

Supplementary information - Statistical learning in acute and chronic pain

Jakub Onysk^{1,2,1}, Mia Whitefield^{1,1}, Nicholas Gregory¹, Maeghal Jain¹, Georgia Turner^{1,3}, Ben Seymour^{4,5}, and Flavia Mancini¹

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

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

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

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

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

¹Equal contribution

March 23, 2023

1 Supplementary information to Experiment 1

1.1 Behavioural results

1.1.1 Model-naive performance

For each sequence condition (Volatility \times Stochasticity), we calculated the root mean squared error (RMSE) of participants responses (Type: perception and prediction ratings) and compared to the normative noxious input, as a measure of performance in the task. We analysed the RMSEs with a repeated measures ANOVA, with the results reported in Supplementary Table 1.

Given the significant interaction between stochasticity and response type, we further ran a post hoc comparison tests for this effect, as reported in Supplementary Table 2.

Supplementary Table 1: Within subjects effects from repeated measures ANOVA of participant RMSE scores with stochasticity, volatility and response type factors. SS - Sum of Squares, MS - Mean Square.

Effect	SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	10.714	1	10.714	0.960	0.336	0.007	0.036
Residuals	290.166	26	11.160				
Stochasticity	113.964	1	113.964	19.939	< 0.001*	0.074	0.434
Residuals	148.603	26	5.715				
Type	365.000	1	365.000	85.109	< 0.001*	0.237	0.766
Residuals	111.503	26	4.289				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	0.006	1	0.006	$5.688e - 4$	0.981	$3.723e - 6$	$2.188e - 5$
Residuals	261.912	26	10.074				
Volatility \times Type	7.313	1	7.313	3.196	0.085	0.005	0.109
Residuals	59.487	26	2.288				
Stochasticity \times Type	63.662	1	63.662	29.842	< 0.001*	0.041	0.534
Residuals	55.466	26	2.133				
Volatility \times Stochasticity \times Type	1.356	1	1.356	0.704	0.409	$8.807e - 4$	0.026
Residuals	50.060	26	1.925				

Supplementary Table 2: Post Hoc Comparisons for the repeated measures ANOVA's interaction effect of Stochasticity \times Type.

		Mean Diff.	95% CI for Mean Diff.		SE	t	p_{bonf}
			Lower	Upper			
High, Perception	Low, Perception	0.367	-0.687	1.421	0.381	0.963	1.000
	High, Prediction	-3.686	-4.636	-2.735	0.345	-10.688	< 0.001*
	Low, Prediction	-1.147	-2.329	0.034	0.430	-2.665	0.062
Low, Perception	High, Prediction	-4.053	-5.234	-2.871	0.430	-9.415	< 0.001*
	Low, Prediction	-1.514	-2.464	-0.564	0.345	-4.390	< 0.001*
High, Prediction	Low, Prediction	2.539	1.484	3.593	0.381	6.658	< 0.001*

1.2 Noxious inputs and responses


1.2.1 Input transformation

We linearly transformed participants' responses to project them from the 1-13 range to 0-100 using a linear transformation we obtained from a regression of stimulus intensities onto pain ratings. Plots of each participant's transformation can be found in Supplementary Fig. 1. The sequences of transformed noxious stimuli provided to each participant are plotted in Supplementary Fig. 2. The condition sequences are concatenated in the order as they were delivered.


1.2.2 Responses

We superimposed participants responses (perception and prediction ratings) onto the noxious input condition sequences in Supplementary Fig. 3.


Finally, we plotted participants' confidence ratings throughout the task in Supplementary Fig. 4.



Supplementary Fig. 1: Linear transformation of the input at perception trials. Blue dots indicate participant's perception responses for a given level of stimulus intensity, black dots indicate transformed intensity values, a linear least squares regression was performed to achieve the best fitting line through participant responses as shown in red, the intercept was constrained > 0 .



Supplementary Fig. 2: Sequences of noxious inputs for each participant. Vertical purple lines mark the end of each condition.




