

Author responses to reviews:

Below, we respond to each issue raised order addressed in your email:

- 1) The previous draft of our manuscript exceeded page length and were we asked to shorten and tighten our presentation. Our revised manuscript was shortened to 5765 words.
- 2) The abstract has been revised to include our analysis plan under methods.
- 3) We were asked to reorganize the introduction and background sections of our paper to introduce the eating disorders and basic propositions of the self-schema model before addressing our previous study. In our revised manuscript, definitions of the self-concept and self-schemas are provided in the second paragraph on page 5. Empirical evidence supporting the hypothesis that self-schemas influence information processing and behavioral regulation is presented before introducing our theoretical model and previous study results.
- 4) The paragraph introducing the study purpose and hypotheses was moved to the end of the background section. We also enumerated our hypotheses to make them clearer (see pages 7-8).
- 5) We added text to clarify the definition of interrelatedness and its consequences in the background section of the paper (page 6), and we included a more complete description of how interrelatedness was measured in the methods section (see pages 10-11).
- 6) We began the Methods section with Design as suggested (see page 9).
- 7) We more fully described the setting in which data was collected in the Procedures section of the paper, with a particular emphasis on strategies we used to minimize distractions during collection of the response latency data (see page 14).
- 8) We removed all background information and results from the Measures section. We also revised the methods/measurement section to provide a subheading for the description of each variable measure (see pages 10-13). We added reliability and validity information to the ED1 measure (see page 12).
- 9) To address the concern about not presenting all of the instruments with which we collected data, we also included a description of the types of measures that were included in the study but were not reported here. This is the first report based on this data set and it addresses the main hypotheses that guided the study.

10) We revised the paper so that there is now a clearer correspondence between the results and the study hypotheses. We also removed explanatory material that was in results section. We successfully shortened the Discussion section to 3 pages. Finally, we clarified Figure 2.

We are hopeful that our changes in the manuscript thoroughly address the concerns that you raised. We appreciate the time and effort necessary to re-review our manuscript and we look forward to your response.