

1 Statistical learning in acute and chronic pain

2 Jakub Onysk^{1,2,!}, Mia Whitefield^{1,!}, Nicholas Gregory¹, Maeghal Jain¹, Georgia
3 Turner^{1,3}, Ben Seymour^{4,5}, and Flavia Mancini^{*1}

4 ¹Computational and Biological Learning Unit, Department of Engineering, University of
5 Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 1PZ, UK

6 ²Applied Computational Psychiatry Lab, Max Planck Centre for Computational Psychiatry and
7 Ageing Research, Queen Square Institute of Neurology and Mental Health Neuroscience
8 Department, Division of Psychiatry, University College London, UK

9 ³MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge, UK

10 ⁴Wellcome Centre for Integrative Neuroimaging, John Radcliffe Hospital, Headington, Oxford
11 OX3 9DU, UK

12 ⁵Center for Information and Neural Networks (CiNet), Osaka 565-0871, Japan

13 [!]Equal contribution

14 ABSTRACT

15 The placebo and nocebo effects highlight the importance of expectations in modulating pain perception, but in
16 every day life we don't need an external source of information to form expectations about pain. The brain can
17 learn to predict pain in a more fundamental way, simply by experiencing fluctuating, non-random streams of
18 noxious inputs, and extracting their temporal regularities. This process is called statistical learning. Here we
19 address two key open questions: (1) does statistical learning modulate pain perception? and (2) is it different
20 in people with chronic musculoskeletal pain? In a first experiment, we asked 27 participants to both rate and
21 predict pain intensity levels in sequences of fluctuating heat pain. Using a computational approach, we show
22 that probabilistic expectations and confidence were used to weight pain perception and prediction. Given that
23 statistical learning involves supramodal processes, we developed an online, stock market game to assess the
24 ability to explicitly predict volatile and stochastic time series, probing the most fundamental components of
25 statistical learning. The game was played by 56 chronic back pain and 55 healthy participants. We show that
26 back pain participants learn the statistics of the sequence more slowly than controls. In conclusion, this study
27 shows that statistical learning shapes pain experience and can be disrupted in common chronic pain conditions,
28 opening a new path of research into the brain mechanisms of pain regulation.

29 1 INTRODUCTION

30 Clinical pain typically varies over time; in most pain states, the brain receives a stream of volatile and noisy
31 noxious signals, which are also auto-correlated in time. The temporal structure of these signals is important,
32 because the human brain has evolved the exceptional ability to extract regularities from streams of auto-correlated
33 sensory signals, a process called statistical learning [1–7]. In the context of pain, statistical learning can allow the
34 brain to predict future pain, which is crucial for orienting behaviour and maximising well-being [8, 9]. Statistical
35 learning might also be fundamental to the ability of the nervous system to endogenously regulate pain. Indeed,
36 statistical learning generates predictions about forthcoming pain. We already know that pain expectations can
37 modulate pain levels by gating the reciprocal transmission of neural signals between the brain and spinal cord, as
38 shown by previous work on placebo and nocebo effects [10–14].

39 Recent work using temporal sequences of noxious inputs has shown that the pain system supports the
40 statistical learning of the basic rate of getting pain by engaging both somatosensory and supramodal cortical
41 regions [8]. Specifically, both sensorimotor cortical regions and the ventral striatum encode probabilistic

*Corresponding author: flavia.mancini@eng.cam.ac.uk

42 predictions about pain intensity, which are updated as a function of learning by engaging parietal and prefrontal
43 regions. According to a Bayesian inference framework, both the predictive inference and its confidence should, in
44 theory, modulate the neural response to noxious inputs and affect perception, as a function of learning. In support
45 of this conjecture, there is evidence that the confidence of probabilistic pain predictions modulates the cortical
46 response to pain [9]. The relationship is inverse: the lower the confidence, the higher is the early cortical response
47 to noxious inputs (and viceversa), as measured by EEG. This is expected based on Bayesian inference theory:
48 when confidence is low, the brain relies less on his prior beliefs and more on sensory evidence to respond to the
49 input. Bayesian inference theory also predicts that prior expectations and their confidence scale perception [15].
50 Thus, we hypothesise that the predictions generated by learning the statistics of noxious inputs in dynamically
51 evolving sequences of stimuli modulate the perception of forthcoming inputs.

52 We address this question in the first experiment of this study. Specifically, we asked healthy participants to
53 both rate the perceived and predicted intensity of pain, and their confidence (Fig. 1a-b), in thermal sequences
54 with varying levels of temporal regularity (Fig. 1c). We contrasted four models of statistical learning, which
55 varied according to the inference strategy used (i.e., optimal Bayesian inference or an heuristic) and the role
56 of expectations on perception. All models used confidence ratings to weight the inference. We anticipate
57 that probabilistic learning weighted by confidence and expectations modulates pain perception. This provides
58 behavioural evidence for a link between learning and endogenous pain regulation.

59 One reason why this is important is that it might help understand individual differences in the ability to
60 endogenously regulate pain. This is particularly relevant for chronic pain, given that endogenous pain regulation
61 can be dysfunctional in several chronic pain conditions [16–21]. Although there is ample evidence for changes
62 in the functional anatomy and connectivity of endogenous pain modulatory systems in chronic pain, their
63 computational mechanisms are poorly understood. We speculate that there might be a close relationship between
64 statistical learning and the ability to effectively regulate pain endogenously. Disrupted statistical learning could
65 result in dysfunctional endogenous pain regulation, and vice versa, in a vicious loop that leads to pain deregulation
66 (i.e. deregulated pain is more difficult to learn and predict, which makes it harder to control).

67 Given that (1) statistical learning modulates pain perception (Experiment 1) and (2) the core mechanisms of
68 statistical learning are shared by a range of cognitive processes across sensory domains and modalities [22], in a
69 second experiment we investigated whether statistical learning of dynamically-changing and noisy sequences
70 is altered in people with chronic back pain vs. the general population. We selected back pain as condition of
71 interest simply because it is one of the most prevalent causes of disability worldwide [23], affecting approx.
72 10% of adults in the U.S. [24]. The experiment was designed iteratively with people with lived experience
73 of chronic back pain, using a systems engineering approach to study design. The result was an open-source,
74 phone-based online game that assessed supramodal aspects of statistical learning, which could be easily scaled-up
75 for future digital healthcare applications. Experiment 2 shows that statistical learning of fluctuating values is
76 indeed disrupted in chronic back pain, opening a promising new path of research on the relationship between
77 statistical learning and endogenous pain regulation.


78 2 RESULTS

79 2.1 Modelling strategy

80 In Experiment 1, participants were required to rate their perceived and predicted pain, whereas in Experiment 2
81 they were required to predict the fluctuating value of shares in noisy and volatile timeseries. In both Experiments
82 1 and 2, we tested two main families of learning strategies: an optimal Bayesian inference strategy (whereby
83 uncertainty weights the learning rate) and an heuristic (a non-probabilistic delta rule, whereby the learning rate
84 is fixed). These two approaches should be viewed as complimentary [25, 26]. As a baseline, we included a
85 random-response model (please see Methods for a formal treatment of the computational models).

86 According to a Bayesian strategy, on each trial, participants update their beliefs about the feature of interest
87 (thermal stimuli or stock market values) based on probabilistic inference, maintaining a full posterior distribution
88 over its values [26, 27]. Operating within a Bayesian paradigm, participants are assumed to track and, following
89 new information, update both the mean of the sequence of interest and the uncertainty around it [28]. In most
90 cases, such inference makes an assumption about environmental dynamics. For example, a common assumption
91 is that the underlying mean (a hidden/latent state) evolves linearly according to a Gaussian random walk, with

Experiment 1



Experiment 2




Fig. 1. Experiment 1 task design. On each trial, each participant received a thermal stimulus lasting 2s from a sequence of intensities. This was followed by a perception (A) or a prediction (B) input screen, where the y-axis indicates the level of perceived/predicted intensity (0-100) centred around participant's pain threshold, and the x-axis indicates the level of confidence in one's perception (0-1). The inter-stimulus interval (ISI; black screen) lasted 2.5s. **C:** Example intensity sequences are plotted in green, participant's perception and prediction responses are in red and black. **D:** Participant's confidence rating for perception (red) and prediction (black) trials. **Experiment 2 task design.** **D:** Schematic of a single trial of the stock market game. After an inter-trial interval lasting 0.2 s, participants predict the value of their shares and then rate their confidence in their prediction out of 5. Then the actual share price is revealed for 2 s. This is repeated for a total of 200 trials. **F:** Display of stock market game interface on a phone screen. The game layout was formatted so it could be played on phones, tablets, and desktops. **G:** Participant's predictions (black) of the stock market values (green), including participant's confidence ratings (red).

92 the rate of this evolution defined by the the variance of this Gaussian walk (volatility). The observed value is then
93 drawn from another Gaussian with that mean, which has some observation noise (stochasticity). In this case, the
94 observer can infer the latent states through the process of Bayesian filtering [27], using the Kalman Filter (KF)
95 algorithm [29].

96 Sequence learning can also be captured by an heuristic to the Bayesian learning, i.e. a simple reinforcement
97 learning (RL) rule. Here, participants maintain and update a point-estimate of the expected value of the sequence
98 in an adaptive manner, within a non-stationary environment. RL explicitly involves correcting the tracked mean of
99 the sequence proportionally to a trial-by-trial prediction error (PE) - a difference between the expected and actual
100 value of the sequence [30]. Importantly, RL agents do not assume any specific dynamics of the environment and
101 hence are considered model-free.

102 Both models perform some form of error correction about the underlying sequence. The rate at which this
103 occurs is captured by the learning rate $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ element. The higher the learning rate, the faster participants
104 update their beliefs about the sequence after each observation. In case of the RL model, the learning rate α is a
105 free parameter that is constant across the trials. On the other hand, the learning rate in the KF model α_t (also
106 known as the kalman gain) is calculated on every trial. It depends on participants' trial-wise belief uncertainty
107 as well as their overall estimation of the inherent noise in the environment (stochasticity, s). In turn, the belief
108 uncertainty is updated after each observation and depends on participants sense of volatility (v) and stochasticity
109 (s) in the environment.

110 Crucially, we also used participants' trial-by-trial confidence ratings to measure to what extent confidence
111 plays a role in learning. This is captured by the confidence scaling factor C , which defines the extent to which
112 confidence affects response (un-)certainty. Intuitively, the higher the confidence scaling factor C , the less
113 important role confidence plays in participant's response. With relatively low values of C , when the confidence is
114 low, participants responses are more noisy, i.e. less certain. We demonstrate this in Fig. 2 by plotting hypothetical
115 responses (A-F) and the effect on the noise scaling (G-L) as a function of C and confidence ratings.




Fig. 2. Confidence scaling factor demonstration. A-F: For a range of values of the confidence scaling factor C , we simulated a set of typical responses a participant would make for various levels of confidence ratings. The belief about the mean of the sequence is set at 50, while the response noise at 10. The confidence scaling factor C effectively scales the response noise, adding or reducing response uncertainty. G-L: The effect of different levels of parameter C on noise scaling. As C increases the effect of confidence is diminished.

