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Reviewer's report:

With this paper entitled "Predictors of orthorexic behaviours in patients with eating disorders. A preliminary study", the authors have addressed a very interesting topic. The manuscript is very interesting and well structured; the results are sound. However, some comments can be helpful to further improve their paper and the comprehension by readers.

1. Major compulsory revisions:

INTRODUCTION

* There is a mistake in the first reference, the term "orthorexia", of course coined by Bratman was published for the first time in 1997. Bratman Steven. Health Food Junkie. Yoga Journal Sept-Oct 1997, 42-50.


METHODS

* Page 5 line "Participants". Authors affirm that patients with AN and BN were assessed in the starting phase of their treatment. I understand that it is difficult to recruit all patients at the same stage of illness and in the case of BN it is even more infrequent that they ask for help in early stages of the ED. Nevertheless, and considering that ON could be related to the different phase of the disorder, authors should specify at least the length of the disease and the length and number of treatments of patients.

Authors should describe the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for each test they used, either explain the coefficients of the original versions or those they found in their current study.

Why the authors only chose the comparative fit index (CFI) and chi-square when Hu and Bentler that they cited recommend to include other indexes as the Tucker-Lewis incremental fit index (TLI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and the ratio of chi-square and degree of freedom (CMIN/DF)?

RESULTS

The frequency of subjects who score under the threshold of the ORTO test is very high. It can be explained because the authors used the cut-off of the general population. I don't know if the Polish version of the ORTO-15 has provided other cut-offs as the Italian one; Donini et al proposed more restrictive cut-off to be used in high-risk populations, and from my point of view, patients with ED should be considered as highly at risk for ON. Could authors discuss this result in the discussion section?

Could authors provide the mean and SD of tests either in the text or in Table 1?

Figure 1. Authors should provide the legend.

Figure 1. Were there significant differences between Class 1 and 2? If so, even if "negligible for appearance", authors should include them in the figure.

SEM analyses in quite difficult to understand for the reader who is not used to to statistics, so the explanation of Table 3 is not clear. Authors should provide the SEM graphic instead or in addition to Table 3.

DISCUSSION

An important result of this research is that health orientation negatively predicted orthorexia. I think that authors have not discussed this result in depth.

Minor revisions:

Please, insert the abbreviations of test in the final list

Final considerations

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
* Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

* Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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