Supplementary Fig. 3: Participants responses (red - perception; green - prediction) to the noxious input (dotted line) sequences. Vertical purple lines mark the end of each condition.



Supplementary Fig. 4: Participants' confidence ratings in (red - perception; green - prediction) during the task. Vertical purple lines mark the end of each condition.


1.3 Model predictions

Following the model fitting procedure, in Supplementary Fig. 5 we plotted example model predicted ratings both for perception and prediction responses for each condition as compared with noxious input for one participant's responses.



Supplementary Fig. 5: Example plot of the input sequences (black) for each condition, one participant's responses (white) and the winning, eKF, model predictions (blue) including 95% confidence intervals (shaded blue) for **A-D**: Perception and **E-H**: Prediction.

Lastly, for each condition and for each participant we plotted model responses (perception and prediction) against participant responses in Supplementary Fig. 6. The grand mean correlation across participants, for each condition and response type was calculated and included in the figure.



Supplementary Fig. 6: Model responses against participants responses for each condition and each response type **A-D**: Perception and **E-H**: Prediction. The annotated value is the grand mean correlation across subjects for each condition and response type.

1.4 Parameter recovery

The results of parameter recovery analysis for each parameter for each model are reported in Supplementary Table 3-7. We recovered each parameter 50 times and calculated the mean and SD of the correlation between the true and recovered parameter values.

Supplementary Table 3: Pearson correlation coefficient r (SD) from the parameter recovery analysis from each model for the eRL

	α	γ	ξ	E^0	C
r (SD)	0.673 (0.122)	0.918 (0.052)	0.992 (0.005)	0.726 (0.105)	0.466 (0.141)

Supplementary Table 4: Pearson correlation coefficient r (SD) from the parameter recovery analysis from each model for the RL

	α	ξ	E^0	C
r (SD)	0.864 (0.06)	0.993 (0.004)	0.63 (0.113)	0.461 (0.127)

Supplementary Table 5: Pearson correlation coefficient r (SD) from the parameter recovery analysis from each model for the eKF

	ϵ	s	v	ξ	E^0	w^0	C
r (SD)	0.748 (0.166)	0.534 (0.172)	0.727 (0.159)	0.974 (0.141)	0.841 (0.138)	0.285 (0.165)	0.455 (0.163)


Supplementary Table 6: Pearson correlation coefficient r (SD) from the parameter recovery analysis from each model for the KF

	s	v	ξ	E^0	w^0	C
r (SD)	0.612 (0.125)	0.595 (0.115)	0.993 (0.005)	0.568 (0.185)	0.29 (0.197)	0.447 (0.145)

Moreover, to assess the number of simulations needed, we calculated the average SD (and its error) as a function of increasing number of simulation, as plotted in Supplementary Fig. 7. The average was obtained from the 500 randomly chosen permutations of different simulations at each n (out of 50).

Supplementary Table 7: Pearson correlation coefficient r (SD) from the parameter recovery analysis from each model for the Random model

	ξ	R	C
r (SD)	0.996 (0.005)	0.999 (0.001)	0.085 (0.211)



Supplementary Fig. 7: **Parameter recovery average SD for each model.** The average SD is plotted as a function of simulation number averaged across 500 permutations of 50 simulations.

1.5 Model recovery

We also ran model recovery analysis as described in the Methods. We report the confusion matrix of our analysis based on 50 simulations in Supplementary Table 8.

Supplementary Table 8: Confusion matrix from the model recovery analysis based on 50 simulations. The y-axis indicates which model simulated the dataset, while the x-axis indicates which model fit the data based on LOOIC.

		eRL	RL	eKF	KF	Random
Simulated	eRL	0.400	0.180	0.340	0.080	0.000
	RL	0.160	0.340	0.220	0.280	0.000
	eKF	0.440	0.060	0.440	0.060	0.000
	KF	0.280	0.160	0.280	0.280	0.000
	Random	0.340	0.000	0.280	0.000	0.380
		Fit				

1.6 Condition-wise model comparison

For each condition, we ran model comparison procedure as described in the Methods. The results are reported in Supplementary Table 9. In each condition, the expectation weighted models provided significantly better fit than models without this element.


