Efficacy of attention bias modification via smartphones in a large population sample

Authors:

Alysha Chelliah, MSc, Neuroscience and Mental Health Group, Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London (*corresponding author*)

Postal address: UCL Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, 17-19 Queen Square,
London, WC1N 3AZ

Email: alysha.chelliah@gmail.com

Dr. Oliver Robinson, PhD, Neuroscience and Mental Health Group, Institute of
Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London

Main text word count: 3,558 words

Abstract

Background

Negative affective biases are a key feature of anxiety and depression that uphold and promote negative mood. Bias modification, which aims to reduce these biases using computerized training, has shown mixed success but has not been tested at scale. Smartphones present an easily-accessible and affordable means of testing the impact of bias modification on mood in the general population. The aim was to determine whether bias modification delivered via smartphones can improve mood in a large sample.

Methods

153,385 self-referring participants were randomly assigned to modification or sham bias training on a dot-probe or visual-search task. The primary outcome of interest was balance of mood, assessed on the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule. 22,933 participants who provided at least two sets of mood ratings were included in analyses.

Results

Results supported the prediction that visual-search modification would result in improved mood (95% CI .10 to .82; $p=.01$, $d=.05$ after two mood ratings; 95% CI 1.75 to 6.54; $p=.001$, $d=.32$ after six mood ratings), which was not seen for the sham version. Dot-probe modification was not associated with mood improvements ($p=.52$).

Conclusions

Visual-search, but not dot-probe, attention bias modification slightly but significantly improved mood in a large sample. Although this effect size is very small; waiting-lists, low responsiveness to available interventions, and, critically, the minimal cost/side-effects, suggest it might be worth considering an adjunct to current treatments.

Abstract word count: 227 words

Introduction

Negative affective bias is the tendency to preferentially process negative emotional information (Mathews & MacLeod, 2005) including preferential attention towards negative stimuli (Mogg et al., 1993). It plays a critical causal role in onset and maintenance of negative mood, and in turn of anxiety disorders and depression (Mathews & MacLeod, 2005; Beck, 1976; Mogg & Bradley, 2016; Beck, 1987; Roiser et al., 2012). These affective disorders pose a significant global concern (World Health Organization, 2017), but there is a lack of effective, affordable, and readily accessible interventions (Bandelow et al., 2015; Parker et al., 2008; Health and Social Care Information Centre, 2013; Hofmann et al., 2012; Gunter & Whittal, 2010).

The ability to modify negative affective bias could prevent onset of or improve negative mood (or both), and is indeed the foundation of successful cognitive behavioural therapy (Beck, 1976). Attention bias modification (ABM) is a class of training paradigms that attempt to automate this by shifting attention away from negative information (and towards positive or neutral stimuli) using cognitive tasks (Mogg & Bradley, 2016; MacLeod & Clarke, 2015).

Dot-probe tasks are arguably the most common *test* of attention bias (Mathews & MacLeod, 2005; MacLeod et al., 1986; Hallion & Ruscio, 2011). They typically involve quick presentations of two emotionally-valenced stimuli, one benign (e.g. a happy or calm face/word), and the other negative (sad or angry face/word). A visual probe – often dots – replaces one item, and participants answer probe-related questions (e.g. “Where are the dots?”, “left” or “right”). Quicker responses to probes replacing negative than benign items suggest negatively-biased attention (MacLeod

et al., 1986; Fox et al., 2002). This therefore assesses attention distribution in spatial orienting to emotionally salient stimuli. Dot-probe negative-avoidance *ABM* involves probes replacing the non-negative item 80-100% of the time (Mogg & Bradley, 2016; Hallion & Ruscio, 2011; MacLeod et al., 2002). Thus individuals are expected to implicitly associate the benign item and goal response over practice, and subsequently habitually bias attention to benign items. Dot-probe *ABM* has been associated with decreased attention bias (Linetzky et al., 2015) and negative affect (Wells & Beevers, 2010; Browning et al., 2012; Dennis & O'Toole, 2014), including reduced subjective anxiety after a gamified smartphone application-based training (Dennis & O'Toole, 2014). However there are some reproducibility concerns (Boettcher et al., 2013; Heeren et al., 2015; McNally et al., 2013; Mastikhina & Dobson, 2017; Eldar et al., 2012), including for smartphone-based *ABM* (Enock et al., 2014), and the effects have not been tested at scale.