116 2.2 Experiment 1: pain perception and prediction

117 In the first experiment we set out to establish whether pain perception is modulated by statistical learning, i.e.
118 whether participants rely on extracted temporal regularities in rating their pain. In particular, following the work
119 by [26], the primary aim of the experiment was to determine whether the expectations participants hold about the
120 sequence inform their perceptual beliefs about the intensity of the stimuli. To that end, we recruited 27 healthy
121 participants to complete a psycho-physical experiment where we delivered four different, 80-trial-long sequences
122 (conditions) of evolving thermal stimuli. On each trial, a 2s thermal stimulus was applied, following which
123 participants were asked to either rate their perception of the intensity (Fig. 1a) or to predict the intensity of the
124 next stimulus in the sequence (Fig. 1b). Participants also reported their response confidence.

125 As a secondary aim, we evaluated how participants perform when we manipulate levels of volatility and
126 stochasticity [31]. The volatility can be conceived of as how quickly (or slowly) the sequence evolves over

127 time. In Kalman-Filter models, this is referred to as the process noise. There are two main families of volatility:
128 within-context volatility (which we explicitly manipulated in Experiment 2) and between-context volatility, i.e.
129 how likely a context, such as a reward rate, is to switch from trial to trial [32]. In Experiment 1, we varied the
130 level of volatility and stochasticity across blocks (i.e. conditions), whilst we fixed their overall level within each
131 block; the level of volatility was defined by the number of trials until the mean intensity level changes. The
132 changes were often subtle and participants were not informed when they happened. Given that volatility was
133 fixed within condition, we treated it as a single-context scenario from the point of view of modelling [32], and
134 we did not interpret its effect on the learning rate [31]. The stochasticity is the additional noise that is added on
135 each trial to the underlying mean, often referred to as the observation noise. In Experiment 1, we set two levels
136 (low/high) of each type of uncertainty, achieving a 2x2 factorial design, with the order of conditions randomised
137 across participants. A set of four example sequences of thermal intensities delivered to one of the participant's
138 can be found in Fig. 1c, alongside their ratings of perception and predictions. Additionally, example confidence
139 ratings for each type of response are plotted in Fig. 1d. We refer the reader to the Methods section for a detailed
140 description of the generative process of the sequences.

141 2.2.1 Model-naive performance

142 Prior to modelling, we first checked whether participant's performance in the task was affected by the sequence
143 condition. As a measure of performance, we calculated the root mean squared error (RMSE) of participants
144 responses (ratings and predictions) compared to the normative noxious input for each condition as in Fig. 3 (see
145 also Methods). The lower the RMSE, the more accurate participants' responses are. Performance in different
146 conditions was analysed with a repeated measures ANOVA, whose results are reported in full in Supplementary
147 Table 1. Although volatility did not affect rating accuracy ($F(1, 26) = 0.96, p = 0.336, \eta_p^2 = 0.036$), we found a
148 2-way interaction between the level of stochasticity of the sequence (low, high) and the type of rating provided
149 (perceived intensity vs. prediction) ($F(1, 26) = 29.842, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.534$). We followed up this interaction
150 in post-hoc comparisons, as reported in Supplementary Table 2. The performance score differences between all
151 the pairs of stochasticity and response type interactions were significant, apart from the perception ratings in the
152 stochastic environment as compared with perception and prediction performance in the low stochastic setting.
153 Intuitively, the RMSE score analysis revealed an overall trend of participants performing worse on the prediction
154 task, in particular when the level of stochasticity is high.




Fig. 3. Participant's model-naive performance in the task. Violin plots of participant Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) for each condition for **A:** rating and **B:** prediction responses as compared with the input.

155 2.2.2 Modelling results

156 To evaluate the effect of expectation on perceived intensity (on top of statistical learning modulating perception),
157 we expanded the standard RL and KF models by adding a perceptual weighting element, $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ (similarly
158 to [26]). Essentially, γ governs how much each participant relies on the normative input on each trial, and how
159 much their expectation of the input influences their reported perception - i.e. they take a weighted average of
160 the two. The higher the γ , the bigger the impact of the expectation on perception. Again, in the case of the
161 Reinforcement Learning model (eRL - expectation weighted RL), γ is a free parameter that is constant across
162 trials, while in the Kalman Filter model (eKF - expectation weighted KF), γ_t is calculated on every trial and
163 depends on: (1) the participants' trial-wise belief uncertainty, (2) their overall estimation of the inherent noise in
164 the environment (stochasticity, s) and (3) the participant's subjective uncertainty about the level of intensity, ϵ .

165 Thus, in total we tested 5 models in Experiment 1: RL and KF (perception not-weighted by expectations), eRL
166 and eKF (perception weighted by expectations), and a baseline random model. We then proceeded to fit these
167 5 computational models to participants' responses. For parameter estimation, we used hierarchical Bayesian
168 methods, where we obtained group- and individual-level estimates for each model parameter (see Methods).

169 **Sequence conditions**

170 We fit each model for each condition sequence. Example trial-by-trial model prediction plots from one participant
171 can be found in Supplementary Fig. 5. To establish which of the models fitted the data best, we ran model
172 comparison analysis based on the difference in expected log point-wise predictive density (ELPD) between
173 models. The models are ranked according to the ELPD (with the largest providing the best fit). The ratio between
174 the ELPD difference and the standard error around it provides a significance test proxy through the sigma effect.
175 In each condition, the expectation weighted models provided significantly better fit than models without this
176 element (Fig. 4a-d), suggesting that regardless of the levels of volatility and stochasticity, participants still
177 weigh perception of the stimuli with their expectation. In particular, we found that the expectation-weighted KF
178 model offered a better fit than the eRL, although in conditions of high stochasticity this difference was short of
179 significance against the eRL model. This suggests that in learning about temporal regularities in the sequences of
180 thermal stimuli, participants' expectations play a significant role in the perception of the stimulus. Moreover, this
181 process was best captured by a model that updates the observer's belief about the mean and the uncertainty of the
182 sequence in a Bayesian manner.




Fig. 4. Model comparison for each sequence condition (A-D). The dots indicate the ELPD difference between the winning model (eKF) every other model. The line indicates the standard error (SE) of the difference. The non-winning models' ELPD differences are annotated with the ratio between the ELPD difference and SE indicating the sigma effect, a significance heuristic.

183 We also found that as the confidence in the response decreases, the response uncertainty is scaled linearly
 184 with a negative slope ranging between 0.112-0.276 across conditions (Fig. 5), confirming the intuition that less
 185 confidence leads to bigger uncertainty.




Fig. 5. (A-D): The effect of the confidence scaling factor on noise scaling for each condition. Each coloured line corresponds to one participant, with the black line indicating the mean across all participants. The mean slope for each condition is annotated.

186 As an additional check, for each participant, condition and response type (perception and prediction),
 187 we plotted participants' ratings against model predicted ratings and calculated a grand mean correlation in
 188 Supplementary Fig. 6.

189 Next, we checked whether the parameters of the the winning eKF model differed across different sequence
190 conditions. There were no differences for the group-level parameters; i.e., we did not detect significant differences
191 between conditions in a hypothetical healthy participant group as generalised from our population of participants.

192 However, we found some differences at the individual-level of parameters (i.e. within our specific population
193 of recruited participants), which we detected by performing repeated-measures ANOVAs (see Supplementary
194 Fig. 9 for visualisation). The stochasticity parameter s was affected by the interaction between the levels of
195 stochasticity and volatility ($F(1, 26) = 35.108, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.575$), and was higher in highly stochastic and
196 volatile conditions as compared to conditions where either volatility ($t = 7.735, p_{bonf} < 0.001$), stochasticity
197 ($t = 9.396, p_{bonf} < 0.001$) or both were low ($t = 8.826, p_{bonf} < 0.001$). This suggests that, while participants'
198 performance was generally worse in highly stochastic environments, participants seem to have attributed this to
199 only one source - stochasticity (s), regardless of the source of higher uncertainty in the sequence (stochasticity or
200 volatility).

201 The response noise ξ was modulated by the level of volatility ($F(1, 26) = 5.079, p = 0.033, \eta_p^2 = 0.163$),
202 where it was smaller in highly volatile conditions. Moreover, we detected a significant interaction between
203 volatility and stochasticity on the confidence scaling factor C ($F(1, 26) = 81.258, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.758$),
204 where the values C were overall lower when either volatility ($t = -11.570, p_{bonf} < 0.001$), stochasticity ($t =$
205 $-6.165, p_{bonf} < 0.001$) or both ($t = -4.575, p_{bonf} < 0.001$) were high as compared to the conditions where
206 both levels of noise were low. This indicates there may have been some trade-off between ξ and C , as lower
207 values of C introduce additional uncertainty when participant's confidence is low.

208 Lastly, we found the initial uncertainty belief w_0 was affected by the interaction between volatility and
209 stochasticity ($F(1, 26) = 5275.367, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.995$) without a consistent pattern, with significant differ-
210 ences between each pair reported in Supplementary Table 17. All the other effects were not significant, and can
211 be found in the Supplementary Tables 10-24.

212 In summary, we formalised the process behind pain perception and prediction in noxious time-series within
213 the framework of sequential learning, where the best description of participants' statistical learning was captured
214 through Bayesian filtering, in particular using a confidence-weighted Kalman Filter model. Most importantly, we
215 discovered that, in addition to weighing their responses with confidence, participants used their expectations
216 about stimulus intensity levels to form a judgement as to what they perceived. This mechanism was present
217 across various levels of uncertainty that defined the sequences (volatility and stochasticity).

218 **2.3 Experiment 2: statistical learning and chronic back pain**

219 Given that statistical learning is involved in endogenously modulating pain perception, we wondered whether the
220 fundamental components of statistical learning are affected in people with chronic pain. Indeed, one of the core
221 mechanisms proposed to explain chronic pain is a dysfunction of the descending pain modulatory system, and
222 this is based on ample neurophysiological and pharmacological evidence [16–21]. However, the computational
223 mechanisms of dysfunctional pain regulation in chronic pain are poorly understood. We hypothesise that there
224 might be a close relationship between statistical learning and the ability to effectively regulate pain endogenously.
225 Disrupted statistical learning could result in dysfunctional endogenous pain regulation, and vice versa, in a vicious
226 loop that leads to pain deregulation (i.e. deregulated pain is more difficult to learn and predict, which makes
227 it harder to control). Importantly, learning the statistics of time-varying sensory inputs is an ubiquitous neural
228 function involved in many tasks across sensory modalities, from the visual to auditory systems, including the
229 pain system. Statistical learning is governed by general computational principles, shared across modalities, and
230 partially shared neurobiological basis [22]. Whereas Experiment 1 focused specifically on statistical learning for
231 pain inputs, Experiment 2 targets fundamental, supramodal aspects of statistical learning which could characterise
232 an individual statistical learning strategy.

233 In collaboration with a group of people with lived experience of chronic pain, we designed an online game
234 where participants made explicit predictions about stochastic and volatile time-series. In the game, participants
235 played the role of a stockbroker predicting how a company's share price fluctuated over a series of days (where
236 each trial represents a day). Participants were informed that the value of their shares was \$100 before the first
237 trial. At the start of each trial participants were asked to predict the value of their shares on that day and rate their
238 confidence in their prediction. Then the actual value of their shares was subsequently revealed. A schematic of
239 a single trial is depicted in Fig. 1e. This was repeated for 200 trials in total. Fig. 1g shows one example of a

240 participant’s share price predictions and confidence ratings over the course of the game. The generative model of
 241 the sequence is detailed in the Methods. The main difference with Experiment 1 was that the level of volatility
 242 and stochasticity of the sequence slowly evolved within each sequence.

