Efficacy of open-label counterconditioning for reducing nocebo effects on pressure pain

Authors: Simone Meijer^{*1,2}, Merve Karacaoglu^{*1,2}, Henriët van Middendorp^{1,2}, Dieuwke S. Veldhuijzen^{1,2}, Karin B. Jensen³, Kaya J. Peerdeman^{1,2}, Andrea W.M. Evers^{1,2,4,5}

¹Health, Medical and Neuropsychology unit, Leiden University; ²Leiden Institute for Brain and Cognition (LIBC); ³Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden; ⁴Medical Delta, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Leiden University & Delft University of Technology, Rotterdam/Leiden/Delft, The Netherlands; ⁵Department of Psychiatry, Leiden University Medical Center

*These authors contributed equally to this manuscript

Note: the current version of the paper is a preprint and has not yet been subject to peer review. It is not the final published version.

Corresponding author:

Simone Meijer, MSc.

Mailing address:

Leiden University
Pieter de la Court
Wassenaarseweg 52
2333 AK Leiden, The Netherlands

Contact:

+31 71 527 2988
s.meijer@fsw.leidenuniv.nl
<https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/staffmembers/simone-meijer>

Abstract

Nocebo effects can adversely affect the experience of physical symptoms, such as pain and itch. Nocebo effects on itch and pain have shown to be induced by conditioning with thermal heat stimuli and reduced by counterconditioning. However, open-label counterconditioning, in which participants are informed about the placebo content of the treatment, has not been investigated, while this can be highly relevant for clinical practice. Furthermore, (open-label) conditioning and counterconditioning has not been investigated for pain modalities relevant to musculoskeletal disorders, such as pressure pain.

In a randomized controlled trial, we investigated in 110 healthy female participants whether nocebo effects on pressure pain combined with open-label verbal suggestions can be 1) induced via conditioning and 2) reduced via counterconditioning. Participants were allocated to either a nocebo or sham conditioning group. Next, the nocebo group was allocated to either counterconditioning, extinction, or continued nocebo conditioning; sham conditioning was followed by placebo conditioning. Nocebo effects were significantly larger after nocebo conditioning than sham conditioning ($d = 1.27$). Subsequently, a larger reduction of the nocebo effect was found after counterconditioning than after extinction ($d = .99$) and continued nocebo conditioning ($d = 1.63$), with effects similar to placebo conditioning (following sham conditioning). These results show that (counter)conditioning combined with open-label suggestions can modulate nocebo effects on pressure pain, which provides promise in designing learning-based treatments to reduce nocebo effects in patients with chronic pain disorders, particularly for musculoskeletal disorders.

Keywords: nocebo effect, counterconditioning, pressure pain, open-label, nocebo hyperalgesia

1. Introduction

It is well known that nocebo effects (i.e., adverse treatment outcomes not attributable to active treatment components) can be induced via learning mechanisms, including classical conditioning and verbal suggestions[2,4,9,28,35,36]. Much less is known about methods to reduce nocebo effects and how to translate such methods to clinical care. First findings indicated that counterconditioning can reduce nocebo effects for conditioned thermal pain and itch[3,35], and may even lead to placebo effects[3,35]. During counterconditioning, the original unconditioned stimulus (US) (e.g., an increase of administered pain) to which a previously neutral stimulus (e.g., activation of a sham electrode) has been paired (conditioned stimulus; CS), is replaced by a US of opposite valence (e.g., decreased pain stimulation) in combination with the CS. First results have indicated that counterconditioning is more effective than extinction, a procedure during which the CS, e.g., a sham electrode, is no longer paired with the US, leading to people gradually learning the US and CS are no longer associated[3,35]. Although not examined yet, pressure pain could be a relevant pain modality in which to examine nocebo-learning strategies, since this elicits a deep tissue pain sensation similar to the pain patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain disorders experience[11,29,39].

Typically, deceptive (counter)conditioning paradigms have been used in experimental research[2,3,7–9,35,36], which might lead one to think that deceptive methods are needed to treat nocebo effects. In clinical practice, however, patients need to be informed about their treatment, as deception could harm trust in the healthcare provider and treatment[24,26]. Therefore, it is difficult to translate current counterconditioning findings to clinical practice. A possible solution lies in open-label procedures, in which people are informed about using inert treatments. Open-label counterconditioning procedures could

provide a non-deceptive opportunity for reducing placebo effects. Although open-label placebos and conditioning have been demonstrated to be effective[5,14,15,17,18,20,31–33], open-label placebo (counter)conditioning on pressure pain has not been investigated. Furthermore, it is unclear whether placebo effects induced after counterconditioning (preceded by placebo conditioning) are as strong as placebo effects induced without prior placebo conditioning.