Visual-search tasks also assess affect-biased attention. Typical procedures involve positive-search trials – identifying the positive face in an array of negative face distractors, and negative-search trials – selecting the negative face surrounded by positive expressions (Mogg & Bradley, 2016; Cisler & Koster, 2010). Negative affective bias is reflected in quicker performances on negative- than positive-search trials, and may reflect poorer inhibition of target-irrelevant negative faces and poorer shifting of attention away from these distractors (Mogg & Bradley, 2016).

Visual-search *ABM* training usually consists of positive-search trials (Dandeneau et al., 2007). It has been associated with anxiolytic effects when delivered in the laboratory (De Voogd et al., 2014), clinic (Waters et al., 2013), at home (Waters et al., 2015, 2016), and work environments (Dandeneau et al., 2007). However, *ABM* was not found to influence bias or mood in dysphoric participants after one session

(Kruijt et al., 2013). A modified laboratory-based version in which moving faces must be selected before they reach the bottom of a computer screen was not found to influence bias or mood in healthy participants after either one or five laboratory-sessions (Pieters et al., 2017). Moreover, these approaches have not been tested at scale.

In this study, we therefore aimed to test the efficacy of these interventions at scale, and outside the clinic (N=153,385) using a smartphone app. 85% of the British public is estimated to own or have access to a smartphone in 2017 (Deloitte, 2017).

Smartphone application-based interventions provide instant access and have a relatively low barrier to entry. They could have particularly high practical utility for patients who live remotely, do not want to try, or do not respond to conventional treatments. Moreover, ABM might be a novel means of delivering secondary prevention of low mood (Browning et al., 2012; National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, 2009; Cuijpers et al., 2012).

The degree to which smartphone-based ABM tasks may be effective at improving mood across the general public remains unknown; no published study has investigated the effects on a large scale. We therefore delivered dot-probe and visual-search tasks to a large sample through an online smartphone application Peak (OSF pre-registration: <https://osf.io/brpxu/>). The primary hypothesis was that receiving dot-probe or visual-search ABM would result in improved mood compared to sham conditions. Secondly, it was predicted that modification training would decrease negative affective bias relative to sham training on each task.

Methods

Participants

This study was approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee (6199/001). Informed consent was obtained from participants through the smartphone application (www.peak.net). Participants were 153,385 self-referring application users between April 2017 and September 2018. Our aim was to test effects at scale in a convenience sample, so no power calculation was performed; we recruited as many participants as possible. Participants were randomly assigned into bias modification (active) or control (sham) training on a dot-probe (henceforth *DOT*) or visual-search (*VS*) task, or they performed no training. This resulted in DOT-active, DOT-sham, VS-active, VS-sham, and no-training groups. Data were anonymised prior to analysis so no demographic information was available.

Tasks and procedure

Sessions started with mood ratings, followed by *test* versions of DOT and then VS tasks. They ended with DOT-active, DOT-sham, VS-active or VS-sham *training* dependent on assigned training version for the experiment (the subset of participants not completing any training comprise those who quit this section of the app before this final stage, some of whom later provided more mood ratings and performed repeated tests). Participants were asked to perform one session a day for at least fifteen days.

Mood ratings

Participants completed the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988) on the first session and after 14 consecutive days. If participants missed one or more sessions, they provided PANAS ratings again during their next session.

