

Cognitive biases in pain

Citation for published version (APA):

Van Ryckeghem, D. M. L., Noel, M., Sharpe, L., Pincus, T., & Van Damme, S. (2019). Cognitive biases in pain: an integrated functional-contextual framework. *Pain*, 160(7), 1489-1493.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001508>

Document status and date:

Published: 01/07/2019

DOI:

[10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001508](https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001508)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document license:

Taverne

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Cognitive biases in pain: an integrated functional–contextual framework

Dimitri M.L. Van Ryckeghem^{a,b,c,*}, Melanie Noel^d, Louise Sharpe^e, Tamar Pincus^f, Stefaan Van Damme^c

1. Cognitive biases in the context of pain

Contemporary models explaining the exacerbation and maintenance of pain, disability, and distress assign a pivotal role to cognitive biases. These models assume that cognitive biases are maladaptive, trait-like processes and propose that individuals who selectively attend to pain-related information (attention bias), interpret ambiguous pain and/or health relevant information as threatening (interpretation bias), and/or recall pain-related information selectively or as more negative/threatening than initially experienced (memory bias), report higher levels of pain and disability, and are at increased risk of developing chronic pain.^{9,10,14,15,50,55,76,86,92,93} This intuitively appealing idea has resulted in an exponential increase in research addressing the presence, antecedents, and consequences of cognitive biases in people experiencing acute and chronic pain.^{9,12,16,40,50,51,66,67,77} However, results are inconsistent and puzzling, with mixed support for theoretical-driven assumptions.^{11,40,66,86,87,92} The aim of this review is to (1) synthesize and discuss current knowledge on the role of cognitive biases in pain, (2) provide conceptual and methodological explanations for equivocal findings, and (3) develop an integrated functional–contextual framework for understanding the role of cognitive biases in pain. Based on this framework, we propose a new research agenda and discuss implications for clinical practice.

2. The presence and impact of cognitive biases in pain: the state of the science

Research on cognitive biases in (chronic) pain has been guided by the research agenda on cognitive biases in psychopathology, where similar theoretical processes are proposed.^{2,23,46} As such, paradigms were adapted from psychopathology research (eg, dot-probe,^{1,20,36,72} homograph or homophone task,^{59,66} and

word memory task^{35,65,71}) to investigate cognitive biases for pain-related information. These paradigms typically use symbolic descriptors of health/illness or pain experiences or situations (eg, words and/or pictures, descriptions of ambiguous situations). Recently, a number of comprehensive reviews synthesized available evidence following this research tradition.^{12,51,66,67,77}

For attention bias, these reviews revealed small effects, indicating that people experiencing acute or chronic pain show a bias towards pain-related information, particularly sensory pain words.^{12,77} No bias was found in people without or merely anticipating pain.^{67,77} Most remarkably, no consistent relationship was found between attention bias for pain and its theoretically proposed antecedents (eg, fear of pain) or consequences (eg, pain severity).¹² Equally inconsistent relationships have been found in prospective research^{41–43,73} and in youth with pain.^{5,40} For interpretation bias, a recent meta-analysis indicated that individuals with chronic pain tend to interpret ambiguous information as more pain-related than healthy individuals.⁶⁶ This meta-analysis also revealed a lack of research addressing the link between interpretation bias and its theoretically proposed antecedents and consequences.⁴⁰ The few studies investigating the link between pain severity or pain-related anxiety and biased interpretations for bodily threat in individuals living with chronic pain failed to find consistent associations,^{56,59} but see Ref. 38. Similarly, in healthy individuals, no systematic link was observed between pain-related anxiety and interpretation bias.^{37,80,81} Finally, a number of studies investigated memory bias for pain- and illness-related information in people experiencing pain. This research suggests that adults and youth with chronic pain recall more sensory pain words compared with neutral words (eg,^{17,54,63} but see Ref. 95), whereas findings on recall of illness-related words are mixed.^{17,57,58} Interestingly, some studies showed that increased recall of illness-related or negative health words relates to increased negative mood, although further research is warranted.^{13,57} A consistent link between memory biases for pain-related information and its theoretically proposed antecedents and consequences is however lacking.^{13,61,71}

In sum, there is limited evidence to support the role of cognitive biases for pain-related information in explaining the exacerbation and maintenance of pain and pain-related disability. Although there is evidence for the presence of cognitive biases in people experiencing pain, effect sizes are small to moderate, and there is substantial heterogeneity between studies. This heterogeneity may be partly due to task parameters, such as stimuli (eg, sensory vs affective pain words^{12,77}) or instructions (self-referent vs other-referent instructions⁵⁷). However, much heterogeneity remains unexplained, and available evidence does not show a robust link between cognitive biases for pain-related information and the theorized antecedents and consequences. Notably, research addressing the interaction between cognitive biases is lacking (see Refs. 65, 68, 75 for exceptions). In addition, there is a need for prospective research

Sponsorships or competing interests that may be relevant to content are disclosed at the end of this article.

