


---

# THE NEURAL CORRELATES OF AUTONOMIC INTEROCEPTION: PERCEPTUAL MISMATCH AND CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

---

A PREPRINT

 **Poppy Z. Grimes\***

Division of Psychiatry  
Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences  
University of Edinburgh, UK  
p.grimes@ed.ac.uk

 **Christina N. Kampourelis**

Department of Clinical Neuroscience  
Brighton and Sussex Medical School  
University of Sussex, UK

 **Charlotte L. Rae**

School of Psychology  
University of Sussex, UK

 **Neil A. Harrison**

Cardiff University Brain Research  
Imaging Centre (CUBRIC)  
University of Cardiff, UK

 **Sarah N. Garfinkel**

Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience  
University College London, UK

 **Hugo D. Critchley†**

Department of Clinical Neuroscience  
Brighton and Sussex Medical School  
University of Sussex, UK

 **Jessica A. Eccles‡**

Department of Clinical Neuroscience  
Brighton and Sussex Medical School  
University of Sussex, UK

May 22, 2023

## ABSTRACT

1 Interoceptive mismatch is a perceptual discrepancy between ascending bodily signals and higher-  
2 order representation of anticipated physiological state. This mismatch is implicated in emotion  
3 inference within predictive coding models. We present *autonomic perceptual mismatch* as a novel  
4 in vivo measure of the discrepancy between actual and perceived autonomic signals, for clinical  
5 application to brain-body interactions, specifically in the expression of anxiety. Joint hypermobility  
6 is disproportionately found in individuals with anxiety disorders, revealing an underexplored link  
7 between the mind and body. Atypical autonomic reactivity represents a likely mediating mechanism  
8 consequent of altered connective tissue within the vasculature and nervous system.

9 The present fMRI study determined neural substrates of autonomic perceptual mismatch on affective  
10 processing in the hypermobility-anxiety interaction. We compared regional brain activity during  
11 emotional face processing in participants with and without hypermobility and generalized anxiety  
12 disorder diagnosis, then tested association with perceptual mismatch. In the brain, autonomic  
13 perceptual mismatch correlated with enhanced activation in emotion processing and autonomic  
14 control regions, notably anterior cingulate cortex. Anxious individuals exhibited increased mid-  
15 insula cortex activity in relation to perceptual mismatch. Activity was decreased within the inferior  
16 frontal gyrus, a region implicated in cognitive control. Dysautonomia mediated the link between  
17 hypermobility and anxiety. Together, these findings support a neural basis of an autonomic perceptual  
18 mismatch model in a clinical sample. This is supported by the engagement of neural systems for  
19 emotion-cognition and interoception. This work highlights convergent aspects of neurodiversity,  
20 mental health, connective tissue disorders and brain-body interactions relevant to precision healthcare.

21 **Keywords** interoception · dysautonomia · brain-body interactions · hypermobility · anxiety · predictive coding

\*Previous: Dept. of Clinical Neuroscience, Brighton and Sussex Medical School, University of Sussex, UK

†Sussex Partnership National Health Service Foundation Trust, Brighton, UK

‡Sussex Partnership National Health Service Foundation Trust, Brighton, UK

## 22 **1 Introduction**

23 The coupling of brain and body is evident in cognitive and emotive responses to visceral afferent signals. Interoception,  
24 the internal sensing of our milieu intérieur, its representation in brain, and its impact on psychological processes  
25 including bodily feelings, is proposed to be central to emotion [1–4]. Afferent interoceptive information is conveyed  
26 centrally by viscerosensory nerves that permit the reflexive and allostatic [5] autonomic nervous control of internal  
27 physiology [6]. Dysautonomia describes perturbation of adaptive autonomic control and may arise through aberrant  
28 interoceptive signalling, representation and regulation. Notably, dysautonomic symptoms are common to many mental  
29 and physical conditions.

30 Anxiety is commonly associated with heightened states of autonomic state of arousal linked to anticipatory fear and  
31 worry. The physiological signalling and perception of arousal amplify negative feelings as subjective anxiety symptoms  
32 and associated avoidant behaviours. Anxiety is thus linked to uncertainty regarding internal states (generalised  
33 anxiety disorder) or external situations (panic and social anxiety disorders) [7]. Arguably, anxious feeling arises from  
34 unexplained arousal and the mismatch between anticipated/desired actual interoceptive signalling [8]. Correspondingly,  
35 discrepancies in accurately discerning interoceptive signals provide a mechanistic explanation for the precipitation of  
36 anxiety by dysregulated bodily states [2, 9, 10].

37 Interoception provides an empirical framework for the relationship between autonomic dysfunction and anxiety [2, 7, 8,  
38 11]. Recent studies link the expression of anxiety to attenuated interoceptive awareness (interoceptive metacognitive  
39 insight), computed as the correspondence (or mismatch) between objective measures of a person’s interoceptive  
40 sensitivity (from performance accuracy on interoceptive tasks) and their subjective perception of their own interoceptive  
41 sensitivity (rated confidence in interoceptive performance accuracy) [12]. Interoceptive mismatch (previously termed  
42 interoceptive trait prediction error), has been conceptualised as the discrepancy between self-reported awareness  
43 measures of interoception (e.g. assessed through the awareness subscale of the Porges Body Awareness Questionnaire;  
44 [13]) relative to behavioural accuracy on interoceptive tests (e.g. heartbeat perception). This interoceptive mismatch is  
45 also associated with heightened anxiety symptomatology [14].

46 The interoceptive predictive coding model (IPC) links aberrant interoceptive processing (uncorrected ‘prediction errors’)  
47 to dysautonomia and anxiety [15, 16]. Heightened attention to physiological responses increases the precision afforded  
48 to interoceptive information, increasing the likelihood of errors in autonomic control and interoceptive inference [8, 15,  
49 17]. Unsuccessful top-down suppression of error results in less accurate perception, reflecting a mismatch between  
50 expected and actual internal states.

51 To investigate this mismatch in dysautonomia, we developed an interoceptive measure of autonomic perceptual mismatch  
52 (APM) – corresponding to the magnitude of mismatch in objective and subjective sensitivity to autonomic signals.

53 Joint hypermobility is an outward manifestation of a more general variation in the structural integrity of connective  
54 tissues, including collagen and other matrix proteins present throughout the body [18]. Although hypermobility is

55 common (present in roughly 20% of the general population) some individuals develop symptoms that can affect multiple  
56 bodily systems: Hypermobility is associated with chronic pain, fatigue, gastrointestinal disturbance, neurodevelopmental  
57 and neuropsychiatric conditions [19–21]. While typically underdiagnosed, the complex comorbidities of symptomatic  
58 hypermobility can go unrecognised in individuals, hindering quality-of-life [19, 22–24].

59 Hypermobility is significantly overrepresented among people with clinical diagnoses of anxiety [25, 26] and present  
60 in up to 70% of such patients [18, 27]. Hypermobile-anxious individuals are more vulnerable to side effects from  
61 anxiolytics and anti-depressants, and experience autonomic and gastrointestinal-associated symptoms that can amplify  
62 affective anxiety [24].