243 We compared the performance of people with chronic back pain ($N = 56$) to age-matched healthy controls
 244 ($N = 55$). We chose back pain as condition of interest, because it is the most common chronic pain disorder
 245 [23]; however, there is no reason to think that the findings would not generalise to other chronic pain conditions.
 246 For the chronic pain participant group, we recruited individuals who had experienced pain in their back for a
 247 duration of over 6 months [33]. Chronic pain is associated with emotional comorbidity, particularly anxiety and
 248 depression, and these have been linked with impaired cognitive functions, including statistical learning [34].
 249 Therefore, to reduce confounding factors in the group comparison, we selected controls with low psychological
 250 questionnaire scores for anxiety and depression as well as pain. Participant questionnaire scores are displayed in
 251 the Supplementary Table 25.

252 Before starting the task, participants rated the intensity of pain they were experiencing in their back and their
 253 current level of fatigue out of 10. Unsurprisingly, back pain participants gave significantly higher ratings than
 254 controls for their levels of pain (Bayesian Independent Samples T-Test, $BF_{10} = 3.136 \times 10^{14}$) and fatigue (BF_{10}
 255 $= 3.608 \times 10^8$).

256 Before the computational analysis, we compared how well the back pain participants performed in the game
 257 relative to the controls. Participants’ predictions and confidence ratings are displayed in the Supplementary Fig.
 258 10-13. As a model-naive measure of performance, we calculated the RMSE of participant predictions compared
 259 to the sequence outcomes. Using this measure, we found prediction performance was comparable across groups
 260 (Bayesian Independent Samples T-Test, $BF_{10} = 0.250$).

261 **2.3.1 Computational modelling results**

262 We fit the RL, KF and random models to the participant prediction and confidence rating data, fitting the back
 263 pain and control participant groups separately. We based the model comparison analysis on the difference in
 264 log point-wise predictive density (ELPD) between models, as in Experiment 1, to determine which model best
 265 fit the participant data. Models were ranked according to the ELPD, where greater ELPD indicates a better fit.
 266 For each model, the ELPD difference relative the best fitting model and its standard error are shown in Table 1.
 267 Additionally shown is the sigma effect, the ratio between the ELPD and the standard error, which is a proxy for
 268 significance.

269 For both the pain and control groups (Fig. 6), the model comparison shows the KF and RL models fit the data
 270 significantly better than the random model. The ELPD difference between the KF and RL was not significant,
 271 indicating they provided similar closeness of fit. Additionally we calculated the correlation between participant
 272 predictions and model predictions as a measure of model accuracy. For each group, we found that the RL and KF
 273 mean Pearson correlation coefficients (r) were identical to 2 significant figures. The correlation between model
 274 prediction and participant prediction was greater for the control group (KF: $r = 0.64$, RL: $r = 0.64$) than the back
 275 pain group (KF: $r = 0.56$, RL: $r = 0.56$), see Supplementary Fig. 14. This indicates that the KF and RL models
 276 provided a similar closeness of fit to the data and similar prediction accuracy.

Table 1. Model comparison for the online task sequence. Reinforcement learning (RL), Kalman filter (KF) and random response (Random) models were fitted to the back pain and control groups separately. expected log predictive density (ELPD) difference between the best performing model (lowest LOOIC (leave-one-out cross-validation information criterion)) and each model are displayed, alongside the standard error (SE) of the difference.

Group	Model	ELPD difference	SE difference	Sigma effect	LOOIC
Back Pain	KF	0.000	0.000	—	106,205.063
	RL	-4.419	17.510	0.252	106,213.903
	Random	-1,817.335	93.371	19.464	109,839.732
Controls	RL	0.000	0.000	—	102,315.536
	KF	-1.964	4.535	0.343	102,318.599
	Random	-2904.378	116.794	24.874	108,124.417




Fig. 6. Model comparison for each subject group (top is back pain and bottom is controls). The dots indicate the ELPD (expected log predictive density) difference between the model with the lowest LOOIC (leave-one-out cross-validation information criterion) and each model. The line indicates the standard error (SE) of the difference. The non-winning models' ELPD differences are annotated with the ratio between the ELPD difference and SE indicating the sigma effect, a significance heuristic.

277 2.3.2 Parameter Analysis

278 Next, we compared the RL and KF parameter estimates between the back pain and control groups. The
 279 models were hierarchically parameterised, such that the individual-level parameters were scaled by group-level
 280 parameters. The models were simultaneously fitted to the group and to the individuals to obtain the joint
 281 probability distribution for all parameters. Therefore, we obtained estimates for group-level means as well as
 282 individual estimates, regularised by group level statistics.

283 To determine whether there were any differences at the group parameter level, we compared the 95% highest
 284 density intervals (HDIs) of the posterior distributions across groups. If the HDI of the difference between the back
 285 pain and control group posteriors did not contain 0, we concluded the group-level posteriors were significantly
 286 different. In the RL model, the back pain group-level mean learning rate was significantly lower than the controls
 287 (95% HDI difference (Back pain – Controls) = [-0.281, -0.010]); Fig. 7a.

288 For the individual-level parameters, we performed Bayesian independent samples T-tests to compare back
 289 pain and control groups. For the RL model, the learning rate α parameters were again significantly lower for the
 290 back pain vs. control groups ($BF_{10} = 10.487$); Fig. 7b. This indicates back pain participants learned the statistics
 291 of the sequences more slowly than controls, confirming findings at the group parameter level. Additionally, the
 292 confidence scaling factor C was significantly lower for the back pain vs. control group ($BF_{10} = 806,177.442$);
 293 Fig. 7d. The parameter C modulates how the confidence rating scales the magnitude of the prediction noise,
 294 such that smaller C values increase the magnitude of the confidence scaling term, leading to noisier responses.
 295 Therefore, the lower C estimates of the back pain group indicate they gave noisier responses in the game, more
 296 strongly affected by confidence, compared to controls.

297 For the KF model, stochasticity s estimates were significantly higher for the back pain vs. control group
 298 ($BF_{10} = 27,332.251$; Fig. 8b). This indicates back pain participants estimated the stochasticity of the sequences
 299 to be greater than controls. The initial uncertainty w_0 parameters were significantly higher for back pain vs.
 300 control group ($BF_{10} = 2.438 \times 10^{11}$; Fig. 8d), indicating their initial estimation of noise of the sequences
 301 was higher. The KF confidence scaling factor C was significantly lower for the back pain vs. control group
 302 ($BF_{10} = 1.170 \times 10^6$; Fig. 8f). This reiterates the finding from the RL model parameter comparison - that the
 303 chronic pain vs. control groups provided noisier responses, more strongly influenced by confidence.

304 Additionally, the mean Kalman gain $\bar{\alpha}_t$ over the whole game was calculated for each participant. The $\bar{\alpha}_t$
 305 values were highly correlated with the RL learning rate α (Bayesian Pearson Correlation, Pearson's $r = 0.975$,
 306 $BF_{10} = 1.182 \times 10^{69}$). As with α , $\bar{\alpha}_t$ values were significantly lower in back pain participants than controls
 307 ($BF_{10} = 10.977$; Fig. 8g). Therefore, the KF results also indicate back pain participants displayed slower learning
 308 of the statistics of the game sequences.

309 In summary, for both the control and back pain groups, the RL and KF models fit the participant data

Table 2. Bayesian Independent Samples T-Test comparing the fitted parameters of the back pain group and control group. Reinforcement learning (RL) model individual level parameters: learning rate (α), prediction noise (ξ), initial estimate (E_0), confidence scaling factor (C). Kalman filter (KF) model individual level parameters: volatility (v), stochasticity (s), prediction noise (ξ), initial estimate uncertainty (w_0), initial estimate (E_0), confidence scaling factor (C), mean Kalman filter learning rate over the 200 trials, ($\bar{\alpha}_t$).

Model	Parameter	BF ₁₀	Error %
RL	α	10.487*	< 0.001
	ξ	0.202	0.030
	E_0	0.493	0.020
	C	806,177.442*	< 0.001
KF	v	3.721	0.007
	s	27,332.251*	< 0.001
	ξ	0.202	0.030
	w_0	2.438 × 10¹¹*	< 0.001
	E_0	0.456	0.021
	C	1.170 × 10⁶ *	< 0.001
	$\bar{\alpha}_t$	10.977*	< 0.001




Fig. 7. Fitted parameter distributions of the reinforcement learning (RL) model. Density plots for (A) group-level mean learning rate, α , posterior, and (C) group-level mean confidence scaling factor, C , posterior. Back pain and control group posteriors are superimposed. Horizontal bar indicates separation between peaks of the distributions. Star indicates a significant difference between posteriors, i.e. the 95% highest density intervals (HDIs) of the distributions do not overlap. Raincloud plots of individual-level parameter estimates for (B) α and (D) C . Black points represent individual parameter estimates for each participant.




Fig. 8. Fitted parameter distributions of the Kalman filter (KF) model. Density plots of group-level mean parameter posteriors for (A) stochasticity s , and (C) confidence scaling factor C . Back pain and control group posteriors are superimposed. Raincloud plots of individual-level parameter estimates for (B) stochasticity s , (D) confidence scaling factor C , (E) initial uncertainty w_0 . (F) Raincloud plot of the mean Kalman filter learning rate over the 200 trials, α_t . Black points represent individual values for each participant.

310 significantly better than the random baseline, although there was no significant difference in the closeness of fit
311 between the RL and KF models. Comparison of model parameter estimates between groups revealed significant
312 group differences. RL learning rate α parameters and KF average Kalman gain $\bar{\alpha}_t$ values were significantly
313 lower for the back pain participants vs. controls, indicating back pain participants learned the statistics of the
314 sequence more slowly than controls.

315 At the level of individual parameters, confidence scaling factor C estimates for both the RL and KF models
316 were lower for back pain participants than controls, suggesting that back pain participants provided more uncertain
317 predictions which were more strongly affected by confidence. KF initial uncertainty w_0 and stochasticity s
318 estimates were higher for the back pain group, indicating back pain participants had greater initial uncertainty
319 and perceived greater stochasticity in the sequence.

320 **3 DISCUSSION**

321 Statistical learning allows the brain to extract regularities from streams of sensory inputs and is central to
322 perception and cognitive function. Despite its fundamental role, it has often been overlooked in the field of
323 pain research. Yet, chronic pain appears to fluctuate over time, in ways that are non-random. For instance,
324 [35–37] reported that chronic back pain ratings vary periodically, over several seconds-minutes and in absence of
325 movements. This temporal aspect of pain is important because periodic temporal structures are easy to learn for
326 the brain [1, 8]. If the temporal evolution of pain is learned, it can be used by the brain to regulate its responses
327 to forthcoming pain, effectively shaping how much pain it experiences. Indeed, Experiment 1 shows that healthy
328 participants extract temporal regularities from sequences of noxious stimuli and use this probabilistic knowledge
329 to form confidence-weighted judgements and predictions about the level of pain intensity they experience in the
330 sequence. We formalised our results within a Bayesian inference framework, where the belief about the level of
331 pain intensity is updated on each trial according to the the amount of uncertainty participants ascribe to the stimuli
332 and the environment. Importantly, their perception and prediction of pain were influenced by the expected level
333 of intensity that participants held about the sequence before responding. This phenomenon remained unchanged
334 when we varied different levels of inherent uncertainty in the sequences of stimuli (stochasticity and volatility).