The PANAS consists of a 10-item positive affect (PA) scale and 10-item negative affect (NA) scale. The PA questions comprised: Interested, Excited, Strong, Enthusiastic, Proud, Alert, Inspired, Determined, Attentive, and Active. In contrast, the NA scale consists of Distressed, Upset, Guilty, Scared, Hostile, Irritable, Ashamed, Nervous, Jittery, and Afraid. Responses were provided on a five-point scale – 1 corresponded to Not At All, 2 to A Little, 3 to Moderately, 4 to Quite A Bit, and 5 to Extremely. Compound PA and NA scores were calculated by adding ratings on respective items, where values range between 10-50 and a higher value corresponds to feeling more positive or negative respectively. Between PANAS ratings, participants were asked to provide rating for three mood items, Happy, Anxious, and Sad.

DOT task

Test

The DOT test started with viewing a fixation-cross in the centre of the screen for 1000ms (Figure 1a). Participants then viewed two vertically aligned cartoon faces, one positive and the other negative. Face positions were counterbalanced randomly such that each was on top 50% of the time. Stimuli were removed after 500ms, and a probe image displaying varying numbers of gems replaced one face; it was equally likely to replace each stimulus. Participants then answered a simple two-option probe-related question by clicking the corresponding answer (e.g. “How many gems?”, “2” or “3”). They had unlimited time to respond but were encouraged to act as quickly and accurately as possible. Each correct response advanced a progress meter at the top of the screen by 1 point, with visual feedback of accuracy provided by a tick or cross. The test ended once 50 trials were answered correctly

(approximately 2 minutes). The first test was preceded by six practice trials, where the probe replaced the positive stimulus on three trials. This was followed by feedback and repeated until performed correctly.

Training

DOT sham training followed the same procedure as test. However, during active training the probe always replaced the positive image; this intended to draw attention towards positive and away from negative stimuli. Participants had to complete 100 trials accurately. Incorrect trials were repeated until a correct response was provided (lasting 4-5 minutes).

VS task

Test

The VS test consisted of positive-search and negative-search blocks with 25 trials each, lasting 4-5 minutes (Figure 1b). The order of blocks was counterbalanced across participants and sessions. In the positive-search block, participants viewed a 4x4 array of emotional faces, one of which was happy and the others negative (angry, fearful and sad – five of each). Face locations were randomised on each trial. Participants selected the happy face and were encouraged to respond as quickly as possible. Trials were separated by a 1000ms interval where visual feedback by a green tick or red cross appeared above the selected stimulus. Trials answered incorrectly were repeated at the end of the block until answered correctly. The negative-search block involved selecting the only negative face in a grid of happy faces. 1-10 points were awarded based on reaction times for correct responses. The number of points gained was presented between blocks, and the final score after

test. The first test was preceded by six practice trials (three of each positive- and negative-search), followed by feedback. Trials with erroneous responses were repeated until answered correctly.

Training

Training followed the test schematic, but consisted of four blocks with 25 trials each and varied in array type. Active training consisted of positive-search trials only with different face stimuli from test, lasting 8-10 minutes. Sham training involved selecting the only five-petalled flower in a 4x4 array of seven-petalled drawings of flowers (Figure 1c), lasting 4-5 minutes.

Data analysis

The outcome of interest was balance of mood (henceforth *mood*) measured by the difference between total PA and total NA ratings ($mood = PA - NA$); a positive value represents higher positive than negative affect.

Unfortunately indicators of negative affective bias on tasks could not be calculated due to an oversight in the task code (outputs were collapsed across trials so we could not distinguish performance by specific trial type). Therefore the analysis cannot assess bias and we are unable to test our second prediction (although it should be noted that training was associated with improved overall accuracy and reduced RTs collapsed across trials; all $p < .001$).

Univariate and mixed ANOVAs were conducted to investigate the effects of training version and time on mood. All analyses employ a significance threshold of $p < .05$. When Mauchly's test was significant, sphericity could not be assumed and the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied. We first analysed the largest group

possible; those with at least 2 PANAS reports; to determine the effect of training over time. Subsequently we analysed the smaller sample with at least 6 PANAS reports in an attempt to plot trajectories of mood change.