Supplementary Table 9: Model comparison results for each condition.

Condition	Model name	ELPD difference	SE difference	Sigma effect	LOOIC
Vol. high Stoch. high	eKF - expectation weighted	0.000	0.000		15748.389
	eRL - expectation weighted	-9.560	5.071	1.885	15767.509
	RL	-139.407	61.362	2.272	16027.202
	KF	-161.444	77.335	2.088	16071.277
	Random response	-730.600	77.009	9.487	17209.588
Vol. high Stoch. low	eKF - expectation weighted	0.000	0.000		15682.115
	eRL - expectation weighted	-17.439	5.896	2.958	15716.993
	RL	-131.817	35.936	3.668	15945.749
	KF	-133.464	37.171	3.591	15949.042
	Random response	-824.346	79.148	10.415	17330.807
Vol. low Stoch. high	eKF - expectation weighted	0.000	0.000		15990.114
	eRL - expectation weighted	-12.027	7.029	1.711	16014.169
	RL	-149.338	43.874	3.404	16288.789
	KF	-159.738	46.485	3.436	16309.590
	Random response	-831.096	84.549	9.830	17652.306
Vol. low Stoch. low	eKF - expectation weighted	0.000	0.000		15904.936
	eRL - expectation weighted	-11.068	4.309	2.569	15927.072
	RL	-70.588	16.643	4.241	16046.111
	KF	-74.031	20.972	3.530	16052.997
	Random response	-901.792	107.244	8.409	17708.519

1.7 Modelling results

1.7.1 Group-level differences between each condition


We plotted the estimate posterior distributions for each parameter of the model (including the across-trial average and the final learning rate and perceptual weighting term) in Supplementary Fig. 8. We found no group-level differences between conditions for any of the posterior distribution of the parameters in the winning eKF model.



Supplementary Fig. 8: Group-level distributions for parameters for each condition for the eKF model.

1.7.2 Individual-level differences between conditions

We estimated the individual-level parameters for each condition, we include their violin plots in Supplementary Fig. 9.



Supplementary Fig. 9: Violin plots (and box-plots) of individual-level parameters for each condition in the winning eKF model.

Furthermore, to detect individual-level parameter differences as we manipulated the level of stochasticity and volatility, we ran repeated-measures ANOVA. In case when there was interaction between

stochasticity and volatility effects, we followed up with post-hoc comparison tests. The results of the analyses are reported in Supplementary Table 10-24.

Supplementary Table 10: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for ϵ

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	0.539	1	0.539	4.014	0.056	0.058	0.134
Residuals	3.492	26	0.134				
Stochasticity	0.017	1	0.017	0.180	0.675	0.002	0.007
Residuals	2.505	26	0.096				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	0.349	1	0.349	3.758	0.063	0.037	0.126
Residuals	2.417	26	0.093				

Supplementary Table 11: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for s

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	0.214	1	0.214	25.246	< 0.001 *	0.111	0.493
Residuals	0.220	26	0.008				
Stochasticity	0.672	1	0.672	53.174	< 0.001 *	0.348	0.672
Residuals	0.329	26	0.013				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	0.285	1	0.285	35.108	< 0.001 *	0.147	0.575
Residuals	0.211	26	0.008				

Supplementary Table 12: Post Hoc Comparisons - Volatility \times Stochasticity for s

Vol, Stoch	Vol, Stoch	Mean Difference	95% CI for Mean Difference		SE	t	P _{bonf}
			Lower	Upper			
High, High	Low, High	0.192	0.124	0.260	0.025	7.735	< 0.001 *
	High, Low	0.260	0.184	0.337	0.028	9.396	< 0.001 *
	Low, Low	0.247	0.170	0.324	0.028	8.826	< 0.001 *
Low, High	High, Low	0.069	-0.008	0.146	0.028	2.462	0.104
	Low, Low	0.055	-0.021	0.131	0.028	1.989	0.313
High, Low	Low, Low	-0.014	-0.082	0.054	0.025	-0.553	1.000