63 Despite the acknowledgement of this association between hypermobility and anxiety, extending to autonomic and  
64 somatic symptoms, a neurobiological account is yet to be elucidated. One such mechanism may exist in interoceptive  
65 autonomic perceptual mismatch.

66 Dysautonomia in hypermobility may manifest as a consequence of reactive autonomic regulation of less elastic vascular  
67 tissues [28, 29]. Imprecise feedback control of peripheral blood flow putatively results in physiological symptoms and  
68 compensatory autonomic and behavioural responses. These can be interpreted as feelings of distress [30]. Peripheral  
69 autonomic dysregulation increases interoceptive surprise, wherein despite a relative reduction in interoceptive accuracy,  
70 there is a subjective overestimation of confidence in perceiving interoceptive experiences. Such frequent unanticipated  
71 feelings of arousal may fuel negative affect including anxiety [28, 31].

72 Hypermobile individuals show higher subjective sensitivity to interoceptive sensations [29] and interoceptive accuracy  
73 influences the relationship between hypermobility and anxiety level [32]. Based on these observations, we predicted the  
74 important interaction between autonomic perceptual mismatch, hypermobility and anxiety will be evident in distinct  
75 brain activation patterns.

76 Orthostatic intolerance (OI) is the onset of autonomic symptoms upon standing, such as palpitations and dizziness,  
77 typically associated with increased heart rate and low blood pressure [33]. OI represents a quantifiable measure of  
78 dysautonomia [10, 11, 34], has a 78% prevalence in hypermobility [35] and symptoms are higher in anxious individuals  
79 [11]. Notably, OI mediates the relationship between hypermobility and diagnosis of anxiety [20], substantiating the  
80 premise of altered connective tissue impeding autonomic function.

81 Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) has shown engagement of the same brain regions during anxiety states  
82 that support interoceptive representations and autonomic control in the limbic system [7]. The insula cortex is a putative  
83 mismatch computation site, shown to respond to altered physiological feedback and relay information to anterior  
84 cingulate cortex [36, 37].

85 To date, few brain imaging studies have examined neural mechanisms that may link hypermobility to anxiety through  
86 interoception. The presence of hypermobility increases reactivity within insula and related regions associated with  
87 anxiety [32]. Hypermobility has also been associated with increased bilateral amygdala volume [29] structural

88 differences within insula, correlating with increased orthostatic heart rate and interoceptive accuracy in anxious-  
89 hypermobile participants [38].

90 The present study investigated the brain substrates of autonomic perceptual mismatch using the hypermobility-anxiety  
91 interaction as a clinical model. Using fMRI to identify patterns of regional neural activity that correlate with APM  
92 in the anxiety-hypermobility interaction, we hope to characterise the neural mechanisms that can ultimately inform  
93 precision healthcare.

## 94 **2 Materials and Methodology**

95 **Participants and psychometric measures** Fifty-one participants, matched for age and gender, were recruited to  
96 the study at the Clinical Imaging Sciences Centre at the University of Sussex (Brighton, UK). Of the participants, 26  
97 (51.0%) (mean age 41.4 12.2 SEM, 9 male) had a diagnosis of generalised anxiety disorder (DSM-IV) as confirmed by a  
98 clinician using the Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI; [39]). The remaining 25 (49.0%) participants  
99 (37.8 14.4, 14 male) were healthy controls with no diagnosed psychiatric condition. The Brighton diagnostic criteria  
100 [40] was applied to the classification of hypermobility. Of those with a diagnosis of generalised anxiety disorder, 18  
101 (69.2%) were classified as hypermobile. Six (24.0%) of the healthy controls were classed as hypermobile.

102 Participant exclusion criteria included MRI incompatibility, neurological condition and any other psychiatric condition  
103 except anxiety and depression in the anxious group. In addition to categorical classification of anxiety and/or hyper-  
104 mobility status, the Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI; [41]) and the Beighton scale of joint laxity (BS; [42]) were used  
105 to quantify the degree of anxiety and hypermobility respectively. Subjective scores for orthostatic intolerance were  
106 recorded using the orthostatic subscale of the Autonomic Symptoms and Quality of Life scale (AQQoL; [43]).

107 Clinically anxious participants were recruited from Sussex Partnership NHS trust and via electric bulletin boards.  
108 Controls were recruited via bulletin boards at Sussex and Brighton Universities. The study procedure was ethically  
109 approved by the Brighton and Hove NRES committee (ref 12/LO/1942).

110 **Statistical Analyses** Behavioural results were first assessed using bivariate correlations between continuous variables,  
111 autonomic perceptual mismatch and anxiety score. Subsequently, independent samples t-tests (two-tailed) were  
112 performed to investigate differences in mean autonomic perceptual mismatch scores for hypermobile and anxious  
113 participants versus controls. Psychophysiological interactions were computed using univariate interaction analyses  
114 in the General Linear Model (GLM). Variables were entered as fixed factors (categorical) or dependent variables  
115 (continuous), and perceptual mismatch was entered as the covariate. Sum-of-squares Type III method was used with  
116 intercept included in the model.

117 **Autonomic perceptual mismatch computed as orthostatic intolerance mismatch** Objective autonomic testing  
118 was performed using an active stand test of orthostatic intolerance, which measured heart rate (HR) change from lying  
119 down to one of minute standing. Participant heart rates were recorded using a pulse oximeter (NONIN, Nonin Medical,

120 Minnesota, USA). Heart rates from lying to standing were recorded at baseline, peak and after one minute of standing.  
121 Changes in heart rate for each participant were calculated as absolute values and proportional to baseline for peak rate  
122 or rate after standing. Subjective scores for orthostatic intolerance were recorded based on the autonomic subsection of  
123 the AQQoLS.

124 Autonomic perceptual mismatch was computed as the mismatch between signs (OI stand test) and symptoms (AQQoLS)  
125 of orthostatic intolerance in the same framework as interoceptive trait prediction error [12]. This was calculated as

$$abs[Z(\text{proportionalHRchange}) - Z(\text{AQQoLscore})] \quad (1)$$

126 where Z is the standard Z-score. Absolute values were used to investigate the magnitude of error with neural activation.  
127 Final APM scores were assigned to participants as the transformed mismatch between orthostatic intolerance signs and  
128 symptoms, as a type of interoceptive prediction error. The results of all autonomic testing are available in Supplementary  
129 Table 1.

130 **Neuroimaging paradigm: Stimuli and experimental design** The in-scanner task was modified from Umeda et al.  
131 (2009)[44]. Emotional faces were selected and grouped into five classes (angry, afraid, disgusted, neutral, happy) from  
132 the Karolinska Directed Emotional Faces (KDEF; [45]). Faces were presented in an event-related design and were  
133 randomised and counter-balanced across runs. Attendance to faces was ensured by asking participants to determine  
134 whether they could see teeth in the faces or not. In total there were 96 trials per participant; there were 15 trials per  
135 class of emotional face and 21 fixation cross trials used as the implicit baseline which served as the control condition.  
136 Each stochastically ordered trial was 4 seconds long, during which the face remained on screen, and the participant was  
137 expected to respond. The fixation cross duration was also 4 seconds in duration. A total run lasted 384s (6m 24s) and  
138 each participant underwent two runs of the emotional faces task.