Results

The flow of participants through the study is displayed in Figure 2. Of the initial 153,385, 147,038 participants provided mood ratings on at least one occasion. 22,933 completed at least two PANAS reports, and 471 at least six reports.

Change in mood over 2 PANAS reports

A univariate ANOVA found that the effect of training version on mood at baseline was not significant ($F(4,22928) < 2.5, p > .05$), indicating that baseline effects were not present.

For participants who reported PANAS scores twice, a mixed ANOVA (time(1,2) x training version(DOT-active, DOT-sham, VS-active, VS-sham, no-training)) on mood found that the overall effect of time was not significant ($F(1,22928) < 0.5, p > .1$) The effect of training version was significant ($F(4,22928) = 8.061, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .001$), indicating group differences in overall mood levels. However, this was qualified by a significant interaction between time and training version

($F(4,22928) = 16.266, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .003$; Figure 3), showing that the extent of mood change differed across participants. The no-training group reduced mood more than all training groups (DOT-active: $t(11224) = -5.293, p < .001, d = .102$, mean difference = -1.020, SE = .193; DOT-sham: $t(11077) = -6.136, p < .001, d = .120$, mean difference = -1.190, SE = .194; VS-active: $t(9364) = -6.07, p < .001, d = .142$, mean

difference=-1.381,SE=.227; and VS-sham: $t(11594)=-5.474, p<.001, d=.102$, mean difference=-1.020,SE=.186). No other significant differences were found between groups (all $t<2, p>.05$). Critically, paired samples t-tests revealed that VS-active participants significantly increased mood from baseline ($t(2587)=2.476, p=.013, d=.049$, mean difference=.458,SE=.185) while no-training participants significantly decreased mood ($t(6777)=-7.604, p<.001, d=.093$, mean difference=-.923,SE=.121). No other groups significantly changed mood over time (all $t<2, p>.05$).

Change in mood over 6 PANAS reports

When investigating mood changes in training participants providing six PANAS reports (Figure 4), a mixed ANOVA (time(1,2,3,4,5,6) x training version(DOT-active, DOT-sham, VS-active, VS-sham)) on mood found that the effect of training version was not significant ($F(3,427)<.5, p>.1$). The effect of time was significant ($F(4.438, 1894.973)=2.347, p=.046$, partial $\eta^2=.005$), qualified by a significant interaction between time and training version ($F(13.314, 1894.973)=2.450, p=.002$, partial $\eta^2=.017$). VS-active participants improved mood to a greater extent than VS-sham participants ($t(254)=3.794, p<.001, d=.474$, mean difference=5.927,SE=1.562). The DOT-sham group improved mood more than VS-sham participants ($t(218)=2.277, p=.024, d=.319$, mean difference=3.722,SE=1.634). No other significant differences were found (all $t<2, p>.05$).

Post hoc paired samples t-tests found that VS-active participants significantly increased mood from time 1-6 ($t(117)=3.428, p=.001, d=.316$, mean difference=4.144,SE=1.209); no other groups significantly changed mood across six

reports (all $t < 2, p > .05$). Post hoc comparisons were conducted to investigate the timepoint from which mood levels significantly differed between VS groups. Between-group t-tests showed that VS-active participants had significantly higher mood than sham counterparts from time 5 onwards (time 5: $n_{active}=205, n_{sham}=248, t(451)=2.174, p=.030, d=.205$, mean difference=2.731, SE=1.256; time 6: $t(254)=2.684, p=.008, d=.337$, mean difference=4.598, SE=1.714), but not times 1-4 (all $t < 2, p > .05$).

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the largest observational study investigating dot-probe and visual-search attention bias modification delivered via smartphones. Results supported the prediction that visual-search, but not dot-probe, modification can improve-mood.