Supplementary Table 13: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for v

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	5.388	1	5.388	3.260	0.083	0.035	0.111
Residuals	42.976	26	1.653				
Stochasticity	4.842	1	4.842	3.533	0.071	0.032	0.120
Residuals	35.633	26	1.371				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	1.017	1	1.017	0.425	0.520	0.007	0.016
Residuals	62.236	26	2.394				

Supplementary Table 14: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for ξ

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	22.595	1	22.595	5.079	0.033*	0.066	0.163
Residuals	115.666	26	4.449				
Stochasticity	0.694	1	0.694	0.182	0.673	0.002	0.007
Residuals	98.959	26	3.806				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	0.129	1	0.129	0.033	0.858	$3.784e - 4$	0.001
Residuals	102.589	26	3.946				

Supplementary Table 15: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for E^0

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	413.996	1	413.996	0.496	0.487	0.008	0.019
Residuals	21679.787	26	833.838				
Stochasticity	427.569	1	427.569	0.718	0.405	0.008	0.027
Residuals	15488.151	26	595.698				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	350.496	1	350.496	0.669	0.421	0.007	0.025
Residuals	13619.554	26	523.829				

Supplementary Table 16: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for w^0

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	0.010	1	0.010	14.483	< 0.001*	0.003	0.358
Residuals	0.017	26	$6.626e - 4$				
Stochasticity	0.292	1	0.292	836.729	< 0.001*	0.083	0.970
Residuals	0.009	26	$3.489e - 4$				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	3.174	1	3.174	5275.367	< 0.001*	0.902	0.995
Residuals	0.016	26	$6.016e - 4$				

Supplementary Table 17: Post Hoc Comparisons - Volatility \times Stochasticity for w^0

Vol, Stoch	Vol, Stoch	Mean Difference	95% CI for Mean Difference		SE	t	P _{bonf}
			Lower	Upper			
High, High	Low, High	0.362	0.343	0.380	0.007	52.859	< 0.001*
	High, Low	0.239	0.223	0.255	0.006	40.259	< 0.001*
	Low, Low	-0.085	-0.102	-0.068	0.006	-13.908	< 0.001*
Low, High	High, Low	-0.123	-0.140	-0.106	0.006	-20.068	< 0.001*
	Low, Low	-0.447	-0.463	-0.431	0.006	-75.309	< 0.001*
High, Low	Low, Low	-0.324	-0.343	-0.305	0.007	-47.348	< 0.001*

Supplementary Table 18: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for C

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	209.573	1	209.573	53.206	< 0.001*	0.238	0.672
Residuals	102.412	26	3.939				
Stochasticity	7.556	1	7.556	2.869	0.102	0.009	0.099
Residuals	68.476	26	2.634				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	373.366	1	373.366	81.258	< 0.001*	0.424	0.758
Residuals	119.466	26	4.595				

Supplementary Table 19: Post Hoc Comparisons - Volatility \times Stochasticity for C

Vol, Stoch	Vol, Stoch	Mean Difference	95% CI for Mean Difference		SE	t	P_{bonf}
			Lower	Upper			
High, High	Low, High	0.933	-0.610	2.475	0.562	1.659	0.619
	High, Low	4.248	2.824	5.671	0.517	8.209	< 0.001 *
	Low, Low	-2.257	-3.612	-0.902	0.493	-4.575	< 0.001 *
Low, High	High, Low	3.315	1.960	4.670	0.493	6.719	< 0.001 *
	Low, Low	-3.190	-4.613	-1.766	0.517	-6.165	< 0.001 *
High, Low	Low, Low	-6.505	-8.047	-4.962	0.562	-11.570	< 0.001 *

Supplementary Table 20: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for α^f

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	0.007	1	0.007	0.183	0.672	0.002	0.007
Residuals	1.019	26	0.039				
Stochasticity	0.119	1	0.119	3.216	0.085	0.031	0.110
Residuals	0.963	26	0.037				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	0.003	1	0.003	0.039	0.845	$6.706e - 4$	0.002
Residuals	1.697	26	0.065				