139 **Image Acquisition** Neuroimaging took place using a 1.5 Tesla Siemens Avanto Scanner with a 32-channel head  
140 coil (Siemens Medical Solutions, Erlangen, Germany). T1 structural scans were first acquired for each participant  
141 using a magnetisation-prepared rapid gradient-echo acquisition (repetition time TR = 2.73s per volume, echo time TE =  
142 3.57msec, inversion time = 1000ms, flip angle = 7°). T2\*-weighted whole-brain functional scans were taken using a  
143 single-shot 2D gradient echo-planar imaging (EPI) sequence. For the functional scans, voxel sizes were 3x3x3mm,  
144 repetition time TR = 2.52s per volume, echo time TE = 43ms. 34 axial slices of 3mm thickness and 0.6mm interslice  
145 gap were taken. Slices were tilted at a 30° flip angle from the intercommissural plane to minimise signal artefacts.

146 **Pre-processing** Imaging data were processed in SPM12 (<http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm>) on MATLAB R2021b  
147 (v9.9.0 Mathworks Inc.). Echo planar images were realigned to the mean image for motion correction, scanner drift and  
148 variation. Slice-time correction to slice 6 (which aligned with amygdala) and was performed for all volumes to remove  
149 artefacts. The first two volumes were discarded for scanner equilibration. T2\*-functional scans were co-registered with

150 T1-structural scans for each participant. Images were normalised to the MNI-152 (Montreal Neurologic Institute) brain  
151 space. Spatiotemporal variation was reduced by smoothing the data using an 8mm full-width half-maximum Gaussian  
152 smoothing kernel filter.

153 **Univariate neuroimaging analysis** First- and second-level designs were implemented and analysed under the general  
154 linear model (GLM) in SPM12 on the whole brain. First-level modelling included a regressor for each of the five  
155 emotional face conditions and the implicit baseline (control condition) of each individual. Participant motion from image  
156 realignment (3 translations and 3 rotations) was included as six regressors of no interest for each participant at the first  
157 level. Statistical comparison of voxel-wise parameters was conducted for first-level contrasts within subjects (emotional  
158 face>baseline), and these contrasts for the five emotions were entered into the second level where a full-factorial design  
159 (2x2x5) was used for component interaction analysis.

160 The first factor had two levels (hypermobile, non-hypermobile), the second factor had two levels (anxious, non-anxious)  
161 and the third factor had five levels (angry, afraid, happy, neutral, sad). Regressors were entered for age and gender. In  
162 this second-level model, autonomic perceptual mismatch was added as a covariate to investigate the correlations and  
163 interactions of autonomic perceptual mismatch on hypermobility and anxiety. All covariates were mean-centred at zero.  
164 Statistical comparison of voxel-wise parameters was conducted for second-level contrasts between subjects  
165 (anxious>non-anxious), (hypermobile>non-hypermobile). A family-wise error cluster correction (FWEc) was per-  
166 formed on the whole brain at  $P<0.05$  to correct for multiple comparisons. This reduced the likelihood of type-I errors,  
167 thus minimising false positives. A cluster-forming threshold of  $P<0.001$  for cluster-wise false discovery rate (FDR) was  
168 applied to statistical contrast images. Brain activations were interpreted as clusters that produced a significant change in  
169 BOLD response to the emotional faces fMRI task (relative to the baseline of fixation cross).

170 Clusters were anatomically defined using the SPM Anatomy toolbox v3.0 (Eickhoff et al., 2007). Where labelling  
171 was not available in the anatomy toolbox, the Harvard-Oxford anatomical atlas was used by overlaying the relevant  
172 t-contrasts onto the ‘ch2better’ template on MRIcron v1.0.20190902 (Rorden and Brett, 2000).

173 For each participant, the eigenvariates were extracted as the weighted mean of the Blood-Oxygen-Level-Dependency  
174 (BOLD) time series from the peaks of activation by entering ‘»clustermean=mean(xY.y)’ into the command window of  
175 MATLAB. Eigenvariates were averaged over the five conditions for each participant for each t-contrast of interest and  
176 used to generate scatter plots against autonomic perceptual mismatch.

177 **Mediation** The interaction between hypermobility, autonomic perceptual mismatch and anxiety was investigated  
178 further as a secondary analysis using a Baron and Kenny (1986)[46] mediation analysis. Mediation testing conducts  
179 three regression correlations between pairs of variables. If when controlling for one factor (the potential mediator),  
180 the correlation between the remaining factors is reduced, then the controlled factor is said to partially mediate their  
181 relationship. Based on previous findings that autonomic dysfunction mediates the anxiety-laxity link [20], we entered  
182 APM as our model mediator. Consistent with development chronology, hypermobility (status and score) was employed

183 as the independent variable, appearing in early childhood [27, 47]. Anxiety manifests later, thus being entered as the  
184 dependent or outcome variable.

### 185 3 Results

#### 186 3.1 Autonomic testing

187 **Orthostatic intolerance mismatch** Both signs (Figure 1A) and symptom scores (Figure 1B) of orthostatic intolerance  
188 were higher in anxious-hypermobile participants indicating a possible ‘mismatch error’ of autonomic dysfunction




Figure 1: Orthostatic Intolerance (OI) in Hypermobility and Anxiety. Objective OI sign measured as the absolute heart rate change after 1 min sitting to standing (A). Subjective OI symptom score from the AQQoLS (B). Error bars represent  $\pm 1SE$ .

189 **Phenotypic correlations of autonomic perceptual mismatch** Anxiety score was positively correlated with autonomic  
190 perceptual mismatch across all participants ( $R_{pcc}=0.425$ ,  $P=0.002$ , Figure 2A). When subgrouping by clinical anxiety  
191 status, the positive correlation of autonomic perceptual mismatch with anxiety score was significantly higher in those  
192 with anxiety (independent samples t-test;  $t=-2.964$ ,  $p=0.005$ ,  $SED=0.149$ , Figure 2B). Similarly, the hypermobile  
193 group showed a significantly stronger positive correlation between anxiety score and autonomic perceptual mismatch  
194 (independent samples t-test;  $t=-2.13$ ,  $p=0.038$ ,  $SED=0.155$ , Figure 2C).

195 GLM univariate analysis demonstrated a significant interaction between hypermobility and anxiety on autonomic  
196 perceptual mismatch (Figure 3,  $F=6.04$ ,  $p=0.002$ ). A significant interaction between hypermobility and autonomic  
197 perceptual mismatch was found on anxiety status ( $F=7.66$ ,  $p=0.008$ ). This interaction effect was also found on anxiety  
198 score ( $F=4.20$ ,  $p=0.046$ ) with a main effect of autonomic perceptual mismatch ( $F=5.70$ ,  $p=0.021$ ). There was no  
199 significant interaction between anxiety status and autonomic perceptual mismatch on hypermobility.