In the current study, we aimed to investigate the reduction of placebo effects on pressure pain through open-label counterconditioning combined with open-label verbal suggestions. To this aim, we first tested whether a placebo effect could be induced by open-label conditioning and verbal suggestions by comparing placebo conditioning with sham conditioning. Secondly, we compared counterconditioning with extinction, continued placebo conditioning, and placebo conditioning. We hypothesized that 1) placebo conditioning induces a stronger placebo effect in comparison to sham conditioning; 2) both counterconditioning and extinction reduce the placebo effect in comparison to continued placebo conditioning; and 3) counterconditioning yields a larger reduction than extinction. We further explored 4) whether placebo conditioning and counterconditioning successfully induce a placebo effect, and 5) whether this effect is larger after placebo conditioning than after counterconditioning. Investigating the effects of open-label counterconditioning on pressure pain in healthy participants builds onto prior knowledge on (closed-label) counterconditioning examined in other pain modalities and could provide a first step for new clinically-applicable treatment strategies for chronic pain disorders.

2. Method

2.1 Ethics statement

This study was approved by the Psychology Research Ethics Committee of Leiden University (reference number CEP18-1114/442) and pre-registered in the Netherlands Trial Register (trialregister.nl, number NL8033). All participants gave written informed consent and were reimbursed by €15 in cash or study credits. The current paper reports on data from a study entailing different study aims; the current paper focusses on the efficacy of conditioning and counterconditioning for inducing and reducing placebo effects on pressure pain, whereas in another paper the predictive value of several psychological characteristics, as well as placebo susceptibility on the strength of the placebo effect and its reduction will be discussed (M. Karacaoglu, S. Meijer, K.J. Peerdeman et al., unpublished data, October 2021).

2.2 Participants

The sample size required for our primary analysis was calculated using G*Power 3.1 for an independent samples t-test (two-sided, $\alpha = .05$, desired power .80). The expected effect size was $d = 0.73$, based on a similar study on counterconditioning of placebo effects[3]. According to the sample size calculation, 31 participants were needed per group. Since the design consisted of 4 groups in the second phase, we aimed for a total of 124 participants.

Participants were recruited through flyers at Leiden University and online via Facebook, as well as via the online recruitment system Sona (Sona systems, Tallin, Estonia). All participants had to be female, between 18 and 35 years old, and have a good understanding of written and spoken Dutch. The counterconditioning procedure tested in the current study, once found to be effective in healthy participants, is intended to be used in future research with patients with fibromyalgia. As fibromyalgia is more prevalent in

women[19], only female participants were tested in the current study, to avoid the possible influence of gender differences.

Exclusion criteria were severe somatic or psychiatric morbidity (e.g., heart/lung diseases, DSM-5 psychiatric disorders), Raynaud's disease, chronic pain complaints at present or in the past (≥ 3 months), current pain complaints ($\geq 2/10$ on Numeric Rating Scale (NRS)), current use of medication, injuries on the non-dominant hand, refusal/inability to remove nail polish or artificial nails on the thumbnail of the non-dominant hand for the experiment, color blindness, and pregnancy or breastfeeding. Participants were excluded from further participation if their sensory discrimination was poor, i.e., if they were unable to distinguish between three different pressure intensities or if a pain intensity of 4.5/10 on NRS was not reached at maximum pressure levels. Participants were asked not to consume alcohol, recreational drugs, painkillers, and/or sleep medication in the 24 hours prior to testing.

2.3 Design

A randomized controlled trial with a between-within subjects design was employed, consisting of two parts (Figure 1). In part 1 (nocebo induction), participants were randomly assigned (3:1) to the experimental group (open-label nocebo conditioning) or the control group (open-label sham conditioning). A randomization list was made by an independent person and group allocation was noted down on paper and inserted into an opaque envelope, which was opened after the pressure pain calibration procedure, to reduce experimenter bias during calibration. Since all experimental manipulations contained open-label verbal instructions, neither the experimenter nor the participant could be blinded to group allocation. In part 2 (nocebo reduction), participants from the experimental group

were randomly assigned (1:1:1) to one of three groups: open-label counterconditioning, open-label extinction, or open-label continued nocebo conditioning. Participants in the control group underwent an open-label placebo conditioning procedure in part 2, to be able to compare the magnitude of placebo effects after counterconditioning (preceded by nocebo conditioning) to the magnitude of placebo effects after placebo conditioning (i.e., an identical procedure, but not preceded by nocebo conditioning).