^a Section Experimental Health Psychology, Clinical Psychological Science, Departments, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands, ^b Institute for Health and Behaviour, INSIDE, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, ^c Department of Experimental Clinical and Health Psychology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium, ^d Department of Psychology, Alberta Children's Hospital Research Institute, Hotchkiss Brain Institute, University of Calgary, Canada, ^e School of Psychology, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia, ^f Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author. Address: Maastricht University, PO Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, the Netherlands. Tel.: +31 (0)43 388 2222. E-mail address: Dimitri.VanRyckeghem@maastrichtuniversity.nl (D.M.L. Van Ryckeghem).

PAIN 160 (2019) 1489–1493

© 2019 International Association for the Study of Pain
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001508>

investigating the link between cognitive biases and the development of chronic pain. Therefore, we argue that it is premature to draw definitive conclusions from the current evidence base. Furthermore, we urge for a shift in the conceptualization and operationalization of cognitive biases to explain existing inconsistencies.

3. Towards an integrated functional–contextual framework

We propose that cognitive biases should be understood from an integrated functional–contextual framework. Key in this framework is that cognitive biases are conceptualized as functional phenomena driven by changing contexts and motivational factors. This conceptual framework has 3 key assumptions: Cognitive biases are (1) functional, (2) dynamic, and (3) interrelated and/or interacting.

3.1. Cognitive biases are functional phenomena

The first assumption contradicts the popular view that cognitive biases are intrinsically maladaptive phenomena. Within proposed framework, cognitive biases are suggested to be functional processes and not necessarily maladaptive. We propose that the adaptive value of cognitive biases for pain depends upon context. This assumption is in line with an evolutionary account on cognitive biases (see also Ref. 24). In particular, we propose that cognitive biases may have an adaptive value in instances where identification of pain and adoption of protective responses to potentially threatening situations can prevent negative outcomes.^{16,83,92} However, when protective responses are unavailable or ineffective, the same cognitive biases may interfere with the pursuit of daily tasks or life goals. Whether cognitive biases to pain-related information are adaptive then depends on their ability to prompt a response that can avert negative pain-related outcomes balanced against the urgency and value of competing goals. When a negative pain-related outcome cannot be prevented or modulated, interpreting situations in a threatening manner and being highly attentive to pain-related information is likely to interfere with daily goals, without benefit. If this assumption is true, adaptive cognitive processing would require the ability to shift flexibly in the way that situation-specific features are interpreted in line with presented demands, which are dependent upon the actual threat level and possibility to influence this threat balanced with the pursuit of ongoing and/or future non-pain-related goals, and attention is deployed consistent with that interpretation. Memory processes may then allow for optimal deployment of cognitive processes in future situations with similar situation-specific features. Based upon this assumption, we propose that it is inflexibility or rigidity in the way people attend, interpret, and remember pain information, irrespective of situation-specific features, such as active goals or changing contexts, that results in negative pain outcomes. Such inflexibility may be partly due to rule-governed behavior^{25,39} and/or reduced executive functioning abilities.⁴⁴ Indeed, flexible adaptation in the way of attending to, interpreting, and remembering pain-related information to contextual demands requires executive functioning, including attentional and cognitive control.^{3,30,44,47}

3.2. Cognitive biases are dynamic phenomena

The second assumption proposes that cognitive biases are dynamic, fluctuating, and unfolding phenomena driven by motivational and contextual factors, rather than stable trait-like processes as often implicitly presumed.^{7,66,67,93} This is supported by increasing