Figure 2: Autonomic perceptual mismatch in the hypermobility-anxiety association. Autonomic perceptual mismatch correlates with anxiety score (A). Anxiety score is higher with increased autonomic perceptual mismatch in clinically anxious (B) and hypermobile (C) individuals.




Figure 3: The hypermobility-anxiety interaction on autonomic perceptual mismatch. Participants classed as anxious-hypermobile have significantly higher APM scores. Bars represent  $\pm 1SE$ .

200 The APM score for one participant fell above the 95% percentile (APM = 2.56, Supplementary Table 1). Although still  
201 representable of an extreme case of perceptual mismatch in anxiety, we excluded the results of this individual from  
202 subsequent statistical neuroimaging analyses. The significant interaction in figure 3 between anxiety and hypermobility  
203 on APM remained after exclusion of this participant from the data.

### 204 3.2 Univariate functional neuroimaging

205 **Neural correlations with autonomic perceptual mismatch** The first t-contrasts modelled the BOLD response to  
206 emotional faces to identify significant clusters of activation that varied with autonomic perceptual mismatch when  
207 added as a covariate to the second-level model. Activations were across all individuals, including controls. Autonomic



208 perceptual mismatch correlated with response to emotional faces in the inferior frontal gyrus (pars triangularis and pars  
209 opercularis) and middle insular cortex. Full results of all imaged activations are available in Supplementary Table 2.

210 **Interaction with anxiety** The interaction of anxiety and autonomic perceptual mismatch produced a positive response  
211 (regions showing increased activation with APM in anxious participants) within the right anterior cingulate gyrus  
212 (Figure 4A) and left middle insular cortex (Figure 4B). Autonomic perceptual mismatch produced a negative response  
213 in the right inferior frontal gyrus (Figure 4C) and anterior mid-cingulate cortex (Figure 4D) in anxious participants.  
214 Weighted mean BOLD estimates for the anterior cingulate gyrus and mid-insula were positively correlated with APM;  
215 inferior frontal gyrus and mid-cingulate estimates were negatively correlated with APM in anxiety (Figure 4E).

216 **Interaction with hypermobility** The interaction of hypermobility and autonomic perceptual mismatch produced a  
217 positive response (regions showing increased activation with APM in hypermobile participants) in the left mid-cingulate  
218 gyrus (Figure 5A). Autonomic perceptual mismatch produced a negative response in the left inferior frontal gyrus in  
219 hypermobile participants (Figure 5B). Weighted mean BOLD estimate for the anterior cingulate gyrus was positively  
220 correlated with autonomic perceptual mismatch and inferior frontal gyrus estimates was negatively correlated in  
221 hypermobility (Figure 5C).

222 **Mediation** Upon mediation testing, we found autonomic perceptual mismatch to partially mediate the relationship  
223 between hypermobility and anxiety status (Figure 6A; categorical variables) when controlled for. Autonomic perceptual  
224 mismatch fully mediated the relationship between hypermobility and anxiety scores (Figure 6B; continuous variables)  
225 when controlled for.




Figure 4: T-contrast estimates of the interaction between anxiety and autonomic perceptual mismatch. Emotional face stimuli increased activation in the anterior cingulate (A) and mid-insula (B). Activation was decreased in the IFG (C) and mid-cingulate (D). Colour bars represent peak-level t-statistics at FWEc  $P < 0.05$ . Crosshairs represent MNI co-ordinates of cluster peak activation. Scatter plots show the interaction between APM and anxiety at mean peak-clusters of activation from extracted eigenvariates (E).




Figure 5: T-contrast estimates of the interaction between hypermobility and autonomic perceptual mismatch. Emotional face stimuli induced an increased response in the anterior cingulate (A) and reduced response in the IFG (B). Colour bars represent peak-level t-statistics at FWEc  $P < 0.05$ . Crosshairs represent MNI co-ordinates of cluster peak activation. Scatter plots show the interaction between APM and hypermobility at mean peak-clusters of activation from extracted eigenvariates (C).




Figure 6: Baron and Kenny mediation. Partial mediation of APM on effect of hypermobility status on anxiety status (A). Full mediation of APM on effect of Beighton score on Beck's anxiety score (B). Reported correlations are standardised beta coefficients.

## 226 **4 Discussion**

227 Autonomic perceptual mismatch is a novel measure of dysautonomia that builds upon the interoceptive predictive  
228 coding framework. Our research has shown that autonomic perceptual mismatch implicates functional brain activity and  
229 is positively associated with anxiety. In a clinical sample, we provide evidence that dysautonomia may be a mechanism  
230 by which hypermobility evokes anxiety through a discrete set of brain regions that support interoceptive representation  
231 and autonomic control.

232 Our findings are consistent with prior research which showed differences in brain activity and a mediating effect of  
233 objective interoception on anxiety, in a non-clinical hypermobile group [32]. However, this previous study did not  
234 consider the mismatch between objective and subjective awareness.

235 **Altered emotion-autonomic processing in anterior cingulate cortex** Increased anterior cingulate cortex (ACC)  
236 activation was observed in both anxious and hypermobile participants with autonomic perceptual mismatch. ACC is  
237 implicated in emotion processing, particularly negative emotions like anxiety, and interoceptive accuracy [2, 48–50].  
238 Imaging studies demonstrate high ACC activity in people with high trait anxiety and involvement in the physiological  
239 response to stress as a locus of autonomic regulation [51–55]. Our findings support the significant role of ACC in  
240 emotion-autonomic regulation, contributing to the development and persistence of anxiety disorders.

241 **A role of mid-insula in interoceptive anxiety** Interestingly, we found a positive response to emotional faces in the  
242 middle insula cortex in the interaction of APM with anxiety. Mid-insula is often overlooked in interoception research,  
243 as the focus is usually on anterior insula as the mismatch comparator [8, 15, 36, 56]. However, some hypotheses suggest  
244 mid-insula to implicate polymodal integration of emotion-interoception processing, with somatosensory and bodily  
245 afferent information projecting to the anterior insula to inform emotional experience and intensity [57–61]. Functional  
246 connections also exist to cingulate and frontal cortices, where autonomic control pertaining to interoceptive information  
247 is elicited and feedback integrated [56, 62–64].

248 Mid-insula is commonly activated in interoceptive neural activations across psychiatric conditions [65]. Its activity  
249 correlates with interoceptive accuracy and anxiety scores, indicating a role in anxiety-related interoception [37].  
250 The insula is functionally graded, with the mid lobe as an intermediary structure [66]. Interoceptive responses to bodily  
251 awareness and organ distension follow this graded response [2, 67].

252 Paulus and Khalsa (2021[56]) propose re-evaluating the mid-insula's role in integrating autonomic-interoceptive  
253 information. Our observed activity patterns suggest potential alterations of this integration, which could result in  
254 mismatched models in the brain and symptom anxiety, as per the IPC framework. The mid-insula's connections to  
255 cingulate and frontal regions may contribute to this effect.

