i>p</i>
Perspective taking	7	204	523	-0.2	-0.44, 0.05	-1.59	0.11
Fantasy	6	166	202	-0.41	-0.62, -0.20	3.83	>.001
Empathic concern	6	166	202	0.01	-0.20, 0.22	1.1	0.92
Personal distress	6	166	202	0.3	-0.13, 0.74	1.36	0.17

Significant differences between AN and HCs are indicated in bold. AN = anorexia nervosa; CI = confidence intervals; HC = healthy control; IRI = Interpersonal Reactivity Index

Figure legends:

Figure 1. Systematic review search process

Figure 2. Studies included in the review and meta-analyses.

Figure 3. Forest plot of standardised mean effect size for differences (SMD) between anorexia nervosa (AN) and healthy controls (HC) on total empathy scores. Negative effect sizes indicate lower empathy scores in the AN group. BES = Basic Empathy Scale; CI = confidence interval; EQ = empathy quotient; I₇ = Impulsiveness, Venturesomeness, and Empathy questionnaire; IRI = interpersonal reactivity index; SEQ = Socio-Emotional Questionnaire

Figure 4. Forest plot of standardised mean effect size for differences (SMD) between anorexia nervosa (AN) and healthy controls (HC) on cognitive empathy scores. Negative effect sizes indicate lower empathy scores in the AN group. BES = Basic Empathy Scale; CI = confidence interval; EQ = empathy quotient; IRI = interpersonal reactivity index

Figure 5. Forest plot of standardised mean effect size for differences (SMD) between anorexia nervosa (AN) and healthy controls (HC) on affective empathy scores. Negative effect sizes indicate lower empathy scores in the AN group. BES = Basic Empathy Scale; CI = confidence interval; EQ = empathy quotient; IRI = interpersonal reactivity index

Figure 6. Funnel plot of studies included in the total empathy meta-analysis

Figure 7. Funnel plot of studies included in the cognitive empathy meta-analysis

Figure 8. Funnel plot of studies included in the total affective meta-analysis

Figure 1.JPEG




Figure 2.JPEG




Figure 3.JPEG




Figure 4.JPEG




Figure 5.JPEG




Figure 6.JPEG




Figure 7.JPEG




Figure 8.JPEG