335 Using a similar theoretical approach, Experiment 2 shows that statistical learning for noisy and volatile
336 sequences of fluctuating values is slower in adults with chronic back pain than age-matched controls. This is
337 important because sub-optimal learning to predict information about the value of events in the context of pain
338 could affect the ability of the nervous system to endogenous regulate its responses to forthcoming negative states,
339 such as pain. This finding opens a new path of research, to determine whether maladaptive statistical learning
340 increase both the risk and severity of chronic pain conditions.

341 **3.1 Statistical inference and learning in pain sequences**

342 The first main contribution of our work is towards the understanding of the phenomenon of statistical learning in
343 the context of pain. Statistical learning is an important function that the brain employs across the lifespan, with
344 relevance to perception, cognition and learning [6]. The large majority of past research on statistical learning
345 focused on visual and auditory perception [1, 3, 4, 38], with the nociceptive system receiving relatively little
346 attention [39]. Recently, we showed that the human brain can learn to predict a sequence of two pain levels (low
347 and high) in a manner consistent with optimal Bayesian inference, by engaging sensorimotor regions, parietal,
348 premotor regions and dorsal striatum [8]. We also found that the confidence of these probabilistic inferences
349 modulates the cortical response to pain, as expected by hierarchical Bayesian inference theory [9]. Here we
350 tested sequences with a much larger range of stimulus intensities to elucidate the effect of statistical learning and
351 expectations on pain perception. As predicted by hierarchical Bayesian inference theory, we find that the pain
352 intensity judgements are scaled by both probabilistic expectations and confidence.

353 Hence, our work highlights the inferential nature of the nociceptive system [26, 39–42], where in addition to
354 the sheer input received by the nociceptors, there is a wealth of a priori knowledge and beliefs the agent holds
355 about themselves and the environment that need to be integrated to form a judgement about pain [43–46]. This
356 has an immediate significance for the real world, where weights need to be assigned to prior beliefs and/or stimuli
357 to successfully protect the organism from further damage, but only to an extent to which it is beneficial.

358 Secondly, our results regarding the effect of expectation on pain perception relate to a much larger literature

359 on this topic. The prime example would be placebo analgesia (i.e. the expectation of pain relief decreasing pain
360 perception) and nocebo hyperalgesia (i.e. the expectation of high level of pain increasing its perception; [10, 42,
361 47, 48]). Recent work attempted to capture such expectancy effects within the Bayesian inference framework.
362 For example, [28] showed that in addition to expectation influencing perceived pain in general, higher level of
363 uncertainty around that expectation attenuated its effect on perception. Similarly, [49] demonstrated that when
364 the discrepancy between the expectation and outcome (prediction error) is unusually large, the role of expectation
365 is significantly reduced and so the placebo and nocebo effects are not that strong. An unusually large prediction
366 error could be thought of as contributing to increased uncertainty about the stimuli, which mirrors the results
367 from [28] Bayesian framework. Nevertheless, the types of stimuli used in the above studies (i.e. noxious stimuli
368 cued by non-noxious stimuli) differed from the more ecologically valid sequences of pain that are reported by
369 chronic pain patients [35], as we indicated above. Furthermore, [26] used a conditioning paradigm and also
370 found that expectations influence both perception and learning, in a self-reinforcing loop. Our work has followed
371 a similar modelling strategy to [26], but it goes beyond simple conditioning schedules or sequences of two-level
372 discrete painful stimuli, showing expectancy effects even when the intensities are allowed to vary across a wider
373 range of values and according to more complex statistical temporal structures. Additionally, given the reported
374 role of confidence in perception of pain [9, 50], we draw a more complete picture by including participants
375 confidence ratings in our modelling analysis.

376 **3.2 Statistical inference in the context of chronic back pain**

377 Statistical learning is known to be mediated by both modality-specific and supramodal mechanisms [22].
378 Although the former can only be probed using paradigms that involve the presentation of noxious stimuli,
379 the most fundamental, supramodal components of statistical learning can be investigated using more abstract
380 sequence learning tasks, such as that used in Experiment 2. We designed volatile and noisy sequences of share
381 values, which would yield gains and losses on each trial. This is an abstraction from the dynamic time-series of
382 pain states that patients experience, which fluctuate between states of relief (i.e. gains) and flares (i.e. losses,
383 from the point of view of their value).

384 The results from Experiment 2 indicate that statistical learning in people with chronic pain is significantly
385 altered. By fitting computational models to the online prediction game data of participants and comparing RL
386 and KF parameter estimates of the back pain participants vs controls, we found the following key differences.
387 Firstly, back pain participants learned the statistics of the time-series more slowly than controls - the difference
388 was significant at both individual and group-parameters levels in both the RL and KF models. Secondly, the
389 estimation of the initial uncertainty and stochasticity of the sequence in the KF model appeared to be greater
390 in chronic back pain participants than controls, although only at the level of individual parameters. It is likely
391 that the greater noise in the estimates of the back pain group underlies their lower learning rates. The greater
392 the random noise (stochasticity) of a sequence, the less informative each observation is about the true value
393 relative to the long term mean. For optimal learning, as the stochasticity of a sequence increases, the slower
394 expectations are updated, hence the lower the learning rate. Finally, the predictions of back pain participants
395 were more strongly affected by confidence, resulting in noisier responses.

396 Future studies would need to determine whether these general features of statistical learning extend to the
397 perception and anticipation of noxious time-series. Our findings predict slower learning of the statistics of
398 fluctuating pain signals, greater perceived stochasticity, and greater uncertainty in the prediction of future pain.
399 Experiment 1 shows that statistical learning is implicated in the endogenous regulation of pain. Therefore, it
400 could, in principle, influence how a pain state evolves. Once a pain state is initiated, how an individual learns and
401 anticipates the fluctuating pain signals may contribute to determine how well it can be regulated by the nervous
402 system, thus affecting the severity and recurrence of pain flares. This, in turn, would affect whether aversive
403 associations with the instigating stimulus are extinguished or reinforced [41]. In chronic pain, dysfunctional
404 learning may promote the amplification and maintenance of pain signals, contributing to the reinforcement of
405 aversive associations with incident stimuli, as well as the persistence of pain [51–53].

406 The present finding of slower statistical learning in chronic back pain is a first step in the direction of both
407 quantifying and understanding learning in the context of chronic pain. The idea that maladaptive learning
408 is causally implicated in chronic pain is not new, being rooted in cognitive accounts of pain [53–55] and
409 neuroimaging evidence of alterations in brain networks involved in value-based learning [36, 56–61]. However,

410 very few studies have actually quantified learning in the context of chronic pain and no study, to the best of
411 our knowledge, has directly investigated whether learning is causally implicated in the development of chronic
412 pain. Our paper comes with open tools, which can be adapted in future studies on statistical learning in chronic
413 pain. Online tasks can be easily used at scale. The key advantage of taking an hypothesis-driven, computational-
414 neuroscience approach to quantify learning is that it allows to go beyond symptoms-mapping, identifying the
415 quantifiable computational principles that mediate the link between symptoms and neural function.

416 **3.3 Conclusions**

417 Statistical expectations and confidence scale the judgement of pain in sequences of noxious inputs, as predicted
418 by hierarchical Bayesian inference theory. More generally, the statistical learning of noisy and volatile sequences
419 of fluctuating values is slower in adults with chronic back pain, possibly because they perceive the environment
420 as being more stochastic than what it truly is. This work makes clear predictions to test in future pre-clinical
421 studies, namely that impaired statistical learning is associated with maladaptive endogenous pain regulation.
422 Therefore, this study opens a new avenue of research on the role of learning in chronic pain.

423 **4 METHODS**

424 **4.1 Participants**

425 In Experiment 1, 33 (18 female) healthy adult participants were recruited for the experiment. The mean age of
426 participants was 22.4 ± 2.7 years old (range: 18-35). Participants had no chronic condition and no infectious
427 illnesses, as well as no skin conditions (e.g. eczema) at the site of stimulus delivery. Moreover, we only recruited
428 participants that had not taken any anti-anxiety, anti-depressive medication, nor any illicit substances, alcohol and
429 pain medication (including NSAIDs such as ibuprofen and paracetamol) in the 24 hours prior to the experiment.

430 In Experiment 2, 724 participants were recruited online using Prolific [62]. All participants gave written
431 informed consent in accordance with procedures approved by the Department of Engineering, University of
432 Cambridge ethics committee, before beginning the screening process. Participants completed a preliminary
433 screening survey consisting of a general health questionnaire, the Keele STarT Back Screening Tool, and
434 psychological questionnaires (the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), the Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale
435 (PASS-20), the Depression Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9), and the Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS)).
436 63 chronic pain participants and 70 controls met the eligibility criteria for the respective participant groups
437 and were invited to take part in the study. 55 healthy control participants (34 female; mean age 34.5 years old;
438 age range 20-75 years) and 56 participants with chronic back pain (38 female; mean age 32.7 years old; age
439 range 22-63 years) completed the estimation task and their data was used in the analysis. Exclusion criteria
440 included neurological and psychiatric illness and failure to pass the attention check. Selected chronic back pain
441 participants reported experiencing persistent pain in their back for a duration of over 6 months and were classified
442 as high-risk for chronic back pain by the STarT tool (STarT score > 4) [63]. Selected healthy controls reported
443 no persisting pain in the general health questionnaire and were classified at low risk for back pain by the STarT
444 tool (scoring 3 or below [63]). Control participants were also selected to have no clinical symptoms of anxiety
445 (STAI score < 41) [64] or depression (PHQ-9 score < 10) [65], to simplify the comparison between the control
446 and chronic pain groups and reduce confounding factors.

447 All participants gave informed written consent to take part in the study, which was approved by the local
448 ethics committee.

449 **4.2 Protocol of Experiment 1**

450 The experimental room's temperature was maintained between 20°C to 23°C. Upon entry, an infrared thermometer
451 was used to ensure participants temperature was above 36°C at the forehead and forearm of the non-dominant
452 hand, to account for the known effects of temperature on pain perception [66]. A series of slideshows were
453 presented, which explained the premise of the experiment and demonstrated what the participant would be asked
454 to carry out. Throughout this presentation, questions were asked to ensure participants understood the task.
455 Participants were given multiple opportunities to ask questions throughout the presentation.

456 We used the Medoc Advanced Thermosensory Stimulator 2 (TSA2) [67] to deliver thermal stimuli using the
457 CHEPS thermode. The CHEPS thermode allowed for rapid cooling (40°C / sec) and heating (70°C / sec) so

458 transitions between the baseline and stimuli temperatures were minimal. The TSA2 was controlled externally,
459 via Matlab (Mathworks).