256 **Reduced frontal control may predispose anxious symptoms** Our study revealed reduced response in a distinct  
257 cluster in the anterior mid-cingulate cortex (aMCC) in the interaction of APM with anxiety. aMCC is linked to cognitive

258 function and error detection, co-activating and functionally connected to insula cortex [1, 51, 62, 68–70]. Important for  
259 pain perception [71–74], attenuation of aMCC activity demonstrated reduced awareness of error detection [75]. aMCC  
260 is also a key locus of the Salience Network for internal-external stimulus recognition [36, 76]. In line with this work,  
261 our observation suggests that reduced activity of the mid-cingulate may induce perceptual mismatch through altered  
262 error detection. Connectivity and co-activation to insula may be a path to the onset of subsequent anxious symptoms.

263 We observed reduced activation of bilateral inferior frontal gyri (IFG) with autonomic perceptual mismatch in both  
264 hypermobile and anxious individuals. IFG is associated with a variety of cognitive functions such as emotion regulation  
265 and response inhibition [77, 78]. IFG is functionally connected to the insula, playing a role in visceromotor-autonomic  
266 functioning [79]. Thus, perceptual mismatch may implicate these functional networks, resulting in altered autonomic  
267 function and related cognitive processes. The accumulation of interoceptive errors may contribute to decision-making  
268 errors at a higher level, potentially exacerbating anxiety. However, further research is needed to investigate the  
269 mechanisms underlying emotion-autonomic processing in networks involving IFG and insular cortex.

270 **Dysautonomia as a mediator in brain-body interactions** We demonstrate that autonomic perceptual mismatch  
271 mediates the effect of hypermobility on anxiety. Our study adds to existing evidence that interoceptive accuracy [32]  
272 and orthostatic symptoms [20] mediate this association. We have employed the interoceptive mismatch framework  
273 [14], to elucidate the underlying mechanism of this relationship. Our findings support the hypothesis that dysautonomia  
274 in hypermobile individuals, resulting from altered vascular collagen [28], may explain the observed overlap between  
275 hypermobility and anxiety.

276 **Clinical relevance to the anxiety-hypermobility link** The link between connective tissue disorders and psychiatric  
277 conditions requires a holistic approach to understanding brain-body interactions. The ‘Neuroconnective phenotype’ [26,  
278 80] is a clinical recognition of the hypermobility-anxiety link that combines somatic and sensory symptoms, behaviour,  
279 psychiatry and neurodevelopmental conditions [21, 81]. Autonomic symptoms are higher in neurodevelopmental  
280 conditions [20, 81, 82]) and autism is overrepresented by up to 52% in hypermobility [83].

281 Our work utilising the Neuroconnective model suggests that somatic symptoms may be linked to differences in sensory  
282 processing, which is common to autism and hypermobility, but needs further empirical research. These findings  
283 highlight the need for personalised screening for various conditions in those displaying autonomic dysfunction in  
284 hypermobility.

285 We did not consider the influence of medication on our results. Hypermobile individuals are more likely to be  
286 prescribed psychotropic drugs [47], which can increase autonomic symptoms and dysfunction to varying degrees [28].  
287 Nonetheless, Eccles (2016;[28]) demonstrated that robust differences in autonomic function of hypermobile individuals  
288 exist regardless of medication status. Exploring medication effect on brain function in the context of hypermobility and  
289 autonomic dysfunction may implicate personalised treatments and phenotyping that account for individual responses to  
290 psychotropic medication.

291 **Conclusions** Our study demonstrates how autonomic dysfunction affects neural activity in emotion-processing and  
292 cognitive control regions in hypermobility and anxiety. These findings offer a mechanistic explanation by which  
293 imprecise autonomic interoceptive signals from bodily afferents manifest as anxiety through autonomic mediation.  
294 The involvement of mid-insula in polymodal error weighting provides novel evidence for interoceptive predictive  
295 coding models. These findings have important implications for brain-body interactions in connective tissue disorders  
296 contributing to anxiety symptomatology.

## 297 **References**

- 298 [1] Craig, A. “How Do You Feel — Now? The Anterior Insula and Human Awareness”. In: *Nature Reviews*  
299 *Neuroscience* 10.1 (1 Jan. 2009), pp. 59–70. DOI: 10.1038/nrn2555.
- 300 [2] Critchley, H. D. et al. “Neural Systems Supporting Interoceptive Awareness”. In: *Nature Neuroscience* 7.2 (2  
301 Feb. 2004), pp. 189–195. DOI: 10.1038/nn1176.
- 302 [3] Seth, A. K. and Critchley, H. D. “Extending Predictive Processing to the Body: Emotion as Interoceptive Infer-  
303 ence”. In: *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36.3 (June 2013), pp. 227–228. DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X12002270.
- 304 [4] Damasio, A. R. *The feeling of what happens: Body and emotion in the making of consciousness*. Houghton  
305 Mifflin Harcourt, 1999.
- 306 [5] Sterling, P. “Allostasis: A Model of Predictive Regulation”. In: *Physiology & Behavior*. Allostasis and Allostatic  
307 Load 106.1 (Apr. 12, 2012), pp. 5–15. DOI: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2011.06.004.
- 308 [6] Ueno, D., Ohira, H., and Narumoto, J. “Editorial: Interoception and the Autonomic Nervous System: Investigating  
309 Affect, Decision-Making, and Mental Health”. In: *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 16 (2023).
- 310 [7] Critchley, H. D. “Neural Mechanisms of Autonomic, Affective, and Cognitive Integration”. In: *Journal of*  
311 *Comparative Neurology* 493.1 (2005), pp. 154–166. DOI: 10.1002/cne.20749.
- 312 [8] Paulus, M. P. and Stein, M. B. “An Insular View of Anxiety”. In: *Biological Psychiatry* 60.4 (Aug. 15, 2006),  
313 pp. 383–387. DOI: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.03.042.
- 314 [9] Critchley, H. D. and Garfinkel, S. N. “Interoception and Emotion”. In: *Current Opinion in Psychology*. Emotion  
315 17 (Oct. 1, 2017), pp. 7–14. DOI: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.04.020.
- 316 [10] Owens, A. P. et al. “Emotional Orienting during Interoceptive Threat in Orthostatic Intolerance: Dysauto-  
317 nomic Contributions to Psychological Symptomatology in the Postural Tachycardia Syndrome and Vaso-  
318 vagal Syncope”. In: *Autonomic Neuroscience: Basic and Clinical* 212 (July 1, 2018), pp. 42–47. DOI:  
319 10.1016/j.autneu.2018.01.004. pmid: 29519640.
- 320 [11] Owens, A. P. et al. “The Genesis and Presentation of Anxiety in Disorders of Autonomic Overexcitation”. In:  
321 *Autonomic Neuroscience: Basic and Clinical* 203 (Mar. 1, 2017), pp. 81–87. DOI: 10.1016/j.autneu.2016.10.004.  
322 pmid: 27865628.