evidence that cognitive biases are influenced by active goal pursuit and contextual factors. For example, research has shown that attention bias for pain information increases when the goal to avoid pain is pursued⁵³ but diminishes in the presence of salient competing goals^{69,70} (eg, rewarded task performance). Furthermore, attentional biases have been found to vary as a result of the threat of an anticipated pain-related task.⁷² For interpretation bias, Moseley and Arntz⁴⁸ showed that contextual cues (ie, blue- vs red-colored cues) influenced how ambiguous nociceptive stimuli are experienced. Finally, numerous studies showed that the affective context (eg, anxiety) of caregivers and the individual experiencing pain exerts influence on the magnitude of memory bias.^{21,22,31,49,50} Each of these examples shows that cognitive biases are dynamic and supports the assumption that they are influenced by context and motivation. Differences in motivation may be due to a number of factors, including the relative importance of pain-relevant or competing goals, goal pursuit opportunities, and experienced emotions.^{6,83,87} Motivation may not only be influenced by proximal state variables, but may also be influenced by more distal trait-like individual difference variables, such as health anxiety, anxiety sensitivity, or pain catastrophizing. Systematic research is needed to address the impact of pain-relevant vs pain-irrelevant goal pursuit and context variables (eg, presence of safety cues, presence of significant others, caregiver affect, etc.) on the direction and magnitude of cognitive biases. Furthermore, we contend that one cannot simply translate findings on cognitive biases from one context (eg, a laboratory context) to another (eg, a daily life context), without considering motivational and contextual factors. As such, the proposed framework underscores the need for future research to consider goal pursuit and context variables.

3.3. Cognitive biases are interrelated

In line with the recent call to investigate the relationship between different cognitive biases in the field of pain,^{68,76,91} we argue for an integrative model in which cognitive biases are interrelated and interacting. Similar to the combined cognitive bias hypothesis, we propose that the relationships between cognitive biases are bidirectional,²⁹ but see Refs. 26 and 76. In the simplest way, early attention is captured by ambiguous bodily sensations, which are then interpreted as either threatening or nonthreatening. This interpretation affects later attentional processes and may consequently impact how the situation is remembered.^{18,76} Finally, the pain memory is activated in the future when similar bodily sensations are experienced, which will invariably influence attention and interpretation.⁵² Within this view, we argue that the interrelationship between cognitive biases is likely due to shared underlying mechanisms, ie, motivation and contextual variables—that fuel their potential co-occurrence. Yet, it may well be that cognitive biases are not merely interrelated, but have cumulative effects, and hence, particular combinations of cognitive biases have an amplified effect upon pain outcomes compared with their impact alone.²⁸ Since research investigating combined cognitive biases in the field of pain is still in its infancy, these hypotheses remain speculative. Hypothesis-driven and systematic research simultaneously addressing cognitive biases is needed to elucidate how they interrelate and interact with each other to affect pain intensity, pain-related disability, and the development and maintenance of chronic pain.

4. The future research agenda for cognitive bias research

Adopting an integrated functional–contextual framework to explain the presence, direction, and dynamics of cognitive biases

brings exciting new research avenues, as well as important methodological challenges. Many of these challenges relate to the typical assessment of cognitive biases in the context of pain. Most of the studies involve a single assessment of a single cognitive bias for symbolic representations of pain or health using a computer task in the laboratory. Yet, if biases are interrelated, dynamic, and context-specific, as we assert, these typical laboratory assessments do not comprehensively or validly capture the nature of cognitive biases for pain as theoretically proposed and as they would occur in real-world contexts. To propel cognitive bias research in the field of pain, we make the following recommendations. First, researchers need to ensure that the stimulus material used in cognitive bias research is relevant to the sample and the context. This may be even more challenging due to the large heterogeneity in pain samples and common comorbidity with psychopathological disorders, such as anxiety and depression.^{45,94} The investigation of cognitive biases using actual pain,⁵² pain-relevant body locations,⁸⁴ signals of impending pain,^{8,89} or ambiguous somatosensory stimuli⁴⁸ may increase the relevance of pain information. Furthermore, avoiding the use of symbolic pain information (particularly words) reduces the possibility that familiarity with the information (ie, pain patients more often use pain-related words than healthy persons) can explain cognitive bias findings due to better recall of and altered attention to familiar information.^{19,62} In similar vein, the link between various cognitive biases should be investigated in relation to similar relevant stimuli, as the presence and magnitude of biases may be determined by the particular type and relevance of pain-related stimuli.⁹¹ Second, cognitive biases are typically investigated without taking context into account and in isolation from active goals, which are common in individuals' daily lives (see Refs. 69 and 70 for an exception). Researchers should aim to test theory-driven hypotheses in dynamic functional contexts by implementing real-life actions and/or goals during pain.^{8,83} This may be achieved by bringing realistic (daily life) goals and contexts into a controlled laboratory setting (eg, by using virtual or augmented reality).^{79,85} Manipulating the features of active goals and the context (eg, safe vs dangerous; controllable vs uncontrollable; and stressful vs relaxed) during the assessment of cognitive biases for pain will provide a better understanding of the dynamic nature of cognitive biases in daily life. Alternatively, researchers may assess cognitive biases in the daily lives of people experiencing acute/chronic pain⁶⁴ by developing novel paradigms to assess information-processing in daily life. Ecological momentary assessment methods may then be used to assess pain outcomes, context, and motivational variables.³⁴ Third, we propose that inflexibility in attending, interpreting, and recalling pain-related information may be central for negative pain outcomes, rather than the temporary presence or direction of cognitive biases. Current study designs often do not enable investigating flexibility in the way that people attend, interpret, and recall pain information (see Refs. 88 and 96 for an exception). Using repeated measurements of cognitive biases for pain-related information in varying contexts would (1) increase the representativeness of the existence and magnitude of cognitive biases for pain in daily contexts and (2) allow to determine whether a person is flexible in the way he or she attends, interprets, and recalls pain-related information. Fourth, researchers should move beyond examining the impact of isolated cognitive biases on pain outcomes. Indeed, although examining single biases is valuable for understanding the exact phenomenon, it provides only one piece of the larger puzzle to explain higher levels of pain and disability and increased risk of