460 We then established the pain threshold, using the method of limits [68], in order to centre the range of
461 temperature intensities used in the experiment. Each participant was provided with stimuli of increasing
462 temperature, starting from 40°C going up in 0.5°C increments, using an inter-stimulus interval (ISI) of 2.5 sec
463 and a 2 sec duration. The participant was asked to indicate when the stimuli went from warm to painful - this
464 temperature was noted and the stimuli ended. The procedure was repeated three times, and the average was used
465 as an estimate of the pain threshold.

466 During the experiment, four sequences of thermal stimuli were delivered. Due to the phenomenon of offset
467 analgesia (OA), where decreases in tonic pain result in a proportionally larger decrease in perceived pain [69], we
468 chose phasic stimuli, with a duration of 2 sec and an inter-stimulus-interval (ISI) 2.5 seconds. In order to account
469 for individual differences, the temperatures which the levels refer to are based upon the participants threshold.
470 The median intensity level was defined as threshold, giving a max temperature of 3°C above threshold, which
471 was found to be acceptable by participants. Before the start of the experiment each participant was provided with
472 the highest temperature stimuli that could be presented, given their measured threshold, to ensure they were
473 comfortable with this. Two participants found the stimulus too painful - the temperature range was lowered by
474 1°C and this was found to be acceptable.

475 After every trial of each sequence, the participant was asked for either their perception of the previous
476 stimulus, or their prediction for the next stimulus through a 2D VAS (Fig. 1b), presented using PsychToolBox-3
477 [70]. The y-axis encodes the intensity of the stimulus either perceived or predicted, ranging from 0 (no heat
478 detected/predicted) to 100 (worst pain imaginable perceived/predicted); on this scale, 50 represents pain threshold.
479 This was done as a given sequence was centred around the threshold. The x-axis encodes confidence in either
480 perception or prediction, ranging from 0 - completely uncertain ('unsure') - to 1 - complete confidence in the
481 rating ('sure'). Differing background colours were chosen to ensure participants were aware of what was being
482 asked, and throughout the experiment participants were reminded to take care in answering the right question.
483 The mouse movement was limited to be inside of the coloured box, which defined the area of participants' input.
484 At the beginning of each input screen, the mouse location was uniformly randomised within the input box.

485 The sequence of response types was randomised so as to retain 40 prediction and 40 perception ratings for
486 each of the four sequence conditions. For an 80-trial long sequence, this gave 80 participant responses. Each
487 sequence condition was separated by a 5 minute break, during which the thermode's probe was slightly moved
488 around the area of skin on the forearm to reduce sensitisation (i.e. a gradual increase in perceived intensity with
489 repetitive noxious stimuli) [71]. In the middle of each sequence, there was a 3 minute break. During the ISI,
490 the temperature returned to a base-line of 38°C. One participant was unable to complete the sequence as their
491 threshold was too low, and data from four participants was lost due to Medoc software issues (the remote control
492 failed and the data of 2 out of 4 sessions were not saved). We excluded one participant's whose ratings/predictions
493 were inversely proportional to the noxious input. Thus, we analysed data from 27 participants.

494 **4.2.1 Generative process of the painful sequences**

495 We manipulated two sources of uncertainty in the sequence: the stochasticity (s) of the observation and the
496 volatility (v) of the underlying sequence. Sequences were defined by two levels (high or low) of stochasticity and
497 volatility, resulting in four different sequences conditions - creating a 2x2 factorial design. Each sequence was
498 defined as a series of chunks, where the intensity for trial t , i_t was sampled from $\mathcal{N}(I, \sigma^2)$, where σ^2 indicates
499 the level of stochasticity ($\sigma^2 = 1.75$ for high level of stochasticity, $\sigma^2 = 0.25$ for low level of stochasticity). The
500 mean of the chunk, I , was drawn from $\mathcal{U}(3.5, 10.5)$. To ensure a noticeable difference in chunk intensity to the
501 participant, concurrent chunk means were constrained to be at least 2 intensity levels different. Volatility was
502 implemented by defining the length, or number of trials, of a chunk (l) drawn from $\mathcal{U}(L - a, L + a)$, where L is
503 the mean of the chunk length ($L = 15$ for high volatility level, $L = 25$ for low volatility level). A jitter, a , was
504 added around the mean to ensure the transition from one chunk to the next was not consistent or predictable. For
505 both high and low volatility conditions we set $a = 3$. Sampled values were then discretised, where any intensities
506 outside the valid intensity range [1, 13] were discarded and re-sampled resulting in an 80-trial long sequence for
507 each condition. The mean of each sequence was centred around intensity level 7, i.e. the participants threshold.
508 So defined, six sets of four sequences were sampled. Each participant received one set, with a randomised

509 sequence order. See an example sequence (after subject-specific linear transformation) and one participant's
510 responses (including confidence ratings) in Fig. 1c-d.

511 4.3 Protocol of Experiment 2

512 After the preliminary screening, selected participants were invited through the Prolific platform to play an
513 online game. Before being directed to the task, participants were asked to rate the intensity of pain they were
514 experiencing in their back and their current level of fatigue out of 10. The instructions preceding the game
515 explained that participants were to play the role of a stockbroker predicting how a company's share price fluctuate
516 over time. Participants were informed the initial value of their shares was \$100 and this value would change
517 over a number of days – where each trial represents a day. At the start of each trial, the participant was asked to
518 predict the value of their shares on that day and rate their confidence in their prediction. After submitting their
519 response, the actual outcome was revealed, alongside an accuracy score. The participant was then asked to make
520 a prediction for the next day. The entire task was 200 trials in length, and participants had fixed 10 sec breaks
521 every 25 trials.

522 For each participant, the sequence of time-varying share prices used in the task was randomly drawn from
523 a set of 20 sequences. The sequences were designed to display variable stochasticity and volatility within a
524 single sequence to test how participants' learning strategy adapted to changing conditions. The sequences were
525 generated using the following generative model.

526 4.3.1 Generative Process of Online Task Sequences

527 For each trial t , the volatility v'_t and stochasticity s'_t evolve according to a random walk.

$$\begin{aligned} v'_t &= v'_{t-1} + \alpha^v(\mu^v - v_{t-1}) + \eta_t^v & \eta_t^v &\sim \mathcal{L}(v^v, \lambda^v) \\ s'_t &= s'_{t-1} + \alpha^s(\mu^s - s_{t-1}) + \eta_t^s & \eta_t^s &\sim \mathcal{L}(v^s, \lambda^s) \end{aligned}$$

528 $\mathcal{L}(v, \lambda)$ represents a Laplace distribution with location, v , and scale, λ . The fixed parameters η_n^v, η_n^s
529 determine the corresponding variances of the step size. The terms with decay rates α^v, α^s and process means $\mu^v,$
530 μ^s add stationarity.

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= x_{t-1} + \alpha^x(\mu^x - x_{t-1}) + \eta_t^x & \eta_t^x &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, v_t) \\ y_t &= x_t + \eta_t^y & \eta_t^y &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, s_t) \end{aligned}$$

531 The underlying mean x_t evolves similarly, with decay rate α^x , process mean μ^x , and step size η_t^x with
532 variance equal to the constrained volatility $v_t = \exp(v'_t)$. The sequence outcome (share price) was generated from
533 the underlying mean with added Gaussian noise with variance equal to the constrained stochasticity $s_t = \exp(s'_t)$.

534 The free parameters $\mu_t^v, \mu_t^s, \lambda^v, \lambda^s, \alpha^v,$ and α^s were adjusted to produce sequences that demonstrated
535 noticeable variation in levels of stochasticity and volatility ($\mu_t^v, \mu_t^s = 2.708, \lambda^v, \lambda^s = 0.0245,$ and $\alpha^v, \alpha^s = 0.075$).
536 Additionally, they were checked for significant variation in autocorrelation – reflecting sufficient change in
537 volatility.

538 4.4 Data pre-processing

539 4.4.1 Experiment 1

540 Since the intensity values of the noxious input were discretised between 1 and 13, while the participant's
541 responses (perception and prediction) were given on a 0-100 scale, we applied a linear transformation of the
542 input to map its values onto a common 0-100 range. For each participant, for a set of inputs at perception
543 trials from the concatenated sequence (separate sequence conditions in the order as presented), we fit a linear
544 least-squares regression using Python's `scipy.stats.linregress` function. On the rare occasions,
545 when the transformed input was negative, we refit the line using Python's non-linear least squares function

546 `scipy.optimize.curve_fit`, constraining the intercept above 0 [72]. See the transformations in Supple-
 547 mentary Fig. 1. We then extracted each participant’s optimised slope and intercept and applied the transformation
 548 both to the concatenated and condition-specific sequence of inputs. So transformed, the sequences were then
 549 used in all the analyses.

550 To capture participant’s model-naive performance in the task, both for the concatenated and condition-specific
 551 sequence, we calculated Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) of each participant’s perception (Eq. 1) and pre-
 552 diction (Eq. 2) responses as compared to the input. The lower the RMSE, the higher the response accuracy.

$$553 \quad RMSE_P = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T_P} (y_t - \hat{P}_t)^2}{T_P}} \quad (\text{Eq. 1}) \quad RMSE_E = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T_E} (y_{t+1} - \hat{E}_{t+1})^2}{T_E}} \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

554 where T_P is the number of perception trials, \hat{P}_t is participant’s perception response to the stimulus y_t at trial t ,
 555 T_E is the number of prediction trials and \hat{E}_{t+1} is participant’s prediction of the next stimulus intensity y_{t+1} at at
 556 trial $t + 1$.

557 4.4.2 Experiment 2

558 For the online task, participant predictions were visually inspected to ensure the game was played properly. Five
 559 participants were excluded at this stage. One participant was excluded because the predictions were negatively
 560 correlated with the sequence outcomes, and four participants were excluded because they repeatedly entered the
 561 same response for large chunks of the game (≥ 30 trials) which indicated they did not properly engage with the
 562 game. Participants’ predictions were processed to remove typing errors (0.009% of trials). Mistakes in typing
 563 that resulted in predictions far outside the range of the sequence outcomes (predictions > 250) were replaced
 564 with the average of the previous trial and following trial. Additionally, confidence ratings were re-scaled from a
 565 0-5 scale to a 0-1 scale.

566 4.5 Models

567 4.5.1 Reinforcement Learning

568 RL

569 In reinforcement learning models, learning is driven by discrepancies between the estimate of the expected value
 570 and observed values. Before any learning begins, at trial $t = 1$, participants have an initial expectation, $E_1 = E_0$,
 571 which is a free parameter that we estimate.

In experiment 1, on each trial, participants receive a thermal input N_t . We then calculate the prediction error δ_t , defined as the difference between the expectation E_t and the input N_t (Eq. 3).

$$\delta_t = N_t - E_t \quad (\text{Eq. 3})$$

Participant is then assumed to update their expectation of the stimulus on the next trial as in Eq. 4

$$E_{t+1} = E_t + \alpha \delta_t \quad (\text{Eq. 4})$$

572 where α is the learning rate (free parameter), which governs how fast participants assimilate new information to
 573 update their belief.