- 323 [12] Garfinkel, S. N. et al. “Knowing Your Own Heart: Distinguishing Interoceptive Accuracy from Interoceptive  
324 Awareness”. In: *Biological Psychology* 104 (Jan. 1, 2015), pp. 65–74. DOI: 10.1016/j.biopsycho.2014.11.004.
- 325 [13] Porges, S. “Body perception questionnaire”. In: *Laboratory of Developmental Assessment, University of Maryland*  
326 10 (1993), s15327752jpa5304\_1.
- 327 [14] Garfinkel, S. N. et al. “Interoceptive Dimensions across Cardiac and Respiratory Axes”. In: *Philosophi-  
328 cal Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 371.1708 (Nov. 19, 2016), p. 20160014. DOI:  
329 10.1098/rstb.2016.0014.
- 330 [15] Seth, A., Suzuki, K., and Critchley, H. “An Interoceptive Predictive Coding Model of Conscious Presence”. In:  
331 *Frontiers in Psychology* 2 (2012).
- 332 [16] Critchley, H. and Seth, A. “Will Studies of Macaque Insula Reveal the Neural Mechanisms of Self-Awareness?”  
333 In: *Neuron* 74.3 (May 10, 2012), pp. 423–426. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2012.04.012. pmid: 22578492.
- 334 [17] Clark, A. “Whatever next? Predictive Brains, Situated Agents, and the Future of Cognitive Science”. In: *Behav-  
335 ioral and Brain Sciences* 36.3 (June 2013), pp. 181–204. DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X12000477.
- 336 [18] Bulbena, A. et al. “Anxiety Disorders in the Joint Hypermobility Syndrome”. In: *Psychiatry Research* 46.1  
337 (Jan. 1, 1993), pp. 59–68. DOI: 10.1016/0165-1781(93)90008-5.
- 338 [19] Baeza-Velasco, C. et al. “Association between Psychopathological Factors and Joint Hypermobility Syndrome in  
339 a Group of Undergraduates from a French University”. In: *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine* 41.2  
340 (2011), pp. 187–201. DOI: 10.2190/PM.41.2.g. pmid: 21675349.
- 341 [20] Csecs, J. L. L. et al. “Joint Hypermobility Links Neurodivergence to Dysautonomia and Pain”. In: *Frontiers in*  
342 *Psychiatry* 12 (2022).
- 343 [21] Casanova, E. L. et al. “The Relationship between Autism and Ehlers-Danlos Syndromes/Hypermobility Spectrum  
344 Disorders”. In: *Journal of Personalized Medicine* 10.4 (4 Dec. 2020), p. 260. DOI: 10.3390/jpm10040260.
- 345 [22] Bulbena, A. et al. “Joint Hypermobility, Anxiety and Psychosomatics: Two and a Half Decades of Progress  
346 Toward a New Phenotype”. In: (Mar. 24, 2015). DOI: 10.1159/000369113.
- 347 [23] Castori, M. “Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome, Hypermobility Type: An Underdiagnosed Hereditary Connective Tissue  
348 Disorder with Mucocutaneous, Articular, and Systemic Manifestations”. In: *International Scholarly Research*  
349 *Notices* 2012 (Nov. 22, 2012), e751768. DOI: 10.5402/2012/751768.
- 350 [24] Bulbena-Cabre, A. and Bulbena, A. “Anxiety and Joint Hypermobility: An Unexpected Association: Examining  
351 This Link Can Improve Diagnosis and Treatment of Both Disorders”. In: *Current Psychiatry* 17.4 (Apr. 1, 2018),  
352 pp. 15–22.
- 353 [25] Eccles, J. A. et al. “Beyond Bones: The Relevance of Variants of Connective Tissue (Hypermobility) to Fi-  
354 bromyalgia, ME/CFS and Controversies Surrounding Diagnostic Classification: An Observational Study”. In:  
355 *Clinical Medicine* 21.1 (Jan. 1, 2021), pp. 53–58. DOI: 10.7861/clinmed.2020-0743. pmid: 33479068.

- 356 [26] Bulbena-Cabré, A. et al. “Updates on the Psychological and Psychiatric Aspects of the Ehlers–Danlos Syndromes  
357 and Hypermobility Spectrum Disorders”. In: *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part C: Seminars in Medical  
358 Genetics* 187.4 (2021), pp. 482–490. DOI: 10.1002/ajmg.c.31955.
- 359 [27] García Campayo, J. et al. “Association Between Joint Hypermobility Syndrome and Panic Disorder: A  
360 Case–Control Study”. In: *Psychosomatics* 51.1 (Jan. 1, 2010), pp. 55–61. DOI: 10.1016/S0033-3182(10)70659-9.
- 361 [28] Eccles, J. A. “Hypermobility and Autonomic Hyperactivity : Relevance for the Expression of Psychiatric  
362 Symptoms”. PhD thesis. University of Brighton, 2016.
- 363 [29] Eccles, J. A. et al. “Brain Structure and Joint Hypermobility: Relevance to the Expression of Psychiatric Sym-  
364 toms”. In: *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 200.6 (June 2012), pp. 508–509. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.111.092460.
- 365 [30] Sharp, H. E. C., Critchley, H. D., and Eccles, J. A. “Connecting Brain and Body: Transdiagnostic Relevance of  
366 Connective Tissue Variants to Neuropsychiatric Symptom Expression”. In: *World Journal of Psychiatry* 11.10  
367 (Oct. 19, 2021), pp. 805–820. DOI: 10.5498/wjp.v11.i10.805.
- 368 [31] Pollatos, O., Gramann, K., and Schandry, R. “Neural Systems Connecting Interoceptive Awareness and Feelings”.  
369 In: *Human Brain Mapping* 28.1 (2007), pp. 9–18. DOI: 10.1002/hbm.20258.
- 370 [32] Mallorquí-Bagué, N. et al. “Neuroimaging and Psychophysiological Investigation of the Link between Anxiety,  
371 Enhanced Affective Reactivity and Interoception in People with Joint Hypermobility”. In: *Frontiers in Psychology*  
372 5 (2014).
- 373 [33] Nilsson, D. et al. “Orthostatic Changes in Hemodynamics and Cardiovascular Biomarkers in Dysautonomic  
374 Patients”. In: *PLOS ONE* 10.6 (June 8, 2015), e0128962. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128962.
- 375 [34] Aslanyan, D. et al. *Dissociative Experiences in Fibromyalgia Are Mediated by Symptoms of Autonomic Dys-  
376 function*. Sept. 11, 2019. DOI: 10.1101/19006320. URL: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/  
377 19006320v1](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/19006320v1) (visited on 05/19/2023). preprint.
- 378 [35] Gazit, Y. et al. “Dysautonomia in the Joint Hypermobility Syndrome”. In: *The American Journal of Medicine*  
379 115.1 (July 1, 2003), pp. 33–40. DOI: 10.1016/S0002-9343(03)00235-3.
- 380 [36] Menon, V. and Uddin, L. Q. “Saliency, Switching, Attention and Control: A Network Model of Insula Function”.  
381 In: *Brain Structure and Function* 214.5 (June 1, 2010), pp. 655–667. DOI: 10.1007/s00429-010-0262-0.
- 382 [37] Tan, Y. et al. “The Role of Mid-Insula in the Relationship between Cardiac Interoceptive Attention and Anxiety:  
383 Evidence from an fMRI Study”. In: *Scientific Reports* 8.1 (1 Nov. 22, 2018), p. 17280. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-  
384 018-35635-6.
- 385 [38] Eccles, J. et al. “Joint Hypermobility Syndrome and Anxiety Disorder: Structural Brain Correlates”. In: *European  
386 Psychiatry* 41.S1 (Apr. 2017), S233–S234. DOI: 10.1016/j.eurpsy.2017.01.2246.
- 387 [39] Sheehan, D. V. et al. “The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI): the development and validation  
388 of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10”. In: *Journal of clinical psychiatry*  
389 59.20 (1998), pp. 22–33.