Visual-search training

The primary finding is that visual-search modification was associated with a significant, albeit small, within-group increase in positive relative to negative mood, which was not seen for the sham version. Consistent with previous investigations (Dandeneau et al., 2007; Enock et al., 2014; De Voogd et al., 2014; Waters et al., 2013), we provide evidence that VS ABM has the potential to improve mood, even when administered at home (Waters et al., 2015; Waters et al., 2016).

While VS ABM appears to have some effect, we could not determine what exactly drove mood improvements due to inability to calculate changes in bias. Cognitive models suggest this may be related to decreasing negative attention bias by

improving the ability to positively-direct attention while inhibiting processing of negative distractors (Mogg & Bradley, 2016; Dandeneau et al., 2007). This would be evidenced by VS-active participants improving positive-search speed to a greater extent than negative-search speed.

It is unclear if VS ABM is effective generally or for a specific subset of the population. The sample was unselected and it is not possible to determine if the approach was: (a) beneficial irrespective of baseline mood, (b) most effective for individuals with or at risk of chronic low mood, so has high clinical potential, or (c) improved already healthy mood. VS ABM is expected to improve highly anxious affect (De Voogd et al., 2014; Waters et al., 2013, 2015, 2016), but previous research does not have strong implications for depressed or non-negative baseline mood. Nevertheless it appears that training can be effective, albeit with a small effect size, in a naturalistic self-selected sample of smartphone users.

Dot-probe training

The presented dot-probe intervention was not effective as the DOT-active group did not significantly change mood following training.

One possibility is that dot-probe ABM is simply not effective. Several investigations failed to find that it improves heightened or severely low mood (Boettcher et al., 2013; Heeren et al., 2015; McNally et al., 2013; Mastikhina & Dobson, 2017); some have questioned its rationale since negative-avoidance may not reflect 'normal' attention processing and negative-attendance may not characterise low mood (Boettcher et al., 2013; Eldar et al., 2012; Bar-Haim et al., 2007). However several studies associated dot-probe ABM with mood improvements in clinical or elevated depression and anxiety (Linetzky et al., 2015; Wells & Beevers, 2010; Browning et

al., 2012), where a moderation analysis by Linetzky et al. (2015) showed a significant effect of dot-probe ABM on self-reported levels of anxiety when administered in clinics ($d=.34$) but not at home ($d=-.10$). Therefore it may be only effective on severely low mood, and more impactful when delivered in clinics than at home.

Our DOT ABM procedure may have also been ineffective due to task characteristics. One study reported that dot-probe modification only effectively changed bias when presenting prototypical and intense fear expressions (Browning et al., 2010). Our face drawings may have been too simple, or not salient enough. Another possibility is that stimulus presentation timings were sub-optimal. Future investigations could use an app to present real faces with intense expressions, decrease probe visibility (present more/smaller/blurred probes), and/or modify stimulus timings.

Limitations and future directions

A key limitation is that predictions about effects of ABM on bias could not be tested. Therefore we are unable to support or falsify our second prediction that dot-probe or visual-search ABM would decrease negative affective bias relative to sham training, and explore whether mood changes were mediated by change in bias. Future research will acquire trial type information, so we will be able to test the interaction between bias and mood change, and provide insights on crossover effects of tasks.

We could not analyse whether VS ABM effectiveness is contingent on initial mood because PANAS ratings were the only indicator of baseline mood. Further research could administer multiple mood scales, as well as demographic questionnaires, at baseline to explore the impact of pre-treatment differences on subsequent PANAS

changes. Similarly, follow-up PANAS ratings should be collected after app completion to identify if VS ABM has sustained benefits.

