Response to Reviewer Number 1

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted in the re-submitted files.

2. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comment 1: This study included female inpatients only. Therefore, I recommend adding 'female' to the title.

Response 1:

Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with your comment and added female to the title:

Body mass index distribution in female child, adolescent and adult inpatients with anorexia nervosa

Comment 2: Please explain the criteria for hospitalization for AN

Response 2:

Inpatient treatment is considered in cases of severe weight loss, insufficient weight gain during outpatient treatment or physical signs of starvation including bradycardia and hypotension.

No changes made to the manuscript.

Comment 3: This study includes 14 patients with the age of more than 60. In general, it is hard to imagine a patient over 60 years old with AN being admitted for treatment purposes, but was the patient admitted for treatment of AN? Is there any possibility of add-on treatment for other diseases or possible age-related loss of appetite?

Response 3:

Thank you for bringing this up. As a tertiary referral centre, the Schoen Clinic also treats rare cases of anorexia in patients between the age of 60 and 85. Physical causes of (unintentional) weight loss are ruled out thoroughly before the initiation of treatment.

No changes made to the manuscript.

For review article

Response to Reviewer X Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files. *[This is only a recommended summary. Please feel free to adjust it. We do suggest maintaining a neutral tone and thanking the reviewers for their contribution although the comments may be negative or off-target. If you disagree with the reviewer's comments please include any concerns you may have in the letter to the Academic Editor.]*

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Is the work a significant contribution to the field?		*[Please give your response if necessary. Or you can also give your corresponding response in the point-by-point response letter. The same as below]*
Is the work well organized and comprehensively described?		

Is the work scientifically sound and not misleading?

Are there appropriate and adequate references to related and previous work?

Is the English used correct and readable?

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: *[Paste the full reviewer comment here.]*

Response 1: *[Type your response here and mark your revisions in red]* Thank you for pointing this out. I/We agree with this comment. Therefore, I/we have….*[Explain what change you have made. Mention exactly where in the revised manuscript this change can be found – page number, paragraph, and line.]*

"[updated text in the manuscript if necessary]"

Comments 2: *[Paste the full reviewer comment here.]*

Response 2: Agree. I/We have, accordingly, done/revised/changed/modified…..to emphasize this point. *Discuss the changes made, providing the necessary explanation/clarification. Mention exactly where in the revised manuscript this change can be found – page number, paragraph, and line.]*

"[updated text in the manuscript if necessary]"

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Point 1:

Response 1: (in red)

5. Additional clarifications

[Here, mention any other clarifications you would like to provide to the journal editor/reviewer.]