developing chronic pain. Without adopting an integrative view, including the relationship between cognitive biases, active goals, and context, equivocal findings will likely remain unexplained.

5. Clinical implications

Our integrated functional-contextual framework also has consequences for the treatment of acute and chronic pain. First, we suggest that targeting cognitive biases without considering context or goal pursuit is likely to prove ineffective. For example, attention bias modification interventions focus upon training attention away from pain-related information independent of context or goal pursuit. Although such training may affect cognitive biases within the trained context,^{4,32,74} it often proves futile in different contexts,^{27,90} but see Ref. 73. The current model suggests that treatment should (1) target contextual and motivational, including affective, factors that drive cognitive biases and/or (2) increase flexibility in the way that people attend, interpret, and recall pain-related information. Clinical psychologists have a plethora of techniques to target and change motivation (eg, motivational interviewing⁸²). Clinicians may also be more effective in impacting cognitive biases for pain by targeting the meaning or the threat value of pain or increasing peoples' awareness of their personal goals by using cognitive behavioral therapy or acceptance and commitment therapy.^{33,60,78,86} Finally, one may also aim to directly train people to flexibly attend, interpret, and remember pain-related information in a changing environment.²⁹ In addition, the current framework provides a clear imperative to investigate the interplay between cognitive biases, which can help to identify under which circumstances it is helpful to target a single bias or multiple interacting cognitive bias(es) or their underlying mechanisms of action.⁹¹

Conflict of interest statement

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Acknowledgments

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 706475 and was supported by the 2016 Early Research Career Grant of the International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) of Dimitri Van Ryckeghem. Finally, the manuscript was initiated at the Expert Meeting "Cognitive biases" in Belgium, supported by the International Research Community grant "Pain, Action and Interference (WO.007-16N)".

Article history:

Received 9 September 2018

Received in revised form 5 January 2019

Accepted 23 January 2019

Available online 29 January 2019

References

- [1] Asmundson GJG, Kuperos JL, Norton GR. Do patients with chronic pain selectively attend to pain-related information?: preliminary evidence for the mediating role of fear. *PAIN* 1997;72:27-32.
- [2] Bar-Haim Y. Research review: attention bias modification (ABM): a novel treatment for anxiety disorders. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2007;51: 859-70.