2.4 Pain induction

To induce pain, pressure pain stimuli were applied to the thumbnail of the non-dominant hand using a custom-made automated pneumatic stimulator, borrowed from the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm, Sweden[12]. The hand-piece of the stimulator (borrowed from Kings College London) has a plastic piston that applies pressure via a 1 cm² hard rubber probe. The handpiece has a cylinder opening where participants can insert their thumb, placed such that the probe contacts the middle of the thumbnail. The thumbnail was selected as a neutral location to repeatedly and safely deliver pressure stimuli as has been previously used and reported on for both healthy and clinical samples[12]. Pressure stimulus duration was set at 2.5 s, with an inter-stimulus interval of 30 s. The minimum intensity of pressure given was set at 50 kPa ($\approx 0.5 \text{ kgf/cm}^2$), while the maximum was set at 850 kPa ($\approx 8.7 \text{ kgf/cm}^2$).

2.5 Pressure pain calibration

A calibration procedure was conducted in order to find the optimal pressure intensity for no pain (0-1/10 NRS), slight pain (2-3/10 NRS), and moderate pain (4.5-5.5/10 NRS) for the individual participant, to be used in parts 1 and 2 of the experiment. A minimally painful pressure intensity (0-1 on the NRS) was also accepted as non-painful, as slight sensitization

was expected to occur due to the repeated administration of pressure, which could increase the non-painful rating above zero. Calibration consisted of three phases. In phase 1, an ascending series of pressure stimuli (50 kPa increments) was applied up to the first pressure intensity participants rated as ≥ 5.5 . In phase 2, five different stimuli were applied three times in random order, ranging from the highest pressure intensity rated as 0 in phase 1 up to the highest pressure intensity rated between 4.5 and 5.5. If no pressure intensity during the ascending series was scored between 4.5 and 5.5, a formula was used to calculate the appropriate value (see appendix A). In phase 3, a calibration check was performed. The intensities for phase 3 were determined by taking the median of all intensities in phase 2 rated within the numeric ranges for no, slight, and moderate pain. If participants did not rate any intensity within one or more of the intended ranges, formulas were used again to inter- or extrapolate the intensity corresponding to the intended range of pain scores (see appendix A). The chosen final intensities were administered twice for no pain and moderate pain, and thrice for slight pain. Participants were required to rate at least one out of two (or two out of three for slight pain) stimuli within the intended ranges. If this requirement was not met for any of the three intensities, again formulas were used to calculate the adjusted intensity (see appendix A). If manual adjustments were impossible (due to the requirement of less than the minimum or more than maximum amount of pressure), participants were excluded. In total, participants received up to 38 pressure stimuli during calibration.

2.6 Experimental procedures

2.6.1 Sham TENS device

During the experiment, a sham Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) device combined with a message indicating its (de)activation on a screen was used as a

conditioning stimulus. Depending on the randomized group allocation, participants were taught a contingency between sham (de)activation of this device and the delivery of either a non-painful, slightly painful, or moderately painful pressure intensity by the pneumatic stimulator. To avoid potential interference by participants' possible previous experiences or knowledge on the functions of a TENS, the device was referred to as a Dermal Nerve Stimulation (DNS) device. Two electrodes were attached below each other on the radial side of the participants' non-dominant forearm. As part of the open-label nocebo and placebo induction, it was explained to participants that while the DNS device was sham and therefore inactive, their pain would still be influenced because of the nocebo or placebo effect, respectively. These suggestions were repeated right before the start of each part.

The messages indicating (de)activation of the device were presented to participants on a computer screen, in purple or yellow text (colors associated with either activation or deactivation were counterbalanced across participants). The messages were displayed for 3.5 s, starting 1s before the pressure was administered. Participants were instructed to keep paying attention to the screen. In between stimuli, a fixation cross was shown.

2.6.2 Nocebo-induction part

Nocebo conditioning consisted of a learning and testing phase (see Figure 1). In the learning phase, a button-press on the sham DNS device by the experimenter combined with a computer screen message in either purple or yellow indicating the activation of the DNS device ("DNS ON"), was repeatedly paired with a moderate-intensity pressure pain stimulus (pressure scored as 4.5-5.5 on 0-10 NRS for that participant), whereas the other-colored computer screen message indicating the deactivation of the sham DNS device ("DNS OFF") was repeatedly paired with a slight-intensity pressure pain stimulus (2-3 on 0-10 NRS). In

total, the learning phase consisted of 10 experimental trials (“DNS ON trials”) and 10 control trials (“DNS OFF trials”), presented in a standard pseudorandom order (max 2 stimuli of the same trial type (experimental or control) could follow each other). The testing phase consisted of 3 experimental and 3 control trials in random order, all associated with a slight pressure pain intensity. Participants in the placebo conditioning group were given open-label suggestions about the conditioning procedure and were told conditioning would be used to teach them that the activation of the sham DNS device will increase their pain sensitivity, by manually increasing the intensity of pressure stimuli after experimental trials. The precise verbal suggestions can be found in the supplementary materials.