On trials when participants rate their perceived intensity, we assume no effects on their perception other than confidence rating c_t and response noise, so participants perception response \hat{P}_t is drawn from a Gaussian distribution, with the mean $P_t = N_t$ and a confidence-scaled response noise ξ (free parameter), as in Eq. 5

$$\hat{P}_t \sim \mathcal{N}\left(P_t, \xi^2 \exp\{C^{-1}(1 - c_t)\}^2\right) \quad (\text{Eq. 5})$$

574 where C is the confidence scaling factor (free parameter), which defines the extent to which confidence affects
 575 response uncertainty. Please, see Fig. 2 for an intuition behind confidence scaling.

On trials when participants are asked to predict the intensity of the next thermal stimulus, we use the updated expectation E_{t+1} to model participants prediction response \hat{E}_{t+1} . This is similarly affected by confidence rating

and response noise and is defined as in Eq. 6.

$$\hat{E}_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(E_{t+1}, \xi^2 \exp\{C^{-1}(1 - c_t)\}^2\right) \quad (\text{Eq. 6})$$

Analogously, in Experiment 2, whereby participants guess the value of the stock market, their response \hat{E}_t is given based on their expectation E_t and confidence rating, and is drawn from a Gaussian distribution with the mean E_t and a confidence-scaled response noise, as in Eq. 7.

$$\hat{E}_t \sim \mathcal{N}\left(E_t, \xi^2 \exp\{C^{-1}(1 - c_t)\}^2\right) \quad (\text{Eq. 7})$$

After the true value of the stock market O_t is revealed on each trial, we calculate the prediction error δ_t , defined as the difference between the expectation E_t and the subsequently observed outcome O_t (Eq. 8).

$$\delta_t = O_t - E_t \quad (\text{Eq. 8})$$

576 The prediction error is then used to update the expectation of the stock market value for the next trial, as in Eq. 4.

577 To recap, the RL model has 4 free parameters: the learning rate α , response noise ξ , the initial expectation
578 E_0 , and the confidence scaling factor C .

eRL

Additionally, in Experiment 1, where we investigate the effects of expectation on the perception of pain [26], we included an element that allows us express the perception as a weighted sum of the input and expectation (Eq. 9)

$$P_t = (1 - \gamma)N_t + \gamma E_t \quad (\text{Eq. 9})$$

579 where $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ (free parameter) captures how much participants rely on the normative thermal input vs. their
580 expectation. When $\gamma = 0$, the expectation plays no role and the model simplifies to that of the standard RL above.
581 All the other equations are the same, and in total eRL has 5 free parameters.

582 4.5.2 Kalman Filter

KF

To capture sequential learning in a Bayesian manner, we used the Kalman filter model [26, 27, 29]. KF assumes a generative model of the environment where the latent state on trial t , x_t (the mean of the sequences in our experiments), evolves according to a Gaussian random walk with a fixed drift rate, ν (volatility), as in Eq. 10.

$$x_t \sim \mathcal{N}(x_{t-1}, \nu^2) \quad (\text{Eq. 10})$$

The observation on trial t , N_t (for experiment 1) or O_t (for experiment 2), is then drawn from a Gaussian (Eq. 11) with a fixed variance, which represents the observation uncertainty s (stochasticity).

$$O_t \sim \mathcal{N}(x_t, s^2) \quad (\text{Eq. 11})$$

583 As such the KF assumes stable dynamics since the generative process has fixed volatility and stochasticity.

584 For ease of explanation, we refer to the thermal input and observed stock market value at each trial as O_t ,
585 we also use the $O_{1:t}$ notation, which refers to a sequence of observations up to and including trial t . The model
586 allows to obtain posterior beliefs about the latent state x_t given the observations. This is done by tracking an
587 internal estimate of the mean m_t and the uncertainty, w_t , of the latent state x_t .

First, following standard KF results, on each trial, the participant is assumed to hold a prior belief (indicated with $(-)$ superscript) about the latent state, x_t (Eq. 12).

$$x_t | O_{1:t-1} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(m_t^{(-)}, w_t^{2(-)}\right) \quad (\text{Eq. 12})$$

588 On the first trial, before any observations, we set $m_1^{(-)} = E^0, w_1^{(-)} = w_0$ (free parameters). In light of the new
589 observation, O_t on trial t , the tracked mean and uncertainty of the latent state are reweighed based on the new
590 evidence O_t and its associated observation uncertainty s as in Eq. 13.

$$x_t | O_{1:t} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\frac{s^2 m_t^{(-)} + w_t^{2(-)} O_t}{s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}}, \frac{s^2 w_t^{2(-)}}{s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}} \right) \quad (\text{Eq. 13})$$

We can then define the learning rate α_t (Eq. 14),

$$\alpha_t = \frac{w_t^{2(-)}}{s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}} \quad (\text{Eq. 14})$$

591 to get the update rule for the new posterior beliefs (indicated with ⁽⁺⁾ superscript) about the mean (Eq. 15) and
592 uncertainty (Eq. 16) of x_t .

$$593 \quad m_t^{(+)} = m_t^{(-)}(1 - \alpha_t) + O_t \alpha_t \quad (\text{Eq. 15}) \quad w_t^{2(+)} = w_t^{2(-)}(1 - \alpha_t) \quad (\text{Eq. 16})$$

Following this new belief, and the assumption about the environmental dynamics (volatility), the participant forms a new prior belief about the latent state x_{t+1} for the next trial $t + 1$ as in Eq. 17.

$$x_{t+1} | O_{1:t} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(m_{t+1}^{(-)}, w_{t+1}^{2(-)} \right) \quad (\text{Eq. 17})$$

595 where

$$596 \quad m_{t+1}^{(-)} = m_t^{(+)} \quad (\text{Eq. 18}) \quad w_{t+1}^{2(-)} = w_t^{2(+)} + v^2 \quad (\text{Eq. 19})$$

597 We can simplify the notation to make it comparable to the RL models. We let, $m_{t+1} = m_t^{(+)} = m_{t+1}^{(-)}$, and
598 $w_{t+1}^2 = w_{t+1}^{2(-)} = w_t^{2(+)} + v^2$. Following a new observation at trial t , we calculate the prediction error (Eq. 20)
599 and learning rate (Eq. 21).
600

$$601 \quad \delta_t = y_t - m_t \quad (\text{Eq. 20}) \quad \alpha_t = \frac{w_t^2}{w_t^2 + s^2} \quad (\text{Eq. 21})$$

602 we then update the belief about the mean (Eq. 22) and uncertainty (Eq. 23) of the latent state for the next trial.

$$m_{t+1} = m_t(1 - \alpha_t) + O_t \alpha_t \quad (\text{Eq. 22}) \quad w_{t+1}^2 = w_t^2(1 - \alpha_t) + v^2 \quad (\text{Eq. 23})$$

Now, mapping this onto the experiments, the mean of the latent state is participants expectation $E_t = m_t$, and so for Experiment 1 we have participant perception rating modelled as in Eq. 24.

$$\hat{P}_t \sim \mathcal{N} \left(P_t, \xi^2 \exp \{ C^{-1} (1 - c_t) \}^2 \right) \quad (\text{Eq. 24})$$

and the prediction rating for the next trial as in Eq. 25.

$$\hat{E}_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(E_{t+1}, \xi^2 \exp \{ C^{-1} (1 - c_t) \}^2 \right) \quad (\text{Eq. 25})$$

Analogously, in Experiment 2, participants' guess is defined as in Eq. 26.

$$\hat{E}_t \sim \mathcal{N} \left(E_t, \xi^2 \exp \{ C^{-1} (1 - c_t) \}^2 \right) \quad (\text{Eq. 26})$$

603 In total the model has 6 free parameters: s (environmental stochasticity), v (environmental volatility), ξ
604 (response noise), E_0 (initial belief about the mean), w_0 (initial belief about the uncertainty) and C (confidence
605 scaling factor).

eKF - expectation weighted Kalman Filter

Lastly, for Experiment 1, we can introduce the effect of expectation on the pain perception, by assuming that participants treat the thermal input as an imperfect indicator of the true level of pain [26]. In this case, the input, N_t , is modelled as in Eq. 27

$$N_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\pi_t, \varepsilon^2) \quad (\text{Eq. 27})$$

which forms an expression for the likelihood of the observation and adds an additional level to the inference, slightly modifying the Kalman filter assumptions such that:

$$\pi_t \sim \mathcal{N}(m_t^{(-)}, s^2) \quad (\text{Eq. 28})$$

However, we can apply the standard KF results and Bayes' rule to arrive at simple update rules for the participants' belief about the mean and uncertainty of the latent state x_t . From this, we get a prior on the π_t defined in Eq. 29

$$\pi_t | N_{1:t-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(m_t^{(-)}, w_t^{2(-)} + s^2) \quad (\text{Eq. 29})$$

which, following a new input N_t , gives us the posterior belief about π_t as in Eq. 30.

$$\pi_t | N_{1:t} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2 m_t^{(-)} + (s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}) N_t}{\varepsilon^2 + s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}}, \frac{\varepsilon^2 (s^2 + w_t^{2(-)})}{\varepsilon^2 + s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}}\right) \quad (\text{Eq. 30})$$

Now, if we define γ_t as in Eq. 31

$$\gamma_t = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon^2 + s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}} \quad (\text{Eq. 31})$$

we have that the posterior belief about the mean level of pain π_t is calculated as:

$$P_t^{(+)} = \gamma_t m_t^{(-)} + (1 - \gamma_t) N_t \quad (\text{Eq. 32})$$

which is a weighted sum of the input N_t and participant expectation about the latent state x_t , governed by the perceptual weight γ_t , analogously to the eRL model. Finally, the posterior belief about x_t is obtained in Eq.

$$x_t | O_{1:t} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{(\varepsilon^2 + s^2) m_t^{(-)} + w_t^{2(-)} N_t}{\varepsilon^2 + s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}}, \frac{(\varepsilon^2 + s^2) w_t^{2(-)}}{\varepsilon^2 + s^2 + w_t^{2(-)}}\right) \quad (\text{Eq. 33})$$

Now, setting the learning rate as in Eq. 34

$$\alpha_t = \frac{w_t^2}{\varepsilon^2 + w_t^2 + s^2} \quad (\text{Eq. 34})$$

606 we get:

$$607 \quad m_t^{(+)} = m_t^{(-)}(1 - \alpha_t) + O_t \alpha_t \quad (\text{Eq. 35})$$

$$608 \quad w_t^{2(+)} = w_t^{2(-)}(1 - \alpha_t) \quad (\text{Eq. 36})$$

609
610 Next, following the same notation simplification as before, we get the update rules for the prior belief about
611 the mean (Eq. 37) and uncertainty (Eq. 38) of the latent state x_{t+1} for the next trial.

$$\begin{aligned} m_{t+1} &= m_t(1 - \alpha_t) + O_t \alpha_t \\ &= m_t + \alpha_t(O_t - m_t) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Eq. 37}) \quad w_{t+1}^2 = w_t^2(1 - \alpha_t) + v^2 \quad (\text{Eq. 38})$$

as well as the expression for subjective perception, P_t , at trial t (Eq. 39).

$$P_t = \gamma_t m_t + (1 - \gamma_t) N_t \quad (\text{Eq. 39})$$

612 The perception and prediction responses are modelled analogously as the KF model. In total, the model has 7
613 free parameters: ε (subjective noise), s (environmental stochasticity), v (environmental volatility), ξ (response
614 noise), E_0 (initial belief about the mean), w_0 (initial belief about the uncertainty) and C (confidence scaling
615 factor).