- [3] Basanovic J, Notebaert L, Grafton B, Hirsch CR, Clarke PJF. Attentional control predicts change in bias in response to attentional bias modification. *Behav Res Ther* 2017;99:47–56.
- [4] Bowler JO, Bartholomew KJ, Kellar I, Mackintosh B, Hoppitt L, Bayliss AP. Attentional bias modification for acute experimental pain: a randomized controlled trial of retraining early versus later attention on pain severity, threshold and tolerance. *Eur J Pain* 2017;21:112–24.
- [5] Brookes M, Sharpe L, Kozłowska K. Attentional and interpretational biases toward pain-related stimuli in children and adolescents: a systematic review of the evidence. *J Pain* 2018;19:1091–101.
- [6] Carver CS, Lawrence JW, Scheier MF. A control-process perspective on the origins of affect. In: Martin LL, Tesser A, editors. *Striving and feeling: Interactions among goals, affect, and self-regulation*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996.
- [7] Chapman CR. Pain: the perception of noxious events. In: Sternbach RA, editor. *The psychology of pain*. New York: Raven Press, 1978.
- [8] Clauwaert A, Torta DM, Danneels L, Van Damme S. Attentional modulation of somatosensory processing during the anticipation of movements accompanying pain: an event-related potential study. *J Pain* 2018;19:219–27.
- [9] Crombez G, Van Damme S, Eccleston C. Hypervigilance to pain: an experimental and clinical analysis. *PAIN* 2005;116:4–7.
- [10] Crombez G, Eccleston C, Van Damme S, Vlaeyen JW, Karoly P. Fear-avoidance model of chronic pain: the next generation. *Clin J Pain* 2012;28:475–83.
- [11] Crombez G, Heathcote L, Fox E. The puzzle of attentional biases to pain: beyond attention. *PAIN* 2015;156:1581–2.
- [12] Crombez G, Van Ryckeghem DM, Eccleston C, Van Damme S. Attentional bias to pain-related information: a meta-analysis. *PAIN* 2013;154:497–510.
- [13] Denton FJ, Sharpe L, Schrieber L. Cognitive bias in systemic lupus erythematosus. *Eur J Pain* 2005;9:5–14.
- [14] Eccleston C, Crombez G. Pain demands attention: a cognitive-affective model on the interruptive function of pain. *Psychol Bull* 1999;125:356–66.
- [15] Eccleston C, Crombez G. Worry and chronic pain: a misdirected problem solving model. *PAIN* 2007;132:233–6.
- [16] Eccleston C, Crombez G. Advancing psychological therapies for chronic pain. *F1000Res* 2017;6:461.
- [17] Edwards L, Pearce S, Collett BJ, Pugh R. Selective memory for sensory and affective information in chronic pain and depression. *Br J Clin Psychol* 1992;31(pt 2):239–48.
- [18] Everaert J, Duyck W, Koster EH. Attention, interpretation, and memory biases in subclinical depression: a proof-of-principle test of the combined cognitive biases hypothesis. *Emotion* 2014;14:331–40.
- [19] Eysenck MW. *Anxiety: the cognitive perspective*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum, 1992.
- [20] Fashler SR, Katz J. Keeping an eye on pain: investigating visual attention biases in individuals with chronic pain using eye-tracking methodology. *J Pain Res* 2016;9:551–61.
- [21] Gedney JJ, Logan H. Memory for stress-associated acute pain. *J Pain* 2004;5:83–91.
- [22] Gorin AA, Stone AA. Recall biases and cognitive errors in retrospective self-reports: a call for momentary assessments. In: Baum A, Revenson TA, Singer JE, editors. *Handbook of health psychology*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001. p. 405–13.
- [23] Hallion LS, Ruscio AM. A meta-analysis of the effect of cognitive bias modification on anxiety and depression. *Psychol Bull* 2011;137:940–58.
- [24] Haselton MG, Nettle D, Murray DR. The evolution of cognitive bias. In: Buss DM, editor. *The handbook of evolutionary psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2015.
- [25] Hayes SC. Acceptance and commitment therapy, relational frame theory, and the third wave of behavioral and cognitive therapies. *Behav Ther* 2004;35:639–65.
- [26] Heathcote LC, Eccleston C. Pain and cancer survival: a cognitive-affective model of symptom appraisal and the uncertain threat of disease recurrence. *PAIN* 2017;158:1187–91.
- [27] Heathcote LC, Jacobs K, Van Ryckeghem DML, Fisher E, Eccleston C, Fox E, Lau JYF. Attention bias modification training for adolescents with chronic pain: a randomized placebo-controlled trial. *PAIN* 2018;159:239–51.
- [28] Hirsch CR, Clark DM, Mathews A. Imagery and interpretations in social phobia: support for the combined cognitive biases hypothesis. *Behav Ther* 2006;37:223–36.
- [29] Hoorelbeke K, Koster EH, Demeyer I, Loeys T, Vanderhasselt MA. Effects of cognitive control training on the dynamics of (mal)adaptive emotion regulation in daily life. *Emotion* 2016;16:945–56.