Sham conditioning deviated from placebo conditioning only in that pressure intensity was now not associated with sham DNS (de)activation, but randomly paired. For that, a random sequence was created for the 20 pain stimuli (10 slight-intensity stimuli and 10 moderate-intensity stimuli), while the order of the messages (“DNS ON” and “DNS OFF”) was identical to placebo conditioning. Again, max 2 stimuli of the same trial type (experimental or control) could follow each other. Furthermore, participants were explicitly told there was no association between the DNS messages and the pain stimuli.

2.6.3 Placebo-reduction part

For all groups, the learning phase of part 2 consisted of 20 trials (10 experimental and 10 control trials) and the testing phase was identical to the testing phase for the placebo-induction part.

The counterconditioning procedure differed from placebo conditioning in part 1 such that a non-painful pressure stimulus (0-1 on a 0-10 NRS) instead of a moderate-intensity pressure pain stimulus now followed the “DNS ON” message. Again, participants were given

open-label suggestions about the counterconditioning procedure and were told counterconditioning would be used now to teach them that the activation of the sham DNS device now decreases their pain sensitivity.

In the extinction procedure, only slightly painful stimuli were given during all trials, in both the learning and the testing phase. Participants were given open-label suggestions about the extinction procedure and were told that the pressure stimuli were no longer manually increased after the CS, to teach them that the activation of the DNS does not influence their pain anymore.

The procedure for the continued nocebo conditioning group in part 2 was identical to nocebo conditioning in part 1 of the experiment.

The procedure for placebo conditioning was identical to the counterconditioning procedure, apart from following sham conditioning instead of nocebo conditioning in part 1 of the experiment and a slight difference in the verbal suggestions given. Participants were told placebo conditioning would be used to teach them that the activation of the sham DNS device decreases their pain sensitivity.

2.7 Self-report ratings

A questionnaire including demographic and health questions was used to screen participants for inclusion. Furthermore, several validated questionnaires were used to measure baseline psychological characteristics, which is elaborated on further in a separate article as this concerns different study aims (M. Karacaoglu, S. Meijer, K.J. Peerdeman et al., unpublished data, October 2021). During the experiment, experienced pain intensity was reported after each pressure stimulus on an NRS, ranging from 0 (no pain) to 10 (worst pain imaginable). Participants were allowed to use decimals while scoring their pain. An exit questionnaire

consisted of questions on 1) what participants thought the aim of the experiment was (open-ended); 2) level of focused attention during the experiment (0-10 NRS; higher score indicates more focused attention); 3) experienced pain during experimental trials in part 1 (on a scale of 0-10, with 0 indicating less pain compared to control trials, 5 indicating equal pain and 10 indicating more pain compared to control trials, 4) experienced pain during experimental trials in part 2 (on the same scale as question 3), 5) trustworthiness of the experimenter (on a scale of 0-10, with a higher score indicating more trustworthiness), 6) competence of the experimenter (on a scale of 0-10, with a higher score indicating more competence), and 7) whether participants adjusted pain ratings during the experiment to help the experimenter (on a scale of 0-10, with a higher score indicating a higher amount of adjusted answers and thus a response bias). Baseline and exit questionnaires were filled in using Qualtrics software (Qualtrics, Provo, Utah, United States). NRS scores were verbally communicated to the experimenter, who noted the scores down using an Excel form (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, United States).

2.8 Experimental procedure

The experiment was conducted in a single session and took approximately two hours, with 5-minute breaks in-between the different parts of the calibration procedure and a 10-minute break between parts 1 and 2 of the experiment. During the experimental procedure, the experimenter always followed a detailed standardized script to ensure procedures for each participant resembled each other closely. After the procedure was explained, participants signed the informed consent form. If participants were eligible based on the screening questions, participants completed all baseline questionnaires. Individual pressure pain levels were then calibrated. Next, part 1 of the experiment commenced (nocebo-

induction part), followed by part 2 (nocebo-reduction part). Finally, participants completed the exit questionnaire and were debriefed and compensated for their participation.

2.9 Statistical analyses

All data were analysed using SPSS 25.0 (IBM SPSS Statistics, Chicago, Illinois, USA).

Assumptions of all statistical tests were checked through examination of histograms, Shapiro-Wilk tests, Levene's tests, and boxplots. In case of violation, we used a bootstrapping approach or non-parametric tests. The threshold of significance was set at $p < 0.05$, unless stated otherwise. One-way ANOVAs were used to assess between-group differences in calibration values, ability to focus during testing, trust in experimenter, perceived competence of the experimenter, and response bias.