It is unclear why large numbers of participants did not perform training. The most convincing explanation is that no-training participants quit the application before training on the first session, and later returned. This group were not fully engaged so may have a selection bias that drives their large decrease in mood. Similarly, there was asymmetric drop-off in different conditions. Fewer people completed at least one VS-active than VS-sham training session, for instance. Thus those assigned to active intervention may have been less likely to stick with training, biasing resultant effects. There therefore appears to be a high attrition rate in participants using smartphone-delivered ABM – only 27% of training participants reporting baseline PANAS subsequently report it again. The 15 day gap between PANAS reports was chosen to mirror approaches used in many clinical trials of psychiatric treatments. However this led to loss of PANAS reports from participants who performed multiple, but <15, consecutive sessions as well as differences in intervals between PANAS reports across participants (since additional PANAS reports are presented following a missed session). Future investigations should fix this confound, as well as investigate why some people persist and others do not complete training.

Research would also benefit from replicating this investigation in a laboratory environment to present a more controlled setting. This would limit concerns about external factors influencing test performance, and biased drop-off. For instance, concerns about participants letting the task run unattended in the background meant that our tasks were self paced, which likely impacted reaction times and attention to the task. Ultimately, however, this study was run in the environment in which application interventions would be theoretically used, so at a population level, any

biased sampling effects would likely also be present. Thus the findings have implications for how effective smartphone-based ABM would be ‘in the wild’.

It should be noted that there are differences between the DOT and VS task designs. Both tasks were based on previously used designs, but differed in the amount and timing of when points were awarded which could explain efficacy differences across tasks. Moreover VS sham-training involved searching an array of flowers rather than faces. While this was based on classic designs found in literature (Dandeneau et al., 2007; Waters et al. 2013, 2015, 2016), future work could present both positive-search and negative-search face trials during sham-training.

Finally, it should be noted that the effect size of the successful mood improvement is very small ($d=0.05$). It cannot therefore be recommended as a substitute for conventional treatment. Nevertheless, at a population level, such small effects can have quite a profound impact. They are also low-cost, easy to access, and have limited potential for side-effects.

Conclusion

This study advances prior work by highlighting that smartphones can be used to successfully improve mood in a large sample through visual-search ABM. The presented dot-probe approach is not effective at changing mood, but does nevertheless act as a negative control indicating that the VS ABM mood improvement is not a generic effect of completing training sessions. This study therefore has important practical implications because smartphones allow access to training remotely, at relatively low cost, and are easily accessible in many countries.

Acknowledgements

This study was completed as part of a consultancy agreement between OJR and Peak. OJR and Peak developed the study, Peak hosted the tasks and the assessment, and collected the data. Analysis was completed by AC and OJR who wrote the paper. OJR was funded by a Medical Research Council Career Development Award (MR/K024280/1). Peak hold a financial interest in the tasks described in this study. The authors declare no conflict of interest and committed in advance to publishing this study regardless of the direction of the findings. We would like to thank Peak for providing the app for research purposes.

Disclosures

Miss Chelliah reports no financial relationships with commercial interests.

Dr. Robinson reports no financial relationships with commercial interests.

References

- Bandelow, B., Reitt, M., Röver, C., Michaelis, S., Görlich, Y., & Wedekind, D. (2015). Efficacy of treatments for anxiety disorders: A meta-analysis. *International Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 30(4), 183-192.
- Bar-Haim, Y., Lamy, D., Pergamin, L., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2007). Threat-related attentional bias in anxious and nonanxious individuals: A meta-analytic study. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 1-24.
- Beck, A. T. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. New York, NY: New American Library.
- Beck, A. T (1987). Cognitive models of depression. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly*, 1, 5-37.
- Boettcher, J., Leek, L., Matson, L., Holmes, E. A., Browning, M., MacLeod, C., ... Carlbring, P. (2013). Internet-based attention bias modification for social anxiety: A randomised controlled comparison of training towards negative and training towards positive cues. *PLoS One*, 8(9), e71760.