- [30] Hou R, Moss-Morris R, Risdale A, Lynch J, Jeevaratnam P, Bradley BP, Mogg K. Attention processes in chronic fatigue syndrome: attentional bias for health-related threat and the role of attentional control. *Behav Res Ther* 2014;52:9–16.
- [31] Hufford MR, Shiffman S, Paty J, Stone AA. Ecological Momentary Assessment: real-world, real-time measurement of patient experience. In: Fahrenberg J, Myrtek M, editors. *Progress in ambulatory assessment*. Kirkland: Hogrefe & Huber, 2001.
- [32] Jones EB, Sharpe L. The effect of cognitive bias modification for interpretation on avoidance of pain during an acute experimental pain task. *PAIN* 2014;155:1569–76.
- [33] Kangasniemi AM, Lappalainen R, Kankaanpää A, Tolvanen A, Tammelin T. Towards a physically more active lifestyle based on one's own values: the results of a randomized controlled trial among physically inactive adults. *BMC Public Health* 2015;15:260.
- [34] Kaplan RM, Stone AA. Bringing the laboratory and clinic to the community: mobile technologies for health promotion and disease prevention. *Ann Rev Psychol* 2013;64:471–98.
- [35] Karimi Z, Pilenko A, Held SM, Hasenbring MI. Recall bias in patients with chronic low back pain: individual pain response patterns are more important than pain itself! *Int J Behav Med* 2016;23:12–20.
- [36] Keogh E, Ellery D, Hunt C, Hannent I. Selective attentional bias for pain-related stimuli amongst pain fearful individuals. *PAIN* 2001;91:91–100.
- [37] Keogh E, Hamid R, Hamid S, Ellery D. Investigating the effect of anxiety sensitivity, gender and negative interpretative bias on the perception of chest pain. *PAIN* 2004;111:209–17.
- [38] Khatibi A, Sharpe L, Jafari H, Gholami S, Dehghani M. Interpretation biases in chronic pain patients: an incidental learning task. *Eur J Pain* 2015;19:1139–47.
- [39] Kissi A, Hughes SJ, De Schryver M, De Houwer J, Crombez G. Examining the moderating impact of plys and tracks on the insensitivity effect: a preliminary investigation. *Psychol Rec* 2018;68:431–40.
- [40] Lau JYF, Heathcote LC, Beale S, Gray S, Jacobs K, Wilkinson N, Crombez G. Cognitive biases in children and adolescents with chronic pain: a review of findings and a call for developmental research. *J Pain* 2018;19:589–98.
- [41] Lautenbacher S, Huber C, Kunz M, Parthum A, Weber PG, Griessinger N, Sittl R. Hypervigilance as predictor of postoperative acute pain: its predictive potency compared with experimental pain sensitivity, cortisol reactivity, and affective state. *Clin J Pain* 2009;25:92–100.
- [42] Lautenbacher S, Huber C, Schöfer D, Kunz M, Parthum A, Weber PG, Roman C, Griessinger N, Sittl R. Attentional and emotional mechanisms related to pain as predictors of chronic postoperative pain: a comparison with other psychological and physiological predictors. *PAIN* 2010;151:722–31.
- [43] Lautenbacher S, Huber C, Baum C, Rossaint R, Hochrein S, Heesen M. Attentional avoidance of negative experiences as predictor of postoperative pain ratings and consumption of analgesics: comparison with other psychological predictors. *Pain Med* 2011;12:645–53.
- [44] Legrain V, Van Damme S, Eccleston C, Davis KD, Seminowicz DA, Crombez G. A neurocognitive model of attention to pain: behavioural and neuroimaging evidence. *PAIN* 2009;144:230–2.
- [45] McWilliams LA, Cox BJ, Enns MW. Mood and anxiety disorders associated with chronic pain: an examination in a nationally representative sample. *PAIN* 2003;106:127–33.
- [46] Mitte K. Memory bias for threatening information in anxiety and anxiety disorders: a meta-analytic review. *Psychol Bull* 2008;134:886–911.
- [47] Mogg K, Bradley BP. Anxiety and attention to threat: cognitive mechanisms and treatment with attention bias modification. *Behav Res Ther* 2016;87:76–108.
- [48] Moseley GL, Arntz A. The context of a noxious stimulus affects the pain it evokes. *PAIN* 2007;133:64–71.
- [49] Noel M, Chambers CT, McGrath PJ, Klein RM, Stewart SH. The role of state anxiety in children's memories for pain. *J Pediatr Psychol* 2012;37:567–79.
- [50] Noel M, Palermo TM, Chambers CT, Taddio A, Hermann C. Remembering the pain of childhood: applying a developmental perspective to the study of pain memories. *PAIN* 2015;156:31–4.
- [51] Noel M, Pavlova M, McCallum L, Vinal J. Remembering the hurt of childhood: a psychological review and call for future research. *Can Psychol* 2017;58:58–68.
- [52] Noel M, Rabbitts JA, Fales J, Chorney J, Palermo TM. The influence of pain memories on children's and adolescents' post-surgical pain experience: a longitudinal dyadic analysis. *Health Psychol* 2017;36:987–95.
- [53] Notebaert L, Crombez G, Vogt J, De Houwer J, Van Damme S, Theeuwes J. Attempts to control pain prioritize attention towards signals of pain: an experimental study. *PAIN* 2011;152:1068–73.