To examine whether a significant placebo effect was induced after placebo conditioning and sham conditioning, two paired samples t-tests were performed separately within the placebo-conditioning group and within the sham-conditioning group. For this, the average NRS score of experimental trials was compared with the average NRS score after control trials in testing phase 1. Then, to test whether the induced placebo effect was stronger after placebo conditioning than after sham conditioning, an independent samples t-test was used to compare the induced *placebo effect* (defined as a difference score between the average NRS score on all 3 experimental trials and the average NRS score on all 3 control trials in testing phase 1) between the placebo-conditioning group and the sham-conditioning group. A Bonferroni correction was applied to correct for multiple testing and threshold for significance was set at $p < 0.017$.

As a manipulation check to see whether the sham conditioning was actually perceived as sham, two paired-samples t-tests were conducted to examine whether

experimental trials were on average rated significantly different from control trials during the learning phase of both nocebo and sham conditioning. Additionally, in the nocebo-conditioning group, it was checked whether a difference between experimental and control trials in the test phase were actually due to increased NRS scores during experimental trials, instead of decreased scores during control trials because they think that there should be a difference with the experimental trials. This was done by comparing the average rating of the final control trial from the learning phase with the first control trial in the testing phase, using a paired samples t-test.

In the nocebo-reduction part of the experiment, to determine whether the reduction of the nocebo effect within each group following nocebo induction was significant, three one sample t-tests were performed. *Nocebo reduction* was defined as a difference score between the nocebo effect in testing phase 1 of the nocebo-induction part of the experiment and the nocebo effect in testing phase 2 of the nocebo-reduction part (the nocebo effect in part 2 was subtracted from the nocebo effect in part 1). In each group, the amount of reduction of the nocebo effect was compared to 0, as a significant (positive) deviation from 0 indicates a significant amount of change and thus reduction of the nocebo effect. A Bonferroni correction was applied to correct for multiple testing and threshold for significance was set at $p < 0.013$.

Then, to test whether the nocebo effect was more strongly reduced by counterconditioning than by extinction and continued nocebo conditioning, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. We first examined the main effect of group on nocebo reduction. A Bonferroni correction was applied to correct for multiple testing and threshold for significance was set at $p < 0.013$. Post-hoc tests compared nocebo reduction after counterconditioning with extinction and continued nocebo conditioning, and nocebo

reduction after extinction versus continued nocebo conditioning. Finally, speed of reduction of the nocebo effect by counterconditioning and extinction were compared by examining the interaction between group (counterconditioning and extinction) and time (all 10 experimental trials in the learning phase of part 2) using a mixed ANOVA.

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess the influence of excluding participants for whom no nocebo effect had been induced in phase 1 (i.e., participants for whom the difference between experimental vs control trials in testing phase part 1 was zero or positive) from all analyses on nocebo reduction, as for these participants, there was no nocebo effect to be reduced, which may lead to incorrect inferences on the effects of counterconditioning).

To test whether a placebo effect could be successfully induced by placebo conditioning (following sham conditioning), a paired samples t-test was performed for the placebo-conditioning group, to test whether the average NRS score on the experimental trials significantly differed from the average NRS score on the control trials during the testing phase of placebo conditioning. Subsequently, an independent samples t-test was performed to explore whether placebo effects induced after sham conditioning (placebo-conditioning group) are stronger than placebo effects induced after nocebo conditioning (counterconditioning group).

3. Results

3.1 Participants

Participants were recruited from December 2018 to March 2020. Out of 166 enrolled participants, 56 participants were excluded. Seven were excluded because of fulfilling one of the health-related exclusion criteria, 46 had a too high pain threshold (i.e., they did not reach a moderate pain level during calibration), 2 were excluded because they sensitized during conditioning (1 from placebo-conditioning group, 1 from sham-conditioning group, part 1) and reported too high pain levels to continue the experiment, and 1 was excluded due to technical difficulties during the experiment. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was decided to end the study prematurely and not to continue to reach the powered 124 participants, as data collected during the pandemic was not considered to be comparable to previously collected data, due to the additional safety measures (e.g., participant and researcher wearing masks, having a different lab set-up to ensure enough distance between participant and researcher).