- 390 [40] Grahame, R., Bird, H. A., and Child, A. “The Revised (Brighton 1998) Criteria for the Diagnosis of Benign Joint  
391 Hypermobility Syndrome (BJHS)”. In: *The Journal of Rheumatology* 27.7 (July 2000), pp. 1777–1779. pmid:  
392 10914867.
- 393 [41] Beck, A. T. et al. “An Inventory for Measuring Clinical Anxiety: Psychometric Properties”. In: *Journal of*  
394 *Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 56 (1988), pp. 893–897. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006X.56.6.893.
- 395 [42] Beighton, P., Solomon, L., and Soskolne, C. L. “Articular Mobility in an African Population.” In: *Annals of the*  
396 *Rheumatic Diseases* 32.5 (Sept. 1973), pp. 413–418. pmid: 4751776.
- 397 [43] Iodice, V. “The Postural Tachycardia Syndrome: A Multi-System Condition. Clinical Features, Pathophysiology,  
398 Genetics and Novel Treatment”. In: (Dec. 2013). DOI: 10.25560/38561.
- 399 [44] Umeda, S. et al. “Functional MRI investigations of emotional processing and autonomic responses in patients  
400 with autonomic hyperactivity”. In: *Neuroimage* 47.Supp 1 (2009), S39–S41.
- 401 [45] Goeleven, E. et al. “The Karolinska Directed Emotional Faces: A Validation Study”. In: *Cognition and Emotion*  
402 22.6 (Sept. 1, 2008), pp. 1094–1118. DOI: 10.1080/02699930701626582.
- 403 [46] Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A. “The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research:  
404 Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations”. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51.6  
405 (Dec. 1986), pp. 1173–1182. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.51.6.1173. pmid: 3806354.
- 406 [47] Bulbena, A. et al. “Joint Hypermobility Syndrome Is a Risk Factor Trait for Anxiety Disorders: A 15-  
407 Year Follow-up Cohort Study”. In: *General Hospital Psychiatry* 33.4 (July 1, 2011), pp. 363–370. DOI:  
408 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2011.03.004.
- 409 [48] Drevets, W. C. et al. “Pet Imaging of Serotonin 1A Receptor Binding in Depression”. In: *Biological Psychiatry*  
410 46.10 (Nov. 15, 1999), pp. 1375–1387. DOI: 10.1016/S0006-3223(99)00189-4.
- 411 [49] Mayberg, H. S. et al. “Cingulate Function in Depression: A Potential Predictor of Treatment Response”. In:  
412 *NeuroReport* 8.4 (Mar. 3, 1997), p. 1057.
- 413 [50] Mayberg, H. S. et al. “Regional Metabolic Effects of Fluoxetine in Major Depression: Serial Changes and Rela-  
414 tionship to Clinical Response”. In: *Biological Psychiatry* 48.8 (Oct. 15, 2000), pp. 830–843. DOI: 10.1016/S0006-  
415 3223(00)01036-2.
- 416 [51] Critchley, H. D. et al. “Human Cingulate Cortex and Autonomic Control: Converging Neuroimaging and Clinical  
417 Evidence”. In: *Brain* 126.10 (Oct. 1, 2003), pp. 2139–2152. DOI: 10.1093/brain/awg216.
- 418 [52] Wager, T. D. et al. “Brain Mediators of Cardiovascular Responses to Social Threat: Part I: Reciprocal Dorsal and  
419 Ventral Sub-Regions of the Medial Prefrontal Cortex and Heart-Rate Reactivity”. In: *NeuroImage. Brain Body*  
420 *Medicine* 47.3 (Sept. 1, 2009), pp. 821–835. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.05.043.
- 421 [53] Wang, L., LaBar, K. S., and McCarthy, G. “Mood Alters Amygdala Activation to Sad Distractors  
422 during an Attentional Task”. In: *Biological Psychiatry* 60.10 (Nov. 15, 2006), pp. 1139–1146. DOI:  
423 10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.01.021. pmid: 16713587.

- 424 [54] Nitschke, J. B. et al. “Anticipatory Activation in the Amygdala and Anterior Cingulate in Generalized Anxiety  
425 Disorder and Prediction of Treatment Response”. In: *American Journal of Psychiatry* 166.3 (Mar. 2009), pp. 302–  
426 310. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2008.07101682.
- 427 [55] Drevets, W. C., Savitz, J., and Trimble, M. “The Subgenual Anterior Cingulate Cortex in Mood Disorders”. In:  
428 *CNS spectrums* 13.8 (Aug. 2008), pp. 663–681. DOI: 10.1017/s1092852900013754. pmid: 18704022.
- 429 [56] Paulus, M. P. and Khalsa, S. S. “When You Don’t Feel Right Inside: Homeostatic Dysregulation and the Mid-  
430 Insular Cortex in Psychiatric Disorders”. In: *American Journal of Psychiatry* 178.8 (Aug. 2021), pp. 683–685.  
431 DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2021.21060622.
- 432 [57] Kerr, K. L. et al. “Altered Insula Activity during Visceral Interoception in Weight-Restored Patients with Anorexia  
433 Nervosa”. In: *Neuropsychopharmacology* 41.2 (2 Jan. 2016), pp. 521–528. DOI: 10.1038/npp.2015.174.
- 434 [58] Kurth, F. et al. “A Link between the Systems: Functional Differentiation and Integration within the Human  
435 Insula Revealed by Meta-Analysis”. In: *Brain Structure and Function* 214.5 (June 1, 2010), pp. 519–534. DOI:  
436 10.1007/s00429-010-0255-z.
- 437 [59] Simmons, W. K. et al. “Keeping the Body in Mind: Insula Functional Organization and Functional Connectivity  
438 Integrate Interoceptive, Exteroceptive, and Emotional Awareness”. In: *Human Brain Mapping* 34.11 (June 13,  
439 2012), pp. 2944–2958. DOI: 10.1002/hbm.22113. pmid: 22696421.
- 440 [60] Craig, A. D. “How Do You Feel?: An Interoceptive Moment with Your Neurobiological Self”. In: *How Do You  
441 Feel?* Princeton University Press, Dec. 21, 2014. DOI: 10.1515/9781400852727.
- 442 [61] Wiech, K. et al. “Differential Structural and Resting State Connectivity between Insular Subdivisions and Other  
443 Pain-Related Brain Regions”. In: *PAIN* 155.10 (Oct. 2014), p. 2047. DOI: 10.1016/j.pain.2014.07.009.
- 444 [62] Taylor, K. S., Seminowicz, D. A., and Davis, K. D. “Two Systems of Resting State Connectivity between the Insula  
445 and Cingulate Cortex”. In: *Human brain mapping* 30.9 (Sept. 1, 2009), pp. 2731–2745. DOI: 10.1002/hbm.20705.  
446 pmid: 19072897.
- 447 [63] Vogt, B. A. “Chapter 3 - Cingulate Cortex in the Three Limbic Subsystems”. In: *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*.  
448 Ed. by Vogt, B. A. Vol. 166. Cingulate Cortex. Elsevier, Jan. 1, 2019, pp. 39–51. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-444-  
449 64196-0.00003-0.
- 450 [64] Reynolds, S. M. and Zahm, D. S. “Specificity in the Projections of Prefrontal and Insular Cortex to Ventral  
451 Striatopallidum and the Extended Amygdala”. In: *Journal of Neuroscience* 25.50 (Dec. 14, 2005), pp. 11757–  
452 11767. DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3432-05.2005. pmid: 16354934.
- 453 [65] Nord, C. L., Lawson, R. P., and Dalgleish, T. “Disrupted Dorsal Mid-Insula Activation During Interoception  
454 Across Psychiatric Disorders”. In: *American Journal of Psychiatry* 178.8 (Aug. 2021), pp. 761–770. DOI:  
455 10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20091340.
- 456 [66] Cloutman, L. L. et al. “The Variation of Function across the Human Insula Mirrors Its Patterns of Structural  
457 Connectivity: Evidence from in Vivo Probabilistic Tractography”. In: *NeuroImage* 59.4 (Feb. 15, 2012), pp. 3514–  
458 3521. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.11.016.