- [54] Pearce SA, Isherwood S, Hrouda D, Richardson PH, Erskine A, Skinner J. Memory and pain: tests of mood congruity and state dependent learning in experimentally induced and clinical pain. *PAIN* 1990;43:187–93.
- [55] Pincus T, Morley S. Cognitive-processing bias in chronic pain: a review and integration. *Psychol Bull* 2001;127:599–617.
- [56] Pincus T, Pearce S, McClelland A, Farley S, Vogel S. Interpretation bias in responses to ambiguous cues in pain patients. *J Psychosom Res* 1994;38:347–53.
- [57] Pincus T, Pearce S, McClelland A, Isenberg D. Endorsement and memory bias of self-referential pain stimuli in depressed pain patients. *Br J Clin Psychol* 1995;34(pt 2):267–77.
- [58] Pincus T, Pearce S, McClelland A, Turner-Stokes L. Self-referential selective memory in pain patients. *Br J Clin Psychol* 1993;32(pt 3):365–74.
- [59] Pincus T, Pearce S, Perrott A. Pain patients' bias in the interpretation of ambiguous homophones. *Br J Med Psychol* 1996;69(pt 3):259–66.
- [60] Powers MB, Zum Vorde Sive Vording MB, Emmelkamp PM. Acceptance and commitment therapy: a meta-analytic review. *Psychother Psychosom* 2009;78:73–80.
- [61] Read J, Pincus T. Cognitive bias in back pain patients attending osteopathy: testing the enmeshment model in reference to future thinking. *Eur J Pain* 2004;8:525–31.
- [62] Richards A, French CC. An anxiety-related bias in semantic activation when processing threat/neutral homographs. *Q J Exp Psychol* 1992;45A:503–25.
- [63] Rusu AC, Pincus T, Morley S. Depressed pain patients differ from other depressed groups: examination of cognitive content in a sentence completion task. *PAIN* 2012;153:1898–904.
- [64] Schneider S, Stone AA, Schwartz JE, Broderick JE. Peak and end effects in patients' daily recall of pain and fatigue: a within-subjects analysis. *J Pain* 2011;12:228–35.
- [65] Schoth DE, Beaney R, Broadbent P, Zhang J, Lioffi C. Attentional, interpretation and memory biases for sensory-pain words in individuals with chronic headache. *Br J Pain* 2019;13:22–31.
- [66] Schoth DE, Lioffi C. Biased interpretation of ambiguous information in patients with chronic pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis of current studies. *Health Psychol* 2016;35:944–56.
- [67] Schoth DE, Nunes VD, Lioffi C. Attentional bias towards pain-related information in chronic pain: a meta-analysis of visual-probe investigations. *Clin Psychol Rev* 2012;32:13–25.
- [68] Schoth DE, Parry L, Lioffi C. Combined cognitive biases for pain and disability information in individuals with chronic headache: a preliminary investigation. *J Health Psychol* 2018;23:1610–21.
- [69] Schrooten MGS, Van Damme S, Crombez G, Kindermans H, Vlaeyen JWS. Winning or not losing? The impact of non-pain goal focus on attentional bias to learned pain signals. *Scand J Pain* 2018;18:675–86.
- [70] Schrooten MG, Van Damme S, Crombez G, Peters ML, Vogt J, Vlaeyen JW. Nonpain goal pursuit inhibits attentional bias to pain. *PAIN* 2012;153:1180–6.
- [71] Serbic D, Pincus T. Diagnostic uncertainty and recall bias in chronic low back pain. *PAIN* 2014;155:1540–6.
- [72] Sharpe L, Brookes M, Jones E, Gittins C, Wufong E, Nicholas MK. Threat and fear of pain induces attentional bias to pain words: an eye-tracking study. *Eur J Pain* 2017;21:385–96.
- [73] Sharpe L, Ianiello M, Dear BF, Nicholson Perry K, Refshauge K, Nicholas MK. Is there a potential role for attention bias modification in pain patients? Results of 2 randomised, controlled trials. *PAIN* 2012;153:722–31.
- [74] Sharpe L, Johnson A, Dear BF. Attention bias modification and its impact on experimental pain outcomes: comparison of training with words versus faces in pain. *Eur J Pain* 2015;19:1248–57.
- [75] Todd J, Sharpe L, Colagiuri B. Attentional bias modification and pain: the role of sensory and affective stimuli. *Behav Res Ther* 2016;83:53–61.