616 **4.5.3 Random model**

As a baseline, we also included a model that performs a random guess. For both experiment the perceptual/prediction rating as well as the guess was modelled as in Eq. 40.

$$\hat{P}_t \sim \mathcal{N}\left(R, \xi^2 \exp\{C^{-1}(1 - c_t)\}^2\right) \quad (\text{Eq. 40})$$

617 The model has 3 free parameters: R , ξ , and C , where R is a constant value that participants respond with.

618 **4.6 Model fitting**

619 Model parameters were estimated using hierarchical Bayesian methods, performed with RStan package (v.
620 2.21.0) [73] in R (v. 4.0.2) based on Markov Chain Monte Carlo techniques (No-U-Turn Hamiltonian Monte
621 Carlo). For the individual level-parameters we used non-centred parametrisation [74]. For the group-level
622 parameters we used $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ priors for the mean, and the gamma-mixture representation of the **Student-t**(3, 0, 1)
623 for the scale [75]. Parameters in the (0, 1) range were constrained using `Phi_approx` - a logistic approximation
624 to the cumulative Normal distribution [76].

625 In Experiment 1, for each condition and each of the four chains, we ran 6000 samples (after discarding 6000
626 warm-up ones). For each condition, we examined R-hat values for each individual- (including the $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ error
627 term from the non-centred parametrisation) and group-level parameters from each model to verify whether the
628 Markov chains have converged. At the group-level and individual-level, all R-hat values had a value < 1.1 ,
629 indicating convergence. In the random response model, 0.01% – 0.16% iterations saturated the maximum tree
630 depth of 11.

631 In Experiment 2, we fit the pain and control group data sets separately. For each of the four chains, we
632 ran 3000 samples (after discarding 3000 warm-up ones). For each group, we examined R-hat values for each
633 individual- and group-level parameters from each model to verify whether the Markov chains have converged. At
634 the group-level and individual-level, all R-hat values had a value < 1.1 , indicating convergence. In the random
635 response model, 3.38% – 7.33% iterations saturated the maximum tree depth of 11.

636 **4.6.1 Model comparison**

637 For model comparison, we used R package `loo`, which provides efficient approximate leave-one-out cross-
638 validation. The package allows to estimate the difference in models' expected predictive accuracy through the
639 difference in expected log point-wise predictive density (ELPD) [77]. By looking at the ratio between the ELPD
640 difference and the standard error (SE) of the difference, we get the sigma effect - a heuristic for significance of
641 such model differences. The closeness of fit can be also captured with LOO information criterion (LOOIC),
642 where the lower LOOIC values indicate better fit.

643 **4.6.2 Parameter comparison**

644 For the comparison of group-level parameters between conditions (Experiment 1) or groups (Experiment 2), we
645 extracted 95% High Density Intervals (HDI) of the permuted and merged (across chains) posterior samples of
646 each group-level parameter [78]. To assess significant differences between groups/conditions, we calculated a
647 difference between such defined intervals. In the Bayesian scenario, a significant difference is indicated by the
648 interval not containing the value 0 [79, 80].

649 For experiment 2, Bayesian independent samples T-tests were performed, using JASP [81], on the two sets
650 of individual-level parameters to determine whether there were significant differences between back pain and
651 control groups. The Bayes Factor BF_{10} is a measure of the evidence for the alternative hypothesis relative to
652 the null hypothesis, such that a greater BF_{10} indicates stronger support for the alternative hypothesis – that a
653 significant difference between groups does exist. A Bayes factor $BF_{10} \geq 10$ was interpreted as strong evidence
654 for the alternative hypothesis [82].

655 **4.6.3 Parameter and model recovery**

656 To assess the reliability of our modelling analysis [83], for each model we performed parameter recovery analysis,
657 where we simulated participants' responses using newly drawn individual-level parameters from the group-level
658 distributions.

659 For Experiment 1, we repurposed existing sequences of noxious inputs in the [1, 13] range (pre-transformation).
660 When then applied a linear transformation to the input sequences using sampled slope and intercept coeffi-
661 cients from a Gaussian distribution of these coefficients that we estimated based on our dataset using R's
662 `fitdistrplus` package. Furthermore, we simulated the confidence ratings based on lag-1 auto-correlation
663 across a moving window of the transformed input sequence.

664 For Experiment 2, we used the same sequences of share values that were used in the task. We simulated
665 confidence ratings based on the lag-1 auto-correlation across a moving window of the share value sequence.

666 We then fit the same model to the simulated data and calculated Pearson correlation coefficients r between the
667 generated and estimated individual-level parameters. The higher the coefficient r , the more reliable the estimates
668 are, which can be categorised as: poor (if $r < 0.5$); fair (if $0.5 < r < 0.75$); good ($0.75 < r < 0.9$); excellent (if $r > 0.9$)
669 [84].

670 We also performed model recovery analysis [83], where we first simulated responses using each model and
671 then fit each model-specific dataset with each model. We then counted the number of times a model fit the
672 simulated data best (according to the LOOIC rule), effectively creating an $M \times M$ confusion matrix, where M is
673 the number of models. In the case where we have a diagonal matrix of ones, the models are perfectly recoverable
674 and hence as reliable as possible.

675 **REFERENCES**

- 676 1. Dehaene, S., Meyniel, F., Wacongne, C., Wang, L. & Pallier, C. The Neural Representation of Sequences:
677 From Transition Probabilities to Algebraic Patterns and Linguistic Trees. *Neuron* **88**, 2–19 (2015).
- 678 2. Schapiro, A. & Turk-Browne, N. Statistical learning. *Brain mapping* **3**, 501–506 (2015).
- 679 3. Fiser, J. & Lengyel, G. A common probabilistic framework for perceptual and statistical learning. *Current*
680 *Opinion in Neurobiology* **58**, 218–228 (2019).
- 681 4. Meyniel, F., Maheu, M. & Dehaene, S. Human Inferences about Sequences: A Minimal Transition Proba-
682 bility Model. *PLOS Computational Biology* **12**, e1005260 (2016).
- 683 5. Kourtzi, Z. & Welchman, A. E. Learning predictive structure without a teacher: decision strategies and
684 brain routes. *Current opinion in neurobiology* **58**, 130–134 (2019).
- 685 6. Sherman, B. E., Graves, K. N. & Turk-Browne, N. B. The prevalence and importance of statistical learning
686 in human cognition and behavior. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* **32**, 15–20 (2020).
- 687 7. Turk-Browne, N. B., Scholl, B. J., Chun, M. M. & Johnson, M. K. Neural Evidence of Statistical Learning:
688 Efficient Detection of Visual Regularities Without Awareness. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **21**.
689 Conference Name: Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 1934–1945 (2009).
- 690 8. Mancini, F., Zhang, S. & Seymour, B. Computational and neural mechanisms of statistical pain learning.
691 *Nature Communications* **13**, 6613 (2022).
- 692 9. Mulders, D., Seymour, B., Mouraux, A. & Mancini, F. Confidence of probabilistic predictions modulates
693 the cortical response to pain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**, e2212252120 (2023).
- 694 10. Tracey, I. Getting the pain you expect: mechanisms of placebo, nocebo and reappraisal effects in humans.
695 *Nature Medicine* **16**, 1277–1283 (2010).
- 696 11. Tinnermann, A., Geuter, S., Sprenger, C., Finsterbusch, J. & Büchel, C. Interactions between brain and
697 spinal cord mediate value effects in nocebo hyperalgesia. *Science* **358**. Publisher: American Association for
698 the Advancement of Science, 105–108 (2017).
- 699 12. Eippert, F., Finsterbusch, J., Bingel, U. & Büchel, C. Direct evidence for spinal cord involvement in placebo
700 analgesia. *Science* **326**, 404–404 (2009).

- 701 13. Geuter, S. & Büchel, C. Facilitation of pain in the human spinal cord by nocebo treatment. *Journal of*
702 *Neuroscience* **33**, 13784–13790 (2013).
- 703 14. Fields, H. L. How expectations influence pain. *Pain* **159**, S3–S10 (2018).
- 704 15. Knill, D. C. & Richards, W. *Perception as Bayesian inference* (Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- 705 16. Bushnell, M. C., Čeko, M. & Low, L. A. Cognitive and emotional control of pain and its disruption in
706 chronic pain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **14**, 502–511 (2013).
- 707 17. Bruhl, S., McCubbin, J. A. & Harden, R. N. Theoretical review: altered pain regulatory systems in chronic
708 pain. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **23**, 877–890 (1999).
- 709 18. Yarnitsky, D. Role of endogenous pain modulation in chronic pain mechanisms and treatment. *Pain* **156**,
710 S24–S31 (2015).
- 711 19. Tracey, I. A vulnerability to chronic pain and its interrelationship with resistance to analgesia. *Brain* **139**,
712 1869–1872 (2016).
- 713 20. King, C. D. *et al.* Deficiency in endogenous modulation of prolonged heat pain in patients with irritable
714 bowel syndrome and temporomandibular disorder. *Pain* **143**, 172–178 (2009).
- 715 21. Bannister, K. & Dickenson, A. The plasticity of descending controls in pain: translational probing. *The*
716 *Journal of physiology* **595**, 4159–4166 (2017).
- 717 22. Frost, R., Armstrong, B., Siegelman, N. & Christiansen, M. Domain generality versus modality specificity:
718 the paradox of statistical learning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **19**, 117–125 (2015).
- 719 23. Vos, T., Allen, C. & Arora, M. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with
720 disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global
721 Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet* **390**, 1211–1259 (2017).
- 722 24. Yong, J. R., Mullins, P. M. & Bhattacharyya, N. Prevalence of chronic pain among adults in the United
723 States. *Pain* **163**, e328–e332 (2022).
- 724 25. Gershman, S. J. A Unifying Probabilistic View of Associative Learning. *PLoS computational biology* **11**,
725 e1004567 (2015).
- 726 26. Jepma, M., Koban, L., van Doorn, J., Jones, M. & Wager, T. D. Behavioural and neural evidence for
727 self-reinforcing expectancy effects on pain. *Nature Human Behaviour* **2**. Number: 11 Publisher: Nature
728 Publishing Group, 838–855 (2018).
- 729 27. Särkkä, S. *Bayesian filtering and smoothing* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2013).
- 730 28. Hoskin, R. *et al.* Sensitivity to pain expectations: A Bayesian model of individual differences. *Cognition*
731 **182**, 127–139 (2019).
- 732 29. Kalman, R. E. A New Approach to Linear Filtering and Prediction Problems. *Transactions of the ASME–*
733 *Journal of Basic Engineering* **82**, 35–45 (1960).
- 734 30. Sutton, R. S. & Barto, A. G. *Reinforcement learning: an introduction* Second edition (The MIT Press,
735 Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2018).
- 736 31. Piray, P. & Daw, N. D. A model for learning based on the joint estimation of stochasticity and volatility.
737 *Nature Communications* **12**. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 6587 (2021).
- 738 32. Heald, J. B., Lengyel, M. & Wolpert, D. M. Contextual inference in learning and memory. *Trends in*
739 *Cognitive Sciences* **0**. Publisher: Elsevier (2022).
- 740 33. Treede, R.-D. *et al.* A classification of chronic pain for ICD-11. *PAIN* **156**, 1003–1007 (6 2015).
- 741 34. Pulcu, E. & Browning, M. The Misestimation of Uncertainty in Affective Disorders. *Trends in Cognitive*
742 *Sciences* **23**, 865–875. ISSN: 1364-6613 (2019).
- 743 35. Mayr, A. *et al.* Patients with chronic pain exhibit individually unique cortical signatures of pain encoding.
744 *Human Brain Mapping* **43**, 1676–1693 (2022).

