The authors did a great job in addressing my previous comments and the manuscript has improved as a result. I only have a few remaining comments to make the manuscript stronger and more reader-friendly.

1. I would include your responses to my query regarding “cognitive fluctuations over time in HS” in your manuscript. While reading the manuscript I was initially confused by the concept of “improvement” in HS. It is wise to address the “learning effect” factor in your discussion.
2. I would also summarize your reply to my question regarding “how do weight fluctuations in the BD sample compare to current findings” and include it in the manuscript.
3. Given the number of predictors and covariates you included in your analyses the question arises as to how strong effect size and power were. The tables you provided in your answers should therefore be included in your manuscript or at the very least in your supplementary material.
4. Page 5. You mention that “higher BMI would be associated with slower improvement in cognition in patients…”. please make sure to specify that they are “patients in remission” or “recovering BD”. The word “improving” is otherwise here extremely confusing.
5. The results are very difficult to follow as written. The authors did a good job in explaining the analyses in their responses and I understand that it is important to provide all the findings. I think that the use of “delta-BMI”, delta-cognition, BL-M6, M6-M12 may be the source of confusion. To start with I wonder if delta can be defined for instance (subtracting BL from M6) and whether the authors could use the symbol Δ instead. Also what about using ΔM6, ΔM12, and ΔM6M12. This is a suggestion, other ways of making this clearer should be explored. For instance, when I read BL-M6 I wonder if it’s BL minus M6 or M6 minus BL. These details will slow down the unfamiliar reader and detract from the meaning/relevance of the finding.
6. You mention that the trajectories of BMI and cognition differed in the first and second 6 months: how did you determine this statistically?
7. Figures. I would stack Figures 1a to d next to each other so that pictures are presented within the same page. I would then stack Figure 2 a-b, and then Figure 3 below Figure 1. I would provide the description of pt+HC etc. within my caption. It would make these figures easier to understand. These are suggestions that should encourage the authors to make these figures more understandable.
8. I still think that the mediation analyses should be included in the methods section. Further the path diagram should be included there too. I think that mentioning mediational analyses within the results section is distracting and confusing. I will, however, leave this it to the editor to decide on this matter.