In total, 110 participants were included in the final analyses of part 1, whereas 108 participants were included in the analyses of part 2. A flowchart of participant inclusion and exclusion, as well as group allocation is displayed in Figure 1. Descriptive data of calibration values and exit questionnaire scores are displayed in Table 1. During screening, 9 people reported having current pain complaints (of lower than 2 on a 0-10 NRS), which was reported to be either muscle soreness from working out, or mild menstrual pain. No significant differences were found between groups for calibration values, trust in experimenter, perceived competence of the experimenter, and response bias. The placebo-conditioning group and sham-conditioning group did differ significantly on the self-reported amount of experienced pain (on average) on experimental trials compared to control trials in

part 1, as the nocebo-conditioning group reported to have felt more pain after experimental trials than the sham-conditioning group. This indicates that participants perceived the experimental procedures in the expected way. Furthermore, regarding part 2, all groups differed significantly on the self-reported amount of experienced pain (on average) on experimental trials (in comparison to control trials) in part 2, except for the counterconditioning group and placebo-conditioning group, as participants in both groups reported to have felt less pain after experimental trials. In the extinction group, no difference was reported and in the continued nocebo conditioning group, participants reported to have felt more pain during experimental trials. This indicates all procedures were perceived by participants as intended.

3.2 Induction of the nocebo effect

The mean ratings on experimental and control trials during the testing phase of conditioning and sham conditioning are displayed in Table 2 and Figure 3. We found a significant difference between experimental and control trials in the testing phase of nocebo conditioning; $t(84) = 12.10, p < .001, d = 1.31$, as well as in the testing phase of sham conditioning; $t(24) = 3.34, p = .003, d = 0.67$, indicating both procedures led to a nocebo effect;. However, as hypothesized and as displayed in Figure 3, the nocebo effect was significantly larger in the nocebo conditioning group than in the sham conditioning group ($t(84.33) = 6.82, p < .001, d = 1.27$).

As a manipulation check, we tested whether experimental trials were on average rated significantly differently from control trials during the learning phase of both nocebo and sham conditioning. NRS scores during experimental trials were significantly higher than during control trials ($t(84) = 22.10, p < .001$) during nocebo conditioning, consistent with the

difference in pressure intensity. As expected, during sham conditioning, experimental trials were not rated significantly higher than control trials ($t(24) = -1.53, p = .138$), consistent with the fact that the different pressure intensities were not specifically paired with either experimental or control trials. Additionally, no significant differences were found in the nocebo-conditioning group between the final control trial of the learning phase and the first control trial of the testing phase ($t(84) = -0.13, p = 0.942$), indicating that the induced nocebo effect in the testing phase of nocebo conditioning was driven by a higher pain score during the experimental trials, instead of a lower pain score after the control trials.

3.3 Reduction of the nocebo effect

The nocebo effect was effectively reduced by both counterconditioning ($t(27) = 6.77, p < .001, d = 1.35$) and extinction ($t(28) = 4.60, p < .001, d = 0.85$), whereas continued nocebo conditioning showed no significant change in the nocebo effect compared to part 1 ($t(27) = -.047, p = .963, d = -.01$).

The mean reduction in each group is shown in Figure 4. This reduction differed significantly between the counterconditioning, extinction, and continued nocebo-conditioning groups (Welch's $F = 18.34, p < .001$). Post-hoc analyses indicated that the reduction was significantly larger in the counterconditioning group as compared to both extinction ($p = .002, d = .99$) and continued nocebo conditioning ($p < .001, d = 1.63$). Furthermore, the extinction group significantly differed from the continued nocebo-conditioning group ($p = .006, d = .87$), as in the extinction group a reduction was found as compared to no reduction in the nocebo-conditioning group.

Reduction of the NRS score during experimental trials is displayed in Figure 5. Speed of reduction did not differ between counterconditioning and extinction, as no

significant interaction between group and time (10 experimental trials in learning phase of part 2 of the experiment) was found ($F(5.04) = 0.395$, $p = .853$).

3.4 Sensitivity analyses

After exclusion of 6 participants whom did not show a nocebo effect after part 1 (i.e., 7.2% of the nocebo-conditioning group; 4 showed no change, 2 showed a change in the opposite direction), all analyses on nocebo reduction yielded the same conclusions.

3.5 Induction of a placebo effect

A placebo effect was successfully induced in both the placebo-conditioning group ($t(24) = -3.09$, $p = .005$, $d = -.63$) and the counterconditioning group ($t(27) = -4.42$, $p < .001$, $d = -.84$), since the average NRS rating on experimental trials was significantly lower than on control trials (as displayed in Figure 6).

The strength of the placebo effect did not differ significantly between the placebo conditioning group ($M = -0.65$ $SD = 0.99$) and the counterconditioning group ($M = -0.62$ $SD = -0.75$; $t(50) = -.14$, $p = .887$).