- Browning, M., Holmes, E., Charles, M., Cowen, P. J., & Harmer, C. J. (2012). Using attentional bias modification as a cognitive vaccine against depression. *Biological Psychiatry*, 72(7), 572-579.
- Browning, M., Holmes, E. A., & Harmer, C. J. (2010). The modification of attentional bias to emotional information: A review of the techniques, mechanisms, and relevance to emotional disorders. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 10(1), 8-20.
- Cisler, J. M., & Koster, E. H. W. (2010). Mechanisms of attentional biases towards threat in anxiety disorders: An integrative review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30, 203-216.
- Cuijpers, P., Beekman, A. T., & Reynolds, C. F. (2012). Preventing depression: A global priority. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 307(10), 1033-1034.
- Dandeneau, S. D., Baldwin, M. W., Baccus, J. R., Sakellaropoulou, M., & Pruessner, J. C. (2007). Cutting stress off at the pass: Reducing vigilance and responsiveness to social threat by manipulating attention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(4), 651-666.
- De Voogd, E. L., Wiers, R. W., Prins, P. J. M., & Salemink, E. (2014). Visual search attentional bias modification reduced social phobia in adolescents. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 45(2), 252-259.
- Deloitte. (2017). State of the Smart. Consumer and Business Usage Patterns. Global Mobile Consumer Survey 2017: The UK Cut. London, UK: Deloitte.
- Dennis, T. A., & O'Toole, L. (2014). Mental Health on the Go: Effects of a Gamified Attention Bias Modification Mobile Application in Trait Anxious Adults. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 2(5), 576-590.
- Eldar, S., Apter, A., Lotan, D., Perez-Edgar, K., Naim, R., Fox, N. A., ... Bar-Haim, Y. (2012). Attention bias modification treatment for pediatric anxiety disorders: A randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 169(2), 213-220.
- Enock, P. M., Hofmann, S. G., & McNally, R. J. (2014). Attention Bias Modification Training Via Smartphone to Reduce Social Anxiety: A Randomized, Controlled Multi-Session Experiment. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 38(2), 200-216.
- Fox, E., Russo, R., & Dutton, K. (2002). Attentional bias for threat: Evidence for delayed disengagement from emotional faces. *Cognition & Emotion*, 16(3), 355-379.
- Gunter, R. W., & Whittal, M. L. (2010). Dissemination of cognitive-behavioral treatments for anxiety disorders: Overcoming barriers and improving patient access. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(2), 194-202.
- Hallion, L. S., & Ruscio, A. M. (2011). A meta-analysis of the effect of cognitive bias modification on anxiety and depression. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(6), 940-958.
- Health and Social Care Information Centre (2013). Improving Access to Psychological Therapies, Key Performance Indicators (IAPT KPIs) – Final Q3 2012–13 and provisional Q4 2012-13. Retrieved from <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/improving-access-to-psychological-therapies-key-performance-indicators-iapt-kpis/improving-access-to-psychological-therapies-key-performance-indicators-iapt-kpis-final-q3-2012-13-and-provisional-q4-2012-13>.
- Heeren, A., Mogoșe, C., McNally, R. J., Schmitz, A., & Philippot, P. (2015). Does attention bias modification improve attentional control? A double-blind randomized experiment with individuals with social anxiety disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 29, 35-42.
- Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., Vonk, I. J. J., Sawyer, A. T., & Fang, A. (2012). The efficacy of cognitive behavioral therapy: A review of meta-analyses. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 36(5), 427-440.

