**Revision Note**

We were pleased to receive your comments and constructive critics. We acknowledge the value of the observations and tried to answer all of them. Subsequent, we will expose the major suggestions and alterations the paper has undertaken according to your suggestions. The new version of the manuscript includes some minor corrections in the text.

**Reviewer 1**

**-recommendation 1:**

*“(pag 9)*

*Material and methods:*

*Data collection*

*Please specify:*

*the time when the treatment outcome was evaluated*

*how long does the treatment plan last”*

**Reply:** We added the time when the treatment was evaluated in the Data Collection topic. (“*Treatment outcome was evaluated in December 2016*”). Regarding the duration of the treatment plan, we do not have a standard period of time for the treatment, each individual has a specific time frame according to their clinical/personal specificities.

**-recommendation 2:**

“*(pag 11)*

*how long does the followup last (1,29 years?)”*

**Reply:** We added further details to the mean follow up period *(“1.29 years – approximately 1 year and 4 months”*. We did not consider the same time period of follow up for every single patient in our sample, the follow up period depends on the specific outcome of each patient during our study period (dropout/full and partial remission).

**-recommendation 3:**

*“(pag12)*

*“t-test for independent and paired samples” – but I didn’t see any paired samples”*

**Reply:** We acknowledge the correction and made the appropriate changes in the document.

**-recommendation 4:**

*“(pag 13)*

*If one of the purposes of this paper is to study the duration of the AN on prognosis and if differences between the two AN types were found (duration and age of first appointment), why not study the differences between the two types concerning the three time frames (<1, 1-2, >2 years). You may extend the AN-R and AN-BP division to the illness duration and change the discussion accordingly”*

**Reply:** Illness duration and age of first appointment are indeed the variables with statistically significant differences among Anorexia Nervosa types. As the reviewer states, we also consider that it would be interesting to analyze differences between the three time frames (<1, 1-2, >2 years). We now add information about differences in the mean age at first appointment in the two AN types according to three time frames*(“When considering differences between illness duration groups (<1, 1-2, >2 years) and mean age at first appointment, we found that only the subgroup of AN-R with < 1 year of illness duration had a statistically significant difference in the age at first appointment comparing to the subgroup of > 2 years (18.51vs. 24.61 years old, p<0.001).”)* and we already analyzed differences between the two types of AN in the three different time frames in the previous version of the manuscript.

**-recommendation 5:**

*“(pag 27)*

*please write > 2 years instead 2 year on the illness duration Table 2”*

**Reply:** We appreciate the suggestion and made the appropriate changes in the document.

Yours sincerely,

Rodrigo Andrade