4. Discussion

The current study investigated the efficacy of open-label nocebo conditioning, and of open-label counterconditioning and open-label extinction on the reduction of induced nocebo effects, using the clinically-relevant pain modality of pressure pain. We demonstrated that open-label conditioning can induce a nocebo effect on pressure pain. Furthermore, open-label counterconditioning and extinction combined with verbal suggestions were found to reduce nocebo effects, with both strategies showing immediate nocebo reduction from the start, but with counterconditioning yielding a greater reduction. Counterconditioning not only reduced nocebo effects, but induced a similar level of conditioned placebo analgesia as placebo conditioning (preceded by sham conditioning).

In line with previous research on closed-label nocebo conditioning[2,9,35], open-label conditioning with verbal suggestions effectively induced a nocebo effect. This shows that conditioning is effective even when there is honesty about the procedure, which supports previous findings on the efficacy of open-label nocebo conditioning on itch[20] and of the use of open-label placebos in clinical trials[5,14,15,17,18,31–33]. The current study was the first to show open-label induction of nocebo effects on pressure pain. The use of pressure pain, compared to commonly used methods like thermal and electrical pain, opens doors to a better understanding of pain regulation in patients with musculoskeletal pain conditions, as it more closely taps into the specific sensitivity to pressure and mimics the real-life experience.

As for nocebo reduction, this study was the first to use an open-label counterconditioning procedure to reduce (open-label) nocebo effects. In line with studies using closed-label procedures[3,35], counterconditioning was found to effectively reduce nocebo effects and to be more effective than extinction. More specifically, open-label

counterconditioning was able to fully extinguish the nocebo effect and to produce a placebo effect. While open-label extinction led to a significant reduction of the nocebo effect, this reduction was smaller than after counterconditioning and the nocebo effect was not fully extinguished. This finding slightly contradicts studies showing nocebo effects cannot be reduced by extinction, but it does provide further support for nocebo effects being resistant to complete extinction[3,6,7,9]. It should be kept in mind that the current study used open-label conditioning to induce nocebo effects. This typically is not the case outside of an experimental environment, as pain is not deliberately associated with certain stimuli and people are not aware of being conditioned. Therefore, conditioning in daily life more closely resembles closed-label conditioning. As more resistance to extinction was found in closed-label studies[6–9] compared to the current study, we should keep in mind that nocebo effects in the real-world context may be more resistant to extinction. This highlights the importance of finding new ways to reduce nocebo effects, such as counterconditioning. As the current study demonstrates, counterconditioning produces a stronger reduction of nocebo effects than extinction and produces placebo effects, which makes counterconditioning promising for use in clinical practice. Additionally, it should be noted that there may have been less resistance to nocebo-reduction strategies, because possibly no (or little) fear towards the CS was induced during conditioning due to the open-label nature of the study. While trial-by-trial fear (or fear after hearing the verbal suggestions) was not assessed in the current study, the open-label procedure was more predictable than traditional closed-label paradigms, which in turn could lead to participants feeling less anxious about the CS and the pain associated with it. A recent study has shown fear to play an important role in the induction and amplification of nocebo effects, as a larger amount of self-reported fear predicted a larger nocebo effect[34]. Furthermore, several studies using

pain conditioning have shown that fear regarding the painful stimuli may arise as a result of conditioning[21–23]. Future studies on open-label (counter)conditioning and extinction should take the possible influence of fear into account, to be able to compare the results of open- and closed-label (counter)conditioning and/or extinction better.

Taken together, the open-label instructions may explain the large effects of counterconditioning and may explain why extinction led to a significant reduction of placebo effects. In closed-label studies, even when closed-label verbal suggestions are added, it is not mentioned that the amount of administered pain is adjusted by the experimenter. During open-label counterconditioning and extinction, it is specifically told that the experimenter will no longer increase the pain or will lower the pain intensity, meaning there is little to no uncertainty regarding the administered pain. This is supported by our finding that speed of reduction did not differ in the counterconditioning and extinction groups. Typically, conditioned effects extinguish gradually during extinction, but our results showed a decrease right after the open-label instructions that suggested the extinction of pain increase. This illustrates the interaction between conditioning and the role of verbal suggestions in pain regulation[25] and the rapid extinction could thus be due to the explicit suggestion that pain would no longer be increased after presentation of the CS. This indicates that the influence of the provided verbal suggestions could be stronger than the counterconditioning or extinction procedure itself. Bajcar et al. (2021) found that the order of procedures (conditioning vs suggestions) matters: when incongruent verbal suggestions were given after a conditioning procedure, the suggestions and not the conditioning determined the placebo effect[1]. Our verbal instructions during placebo reduction may have been more dominant than the preceding placebo-conditioning procedure, which could explain why the placebo effect was reduced right from the start of counterconditioning and

extinction. Nevertheless, the reduction of the nocebo effect may have been strengthened by the counterconditioning or extinction procedure that followed. It could be relevant to compare the effects of counterconditioning and/or extinction with and without open-label verbal suggestions, to better disentangle the effects of the individual learning mechanisms.