- 459 [67] Stephan, E. et al. “Functional Neuroimaging of Gastric Distention”. In: *Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery* 7.6  
460 (Sept. 1, 2003), pp. 740–749. DOI: 10.1016/S1091-255X(03)00071-4.
- 461 [68] Medford, N. and Critchley, H. D. “Conjoint Activity of Anterior Insular and Anterior Cingulate Cortex: Awareness  
462 and Response”. In: *Brain Structure and Function* 214.5 (June 1, 2010), pp. 535–549. DOI: 10.1007/s00429-010-  
463 0265-x.
- 464 [69] Deen, B., Pitskel, N. B., and Pelphey, K. A. “Three Systems of Insular Functional Connectivity Identified with  
465 Cluster Analysis”. In: *Cerebral Cortex* 21.7 (July 1, 2011), pp. 1498–1506. DOI: 10.1093/cercor/bhq186.
- 466 [70] Klein, T., Ullsperger, M., and Danielmeier, C. “Error Awareness and the Insula: Links to Neurological and  
467 Psychiatric Diseases”. In: *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 7 (2013).
- 468 [71] Vogt, B. A., Derbyshire, S., and Jones, A. K. P. “Pain Processing in Four Regions of Human Cingulate Cortex  
469 Localized with Co-registered PET and MR Imaging”. In: *European Journal of Neuroscience* 8.7 (1996), pp. 1461–  
470 1473. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.1996.tb01608.x.
- 471 [72] Vogt, B. A., Berger, G. R., and Derbyshire, S. W. G. “Structural and Functional Dichotomy of Human Mid-  
472 cingulate Cortex”. In: *European Journal of Neuroscience* 18.11 (2003), pp. 3134–3144. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-  
473 9568.2003.03034.x.
- 474 [73] Büchel, C. et al. “Brain Systems Mediating Aversive Conditioning: An Event-Related fMRI Study”. In: *Neuron*  
475 20.5 (May 1, 1998), pp. 947–957. DOI: 10.1016/S0896-6273(00)80476-6. pmid: 9620699.
- 476 [74] Büchel, C. et al. “Amygdala–Hippocampal Involvement in Human Aversive Trace Conditioning Revealed  
477 through Event-Related Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging”. In: *Journal of Neuroscience* 19.24 (Dec. 15,  
478 1999), pp. 10869–10876. DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.19-24-10869.1999. pmid: 10594068.
- 479 [75] Hester, R., Simões-Franklin, C., and Garavan, H. “Post-Error Behavior in Active Cocaine Users: Poor Awareness  
480 of Errors in the Presence of Intact Performance Adjustments”. In: *Neuropsychopharmacology* 32.9 (9 Sept. 2007),  
481 pp. 1974–1984. DOI: 10.1038/sj.npp.1301326.
- 482 [76] Seeley, W. W. et al. “Dissociable Intrinsic Connectivity Networks for Salience Processing and Executive Control”.  
483 In: *Journal of Neuroscience* 27.9 (Feb. 28, 2007), pp. 2349–2356. DOI: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5587-06.2007.  
484 pmid: 17329432.
- 485 [77] Liakakis, G., Nickel, J., and Seitz, R. J. “Diversity of the Inferior Frontal Gyrus—A Meta-Analysis  
486 of Neuroimaging Studies”. In: *Behavioural Brain Research* 225.1 (Nov. 20, 2011), pp. 341–347. DOI:  
487 10.1016/j.bbr.2011.06.022.
- 488 [78] Swick, D. et al. “Left Inferior Frontal Gyrus Is Critical for Response Inhibition”. In: *BMC Neuroscience* 9.1  
489 (Oct. 21, 2008), p. 102. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2202-9-102.
- 490 [79] Du, J. et al. “Functional Connectivity of the Orbitofrontal Cortex, Anterior Cingulate Cortex, and Inferior Frontal  
491 Gyrus in Humans”. In: *Cortex* 123 (Feb. 1, 2020), pp. 185–199. DOI: 10.1016/j.cortex.2019.10.012.

- 492 [80] Bulbena, A. et al. “Psychiatric and Psychological Aspects in the Ehlers–Danlos Syndromes”. In: *Ameri-*  
493 *can Journal of Medical Genetics Part C: Seminars in Medical Genetics* 175.1 (2017), pp. 237–245. DOI:  
494 10.1002/ajmg.c.31544.
- 495 [81] Casanova, E. L. et al. *Immune, Autonomic, and Endocrine Dysregulation in Autism and Ehlers-Danlos Syn-*  
496 *drome/Hypermobility Spectrum Disorders Versus Unaffected Controls*. June 13, 2019. DOI: 10.1101/670661.  
497 URL: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/670661v1> (visited on 05/19/2023). preprint.
- 498 [82] Eccles, J. A. et al. “Joint Hypermobility and Autonomic Hyperactivity: Relevance to Neurodevelopmental  
499 Disorders”. In: *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry* 85.8 (Aug. 1, 2014), e3–e3. DOI: 10.1136/jnnp-  
500 2014-308883.9.
- 501 [83] Savage, G. K. et al. “#3085 Relationship between Variant Connective Tissue (Hypermobility) and Autism Sensory  
502 Processing: Externally Oriented Thinking as a Mediator”. In: *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*.  
503 92.8 (Aug. 1, 2021), A7–A8. DOI: 10.1136/jnnp-2021-BNPA.19.