- 745 36. Baliki, M. N. *et al.* Corticostriatal functional connectivity predicts transition to chronic back pain. *Nature*
746 *neuroscience* **15**, 1117–1119 (2012).
- 747 37. Foss, J. M., Apkarian, A. V. & Chialvo, D. R. Dynamics of pain: fractal dimension of temporal variability
748 of spontaneous pain differentiates between pain states. *Journal of neurophysiology* **95**, 730–736 (2006).
- 749 38. Meyniel, F. & Dehaene, S. Brain networks for confidence weighting and hierarchical inference during
750 probabilistic learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114** (2017).
- 751 39. Tabor, A., Thacker, M. A., Moseley, G. L. & Körding, K. P. Pain: A Statistical Account. *PLOS Computa-*
752 *tional Biology* **13**, e1005142 (2017).
- 753 40. Fardo, F. *et al.* Expectation violation and attention to pain jointly modulate neural gain in somatosensory
754 cortex. *Neuroimage* **153**, 109–121 (2017).
- 755 41. Seymour, B. & Mancini, F. Hierarchical models of pain: Inference, information-seeking, and adaptive
756 control. *NeuroImage* **222**, 117212 (2020).
- 757 42. Büchel, C., Geuter, S., Sprenger, C. & Eippert, F. Placebo Analgesia: A Predictive Coding Perspective.
758 *Neuron* **81**, 1223–1239 (2014).
- 759 43. Yoshida, W., Seymour, B., Koltzenburg, M. & Dolan, R. J. Uncertainty Increases Pain: Evidence for a
760 Novel Mechanism of Pain Modulation Involving the Periaqueductal Gray. *Journal of Neuroscience* **33**,
761 5638–5646 (2013).
- 762 44. Anchisi, D. & Zanon, M. A Bayesian Perspective on Sensory and Cognitive Integration in Pain Perception
763 and Placebo Analgesia. *PLOS ONE* **10**, e0117270 (2015).
- 764 45. Wiech, K. Deconstructing the sensation of pain: The influence of cognitive processes on pain perception.
765 *Science* **354**, 584–587 (2016).
- 766 46. Tabor, A. & Burr, C. Bayesian Learning Models of Pain: A Call to Action. *Current Opinion in Behavioral*
767 *Sciences* **26**, 54–61 (2019).
- 768 47. Colloca, L., Sigauco, M. & Benedetti, F. The role of learning in nocebo and placebo effects. *Pain* **136**,
769 211–218 (2008).
- 770 48. Blasini, M., Corsi, N., Klinger, R. & Colloca, L. Nocebo and pain: an overview of the psychoneurobiological
771 mechanisms. *PAIN Reports* **2**, e585 (2017).
- 772 49. Hird, E. J., Charalambous, C., El-Derey, W., Jones, A. K. P. & Talmi, D. Boundary effects of expectation
773 in human pain perception. *Scientific Reports* **9**, 9443 (2019).
- 774 50. Brown, C. A., Seymour, B., El-Derey, W. & Jones, A. K. Confidence in beliefs about pain predicts
775 expectancy effects on pain perception and anticipatory processing in right anterior insula. *Pain* **139**, 324–
776 332 (2008).
- 777 51. Seymour, B. Pain: a precision signal for reinforcement learning and control. *Neuron* **101**, 1029–1041
778 (2019).
- 779 52. Baliki, M. N. & Apkarian, A. V. Nociception, pain, negative moods, and behavior selection. *Neuron* **87**,
780 474–491 (2015).
- 781 53. Vlaeyen, J. W., Crombez, G. & Linton, S. J. The fear-avoidance model of pain. *Pain* **157**, 1588–1589
782 (2016).
- 783 54. Büchel, C. Pain persistence and the pain modulatory system—an evolutionary mismatch perspective. *Pain*
784 **163**, 1274 (2022).
- 785 55. Borsook, D., Youssef, A. M., Simons, L., Elman, I. & Eccleston, C. When pain gets stuck: the evolution of
786 pain chronification and treatment resistance. *Pain* **159**, 2421 (2018).
- 787 56. Heathcote, L. C. *et al.* Brain signatures of threat-safety discrimination in adolescent chronic pain. *Pain* **161**,
788 630 (2020).

- 789 57. Reddan, M. C. & Wager, T. D. Brain systems at the intersection of chronic pain and self-regulation.
790 *Neuroscience letters* **702**, 24–33 (2019).
- 791 58. Moayed, M. & Hodaie, M. Trigeminal nerve and white matter brain abnormalities in chronic orofacial
792 pain disorders. *Pain Reports* **4** (2019).
- 793 59. Davis, K. D. & Moayed, M. Central mechanisms of pain revealed through functional and structural MRI.
794 *Journal of Neuroimmune Pharmacology* **8**, 518–534 (2013).
- 795 60. Seminowicz, D. A. & Moayed, M. The dorsolateral prefrontal cortex in acute and chronic pain. *The Journal*
796 *of Pain* **18**, 1027–1035 (2017).
- 797 61. Seixas, D., Palace, J. & Tracey, I. Chronic pain disrupts the reward circuitry in multiple sclerosis. *European*
798 *Journal of Neuroscience* **44**, 1928–1934 (2016).
- 799 62. Prolific. <https://www.prolific.co>. 2022.
- 800 63. Hill, J. C. *et al.* A primary care back pain screening tool: identifying patient subgroups for initial treatment.
801 *Arthritis Rheum.* **59**, 632–641 (2008).
- 802 64. Julian, L. J. Measures of anxiety: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI), and
803 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale-Anxiety (HADS-A). *Arthritis Care Res* **63** (2011).
- 804 65. Manea, L., Gilbody, S. & McMillan, D. Optimal cut-off score for diagnosing depression with the Patient
805 Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9): a meta-analysis. *CMAJ* **184**, e191–e196 (2012).
- 806 66. Strigo, I. A., Carli, F. & Bushnell, M. C. Effect of ambient temperature on human pain and temperature
807 perception. *Anesthesiology* **92**, 699–707 (2000).
- 808 67. Medoc Advanced Medical Systems. *TSA 2 - Advanced Thermosensory Stimulator* [https://www.medoc-](https://www.medoc-web.com/tsa-2)
809 [web.com/tsa-2](https://www.medoc-web.com/tsa-2). [Online; accessed 15-Aug-2022]. <https://www.medoc-web.com/tsa-2> (2022).
- 810 68. Lue, Y.-J., Shih, Y.-C., Lu, Y.-M. & Liu, Y.-F. Method of Limit and Method of Level for Thermal and Pain
811 Detection Assessment. *International Journal of Physical Therapy & Rehabilitation* **3** (2017).
- 812 69. Hermans, L. *et al.* An Overview of Offset Analgesia and the Comparison with Conditioned Pain Modulation:
813 A Systematic Literature Review. *Pain Physician* **19**, 307–326 (2016).
- 814 70. Kleiner, M. *et al.* What’s new in psychtoolbox-3. English (US). *Perception* **36**, 1–16. ISSN: 0301-0066
815 (2007).
- 816 71. Hollins, M., Harper, D. & Maixner, W. Changes in pain from a repetitive thermal stimulus: the roles of
817 adaptation and sensitization. *Pain* **152**, 1583–1590 (2011).
- 818 72. Virtanen, P. *et al.* SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python. *Nature Methods*
819 **17**, 261–272 (2020).
- 820 73. Stan Development Team. *RStan: the R interface to Stan* R package version 2.21.0. 2019. <http://mc-stan.org/>.
- 821 74. Papaspiliopoulos, O., Roberts, G. O. & Sköld, M. A General Framework for the Parametrization of
822 Hierarchical Models. *Statistical Science* **22**. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 59–73 (2007).
- 823 75. Stan Development Team. *25.7 Reparameterization Stan User’s Guide* [https://mc-stan.org/docs/stan-users-](https://mc-stan.org/docs/stan-users-guide/reparameterization.html)
824 [guide/reparameterization.html](https://mc-stan.org/docs/stan-users-guide/reparameterization.html). [Online; accessed 15-Aug-2022].
- 825 76. Bowling, S. R., Khasawneh, M. T., Kaewkuekool, S. & Cho, B. R. A Logistic Approximation to the
826 Cumulative Normal Distribution. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management* **2**, 114–27 (2009).
- 827 77. Vehtari, A., Gelman, A. & Gabry, J. Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-
828 validation and WAIC. *Statistics and Computing* **27**. arXiv:1507.04544 [stat], 1413–1432 (2017).
- 829 78. Kruschke, J. K. *Doing Bayesian data analysis: a tutorial with R, JAGS, and Stan* Edition 2 (Academic
830 Press, Boston, 2015).
- 831 79. Aylward, J. *et al.* Altered learning under uncertainty in unmedicated mood and anxiety disorders. *Nature*
832 *Human Behaviour* **3**. Number: 10 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 1116–1123 (2019).

- 833 80. Ahn, W.-Y., Haines, N. & Zhang, L. Revealing Neurocomputational Mechanisms of Reinforcement
834 Learning and Decision-Making With the hBayesDM Package. *Computational Psychiatry* **1**. Number: 0
835 Publisher: Ubiquity Press, 24–57 (2017).
- 836 81. JASP Team. *JASP (Version 0.16.2)[Computer software]* <https://jasp-stats.org/>. 2022.
- 837 82. Jeffreys, H. *The Theory of Probability* 3rd ed., 432 (1998).
- 838 83. Wilson, R. C. & Collins, A. G. Ten simple rules for the computational modeling of behavioral data. *eLife* **8**,
839 e49547 (2019).
- 840 84. White, C. N., Servant, M. & Logan, G. D. Testing the validity of conflict drift-diffusion models for use in
841 estimating cognitive processes: A parameter-recovery study. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* **25**, 286–301
842 (2018).

843 **5 DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY**

844 All code and data will be available open source, released upon acceptance of the paper.

845 **6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

846 The study was funded by a MRC Career Development Award to FM (MR/T010614/1) and a UKRI Advanced
847 Pain Discovery Platform grant to both F.M. and B.S. (MR/W027593/1). B.S. was also funded by Wellcome
848 (214251/Z/18/Z), Versus Arthritis (21537), and IITP (MSIT 2019-0-01371). This work has been performed
849 using resources provided by the Cambridge Tier-2 system operated by the University of Cambridge Research
850 Computing Service (www.hpc.cam.ac.uk) funded by EPSRC Tier-2 capital grant (EP/T022159/1). HPC access
851 was additionally funded by an EPSRC research infrastructure grant to F.M.. For the purpose of open access,
852 the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript
853 version arising from this submission.

854 **7 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

855 JO, MW, NG, GT, BS and FM designed the study. MW and NG collected the data. JO, MW, MJ and FM analysed
856 the data. JO, MW, BS and FM wrote the article.