- Kruijt, A. W., Putman, P., & Van der Does, W. (2013). The effects of a visual search attentional bias modification paradigm on attentional bias in dysphoric individuals. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 44(2), 248-254.
- Linetzky, M., Pergamin-Hight, L., Pine, D. S., & Bar-Haim, Y. (2015). Quantitative evaluation of the clinical efficacy of attention bias modification treatment for anxiety disorders. *Depression and Anxiety*, 32(6), 383-391.
- MacLeod, C., & Clarke, P. J. F. (2015). The attentional bias modification approach to anxiety intervention. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 3(1), 58-78.
- MacLeod, C., Mathews, A., & Tata, P. (1986). Attentional bias in emotional disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 95(1), 15-20.
- MacLeod, C., Rutherford, E., Campbell, L., Ebsworthy, G., & Holker, L. (2002). Selective attention and emotional vulnerability: Assessing the causal basis of their association through the experimental manipulation of attentional bias. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 111(1), 107-123.
- Mastikhina, L., & Dobson, K. (2017). Biased attention retraining in dysphoria: A failure to replicate. *Cognition and Emotion*, 31(3), 625-631.
- Mathews, A., & MacLeod, C. (2005). Cognitive vulnerability to emotional disorders. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 1, 167-195.
- McNally, R. J., Enock, P. M., Tsai, C., & Tousian, M. (2013). Attention bias modification for reducing speech anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 51(12), 882-888.
- Mogg, K., & Bradley, B. P. (2016). Anxiety and attention to threat: Cognitive mechanisms and treatment with attention bias modification. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 87, 76-108.
- Mogg, K., Bradley, B. P., Williams, R., & Mathews, A. (1993). Subliminal processing of emotional information in anxiety and depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102(2), 304- 311.
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. (2009). Depression in adults with a chronic physical health problem. London, UK: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence.
- Parker, G. B., Crawford, J., & Hadzi-Pavlovic, D. (2008). Quantified superiority of cognitive behaviour therapy to antidepressant drugs: A challenge to an earlier meta-analysis. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 118(2), 91-97.
- Pieters, E. K., De Raedt, R., Enock, P. M., De Putter, L. M., Braham, H., McNally, R. J., & Koster, E. H. (2017). Examining a novel gamified approach to attentional retraining: effects of single and multiple session training. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 41(1), 89-105.
- Roiser, J. P., Elliott, R., & Sahakian, B. J. (2012). Cognitive mechanisms of treatment in depression. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 37(1), 117-136.
- Waters, A. M., Pittaway, M., Mogg, K., Bradley, B. P., & Pine, D. S. (2013). Attention training towards positive stimuli in clinically anxious children. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 4, 77-84.
- Waters, A. M., Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Craske, M. G., Pine, D. S., Bradley, B. P., & Mogg, K. (2015). Look for good and never give up: A novel attention training treatment for childhood anxiety disorders. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 73, 111-123.
- Waters, A. M., Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Craske, M. G., Pine, D. S., Bradley, B. P., & Mogg, K. (2016). A preliminary evaluation of a home-based, computer-delivered attention training treatment for anxious children living in regional communities. *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, 7(3), 511-527.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070.

Wells, T. T., & Beevers, C. G. (2010). Biased attention and dysphoria: Manipulating selective attention reduces subsequent depressive symptoms. *Cognition & Emotion*, 24(4), 719-728.

World Health Organization. (2017). *Depression and other common mental disorders: Global health estimates*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization Press.

9. Figures

Figure 1 Stimuli used in DOT and VS tasks. **a.** Task schematic for the DOT test. A fixation cross is displayed for 1000ms, followed by a positive and negative face which disappear after 500ms. Participants make quick responses to a question about a probe that replaces one of the faces. **b.** Timeline of the positive-search block of the VS test. A 4x4 grid of faces is displayed, and participants pick the only happy face surrounded by negative faces as quickly as possible. There is a 1000ms gap between trials where feedback is provided in the form of a green tick or red cross. **c.** Example of VS sham training stimuli including a five-petalled flower goal and a seven-petalled flower distractor.

Figure 2 CONSORT Diagram displaying flow of participants

Figure 3 Mood by training version across two PANAS reports. **a.** Mean mood for each group on first and second PANAS reports. **b.** Change in mean mood across both PANAS reports for each group (same data as **a.** but plotted more clearly). Error bars represent standard error of the mean in all figures. Single asterisks (*) represent significant differences at the level of $p \leq .05$; triple asterisks (***) represent significant differences at the level of $p \leq .001$.

Figure 4 Mood by training version across six PANAS reports. **a.** Mean mood for each VS group on the six PANAS reports. **b.** Mean mood for each DOT group on the six PANAS reports.