Supplementary Table 21: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for γ^f

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	0.018	1	0.018	0.956	0.337	0.011	0.035
Residuals	0.488	26	0.019				
Stochasticity	$7.475e - 4$	1	$7.475e - 4$	0.043	0.837	$4.448e - 4$	0.002
Residuals	0.447	26	0.017				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	0.044	1	0.044	1.694	0.204	0.026	0.061
Residuals	0.682	26	0.026				

Supplementary Table 22: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for w^f

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	3.399	1	3.399	2.040	0.165	0.023	0.073
Residuals	43.321	26	1.666				
Stochasticity	4.267	1	4.267	3.153	0.088	0.029	0.108
Residuals	35.193	26	1.354				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	1.145	1	1.145	0.477	0.496	0.008	0.018
Residuals	62.373	26	2.399				

Supplementary Table 23: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for $\bar{\alpha}$

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	0.008	1	0.008	0.198	0.660	0.002	0.008
Residuals	1.000	26	0.038				
Stochasticity	0.120	1	0.120	3.245	0.083	0.032	0.111
Residuals	0.963	26	0.037				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	0.004	1	0.004	0.065	0.801	0.001	0.002
Residuals	1.688	26	0.065				

Supplementary Table 24: Within subjects effects from repeated-measures ANOVA for $\bar{\gamma}$

Effect	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2	η_p^2
Volatility	0.018	1	0.018	0.955	0.337	0.011	0.035
Residuals	0.483	26	0.019				
Stochasticity	$6.263e - 4$	1	$6.263e - 4$	0.037	0.850	$3.753e - 4$	0.001
Residuals	0.446	26	0.017				
Volatility \times Stochasticity	0.047	1	0.047	1.816	0.189	0.028	0.065
Residuals	0.674	26	0.026				

2 Supplement to Experiment 2

2.1 Participants


Participants completed a number of clinical and psychological questionnaires during the screening process. These included the Keele STarT Back Screening Tool (STarT), the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), the Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale (PASS-20), Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) for depression, Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS), and the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) interference and severity components. As chronic pain is often comorbid with the above disorders - which are associated with altered cognitive function - control participants with low scores were selected to simplify the comparison between participant groups. Supplementary Table 25 shows that the controls had significantly lower questionnaire scores compared to the back pain participants.

Supplementary Table 25: Participant questionnaire scores for the back pain and control groups. The table shows the mean score and standard error (SE) for the Keele STarT Back Screening Tool (STarT), the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), the Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale (PASS-20), Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) for depression, Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS), and the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) interference and severity components. The Bayes Factor (BF_{10}) for the Bayesian independent samples T-tests comparing the back pain and control group scores are also shown.


Questionnaire	Back Pain		Controls		BF_{10}
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	
STarT	5.660	1.552	0.655	0.865	2.305×10^{36}
STAI	52.786	11.736	31.345	31.345	7.887×10^{18}
PASS-20	60.911	18.236	30.164	19.755	5.600×10^{10}
PHQ-9	12.589	5.917	1.945	2.206	3.338×10^{19}
PCS	28.768	14.304	6.164	7.408	8.315×10^{14}
BPI (severity)	4.902	1.767	1.841	1.071	1.660×10^{16}
BPI (interference)	5.050	2.346	1.023	1.787	2.121×10^{14}

2.2 Behavioural Results


We superimposed participants' share price predictions on the game sequences for the back pain group Supplementary Fig. 10 and controls Supplementary Fig. 12. Supplementary Fig. 11 and 13 display their confidence ratings throughout the game for the back pain and control groups respectively.



Supplementary Fig. 11: Back pain group participants confidence ratings over the 200 trials of the stock market game.




Supplementary Fig. 12: Control participant predictions (blue) and the input game sequence (black) over the 200 trials of the stock market game.



Supplementary Fig. 13: Control group participants confidence ratings over the 200 trials of the stock market game.

2.3 Correlation between model predictions and participant responses

For each participant we plotted the RL and KF model predictions against the participant responses in Supplementary Fig. 14. The grand mean correlations across participants for each model and participant group was calculated and included in the figure.