- [76] Todd J, Sharpe L, Johnson A, Nicholson Perry K, Colagiuri B, Dear BF. Towards a new model of attentional biases in the development, maintenance, and management of pain. *PAIN* 2015;156:1589–600.
- [77] Todd J, van Ryckeghem DML, Sharpe L, Crombez G. Attentional bias to pain-related information: a meta-analysis of dot-probe studies. *Health Psychol Rev* 2018;12:419–36.
- [78] Turner JA, Holtzman S, Mancl L. Mediators, moderators, and predictors of therapeutic change in cognitive-behavioral therapy for chronic pain. *PAIN* 2007;127:276–86.
- [79] Urech A, Krieger T, Chesham A, Mast FW, Berger T. Virtual reality-based attention bias modification training for social anxiety: a feasibility and proof of concept study. *Front Psychiatry* 2015;28:154.
- [80] Vancleef LM, Hanssen MM, Peters ML. Are individual levels of pain anxiety related to negative interpretation bias? An examination using an ambiguous word priming task. *Eur J Pain* 2016;20:833–44.
- [81] Vancleef LM, Peters ML, De Jong PJ. Interpreting ambiguous health and bodily threat: are individual differences in pain-related vulnerability constructs associated with an on-line negative interpretation bias? *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry* 2009;40:59–69.
- [82] Van Damme S, Kindermans H. A self-regulation perspective on avoidance and persistence behavior in chronic pain: new theories, new challenges? *Clin J Pain* 2015;31:115–22.
- [83] Van Damme S, Legrain V, Vogt J, Crombez G. Keeping pain in mind: a motivational account of attention to pain. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2010;34:204–13.
- [84] Van Damme S, Vanden Bulcke C, Van Den Berghe L, Poppe L, Crombez G. Do patients with chronic unilateral orofacial pain due to a temporomandibular disorder show increased attending to somatosensory input at the painful side of the jaw? *PeerJ* 2018;6:e4310.
- [85] Van Ryckeghem DML. The interference of pain with task performance: increasing ecological validity in research. *Scan J Pain* 2017:91–2.
- [86] Van Ryckeghem DML, Crombez G. Attentional bias and chronic pain: where to go from here? *PAIN* 2014;155:6–7.
- [87] Van Ryckeghem DML, Crombez G. Pain and attention: towards a motivational account. In: Karoly P, Crombez G, editors. *Motivational perspectives on chronic pain: theory, research, and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- [88] Van Ryckeghem D, Crombez G, Eccleston C, Liefoghe B, Van Damme S. The interruptive effect of pain in a multitask environment: an experimental investigation. *J Pain* 2012;13:131–8.
- [89] Van Ryckeghem DM, Crombez G, Goubert L, De Houwer J, Onraedt T, Van Damme S. The predictive value of attentional bias towards pain-related information in chronic pain patients: a diary study. *PAIN* 2013;154:468–75.
- [90] Van Ryckeghem DML, Van Damme S, Vervoort T. Does attention bias modification training impact on task performance in the context of pain: an experimental study in healthy participants. *PLoS One* 2018;13:e0200629.
- [91] Van Ryckeghem DM, Vervoort T. Towards an integrative view of cognitive biases in pain. *Eur J Pain* 2016;20:1201–2.
- [92] Vlaeyen JWS, Morley S, Crombez G. The experimental analysis of the interruptive, interfering, and identity-distorting effects of chronic pain. *Behav Res Ther* 2016;86:23–34.
- [93] Vlaeyen JWS, Linton SJ. Fear-avoidance and its consequences in chronic musculoskeletal pain: a state of the art. *PAIN* 2000;85:317–32.
- [94] Vinall J, Pavlova M, Asmundson GJC, Rasic N, Noel M. Mental health comorbidities in pediatric chronic pain: a narrative review of epidemiology, models, neurobiological mechanisms and treatment. *Children* 2016;3:1–31.
- [95] Wells HJ, Pincus T, McWilliams E. Information processing biases among chronic pain patients and ankylosing spondylitis patients: the impact of diagnosis. *Eur J Pain* 2003;7:105–11.
- [96] Zvielli A, Bernstein A, Koster E. Temporal dynamics of attention bias. *Clin Psychol Sci* 2015;3:772–88.