Supplementary Fig. 14: Model predictions against participant responses for **A-B**: the RL model and **C-D**: the KF model. **A**, **C**: back pain group; **B**, **D**: controls. The annotated value is the grand mean correlation across subjects for each model and participant group.

2.4 Parameter Recovery

The results from the parameter recovery analysis for the RL, KF and random models are displayed in Supplementary Table 26-28. We recovered each parameter 50 times and calculated mean and SD of the correlation between the true and recovered parameter values.

Supplementary Table 26: Pearson correlation coefficient r (SD) from the parameter recovery analysis from each model for the RL

	α	ξ	E_0	C
r (SD)	0.936 (0.139)	0.934 (0.223)	0.800 (0.149)	0.654 (0.122)

2.5 Model Recovery

We also ran a model recovery analysis as described in the Methods. The confusion matrix of our analysis based on 50 simulations is shown in Supplementary Table 29.

Supplementary Table 27: Pearson correlation coefficient r (SD) from the parameter recovery analysis from each model for the KF

	v	s	ξ	w_0	E_0	C
r (SD)	0.573 (0.147)	0.546 (0.181)	0.960 (0.132)	0.303 (0.128)	0.727 (0.102)	0.608 (0.201)

Supplementary Table 28: Pearson correlation coefficient r (SD) from the parameter recovery analysis from each model for the random model

	ξ	E_0	C
r (SD)	0.959 (0.153)	0.964 (0.131)	0.601 (0.119)


Supplementary Table 29: Confusion matrix from the model recovery analysis based on 50 simulations. The y-axis indicates which model simulated the dataset, while the x-axis indicates which model fit the data.

		RL	KF	Random
Simulated	RL	0.688	0.250	0.062
	KF	0.540	0.420	0.040
	Random	0.435	0.043	0.522
		Fit		

2.6 Parameter Comparison

2.6.1 Group-level parameters


We plotted the estimate posterior distributions for the group level-mean of each parameter of the RL model in Supplementary Fig. 15 and the KF model in Supplementary Fig. 16 and 17. We found that the estimate for group-level mean for the RL learning rate was significantly lower for the back pain group than the controls. We found no other group-level differences between the back pain and control groups for any of the posterior distributions of the parameters.




Supplementary Fig. 15: Posterior distribution estimates for the RL model group-level parameters. Back pain (yellow) and controls (blue) posterior estimates for the group-level mean of the **A** learning rate (α), **B** prediction noise (ξ), **C** initial estimate (E_0), **D** confidence scaling factor (C) are superimposed.

2.6.2 Individual-level parameters


We estimated the individual-level parameters for the back pain and control participant groups. The raincloud plots of the individual parameter estimates are shown for the RL model in Supplementary Fig. 18 and for the KF model in Supplementary Fig. 19.




Supplementary Fig. 16: Posterior distribution estimates for the KF model group-level parameters. Back pain (yellow) and controls (blue) posterior estimates for the group-level mean of the **A** stochasticity (s), **B** prediction noise (ξ), **C** initial estimate (E_0), **D** confidence scaling factor (C) are superimposed.



Supplementary Fig. 17: The posterior distribution estimates for the KF model group-level mean **A** volatility (v), **B** initial estimate uncertainty (w_0). The back pain and control groups' posteriors are displayed on separate graphs for ease of visualisation due to the large difference in scales.



Supplementary Fig. 18: Raincloud plots for the RL model individual-level parameter estimates. Back pain (yellow) and controls (blue) density plots for the learning rate (α), prediction noise (ξ), initial estimate (E_0), confidence scaling factor (C) parameter estimates. The black points represent the individual parameter estimates.



Supplementary Fig. 19: Raincloud plots for the KF model individual-level parameter estimates. Back pain (yellow) and controls (blue) density plots for the volatility (v), stochasticity (s), prediction noise (ξ), initial uncertainty w_0 , initial estimate (E_0), confidence scaling factor (C) parameter estimates. The black points represent the individual parameter estimates.