Importantly, our findings suggest that counterconditioning can not only reduce a nocebo effect, but even produce as strong a placebo effect as could be induced without prior negative learning experiences. However, our findings could be due to the lack of induced fear and the open-label nature of the study, making it easier to reduce the established nocebo effects.

The effectiveness of open-label counterconditioning in an experimental setting is promising for clinical practice, as it could offer a new treatment strategy for reducing nocebo effects, while remaining fully transparent to patients. However, it remains to be researched whether the current findings in healthy participants will also be found in chronic pain patients. Those suffering from chronic pain might respond less to counterconditioning than healthy controls, due to multiple negative treatment experiences in the past[27]. However, patients may have a stronger desire for relief, meaning it is also possible they respond better to counterconditioning, as studies have shown desire for pain relief is associated with placebo analgesia[37,38]. Therefore, the efficacy of this procedure should be tested in individuals with chronic pain. Furthermore, future research could focus on disentangling the effects of open-label (counter)conditioning and verbal suggestions. Additionally, it would be relevant to investigate whether open-label counterconditioning can also effectively reduce nocebo effects induced by closed-label conditioning, since this better resembles real-world settings. Finally, in order to make personal recommendations for choosing a certain treatment option (e.g., counterconditioning or extinction), it is relevant to explore individual

characteristics predicting efficacy of counterconditioning and extinction. We have studied the influence of personal characteristics, as well as nocebo susceptibility, on nocebo-reduction efficacy in our participants, which is reported in a separate article (M. Karacaoglu, S. Meijer, K.J. Peerdeman et al., unpublished data, October 2021).

A possible limitation of the study is that valence of the CS has not been measured throughout the experiment. Therefore, it is not possible to judge whether valence regarding the CS changed in the expected direction during conditioning and after counterconditioning or extinction. Several studies demonstrating the superiority of counterconditioning over extinction (using fear or evaluative conditioning) have suggested this might be because counterconditioning effectively changes CS valence, whereas extinction does not [10,13,16,30]. However, it could be argued that nocebo counterconditioning does not completely resemble counterconditioning used in fear or evaluative paradigms, as the US is never fully taken away (only lowered to a less intense level). It is therefore important to assess whether this is sufficient for altering CS valence, as the alteration of valence has been found to strengthen the reduction of fear and reduce relapse, suggesting the effects of nocebo reduction of the nocebo effect might last longer when CS valence is successfully altered during counterconditioning.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that nocebo effects on the clinically relevant pressure pain modality can successfully be induced by a combination of open-label conditioning and verbal suggestions. Moreover, open-label counterconditioning and extinction can effectively reduce these nocebo effects, with counterconditioning leading to a stronger reduction than extinction and even producing a placebo effect similar to placebo conditioning without prior negative-associative learning. While more research is needed on the effectiveness of counterconditioning in chronic pain patients, the current study

demonstrates that open-label counterconditioning in a pain modality that is relevant for many chronic pain conditions may be a promising new strategy for reducing placebo effects in a non-deceptive and ethical manner.

PREPRINT

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Matthew Howard from King's College London for lending their handpiece to use with our pressure pain device for the purposes of this study. Also, the authors thank Elio Sjak-Shie and the technical support team of Leiden University (SOLO) for their support with the pressure pain device during this study. The authors also thank all student assistants involved in data collection. This study was funded by a VICI grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO; grant number 45316004), awarded to A.W.M. Evers.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

References

- [1] Bajcar EA, Wiercioch-Kuzianik K, Farley D, Buglewicz E, Paulewicz B, Bąbel P. Order does matter: the combined effects of classical conditioning and verbal suggestions on placebo hypoalgesia and nocebo hyperalgesia. *Pain* 2021;162:2237.
- [2] Bartels DJP, van Laarhoven AIM, Haverkamp EA, Wilder-Smith OH, Donders ART, van Middendorp H, van de Kerkhof PCM, Evers AWM. Role of Conditioning and Verbal Suggestion in Placebo and Nocebo Effects on Itch. *PLoS ONE* 2014;9:e91727–e91727.
- [3] Bartels DJP, van Laarhoven AIM, Stroo M, Hijne K, Peerdeman KJ, Donders ART, van de Kerkhof PCM, Evers AWM. Minimizing nocebo effects by conditioning with verbal suggestion: A randomized clinical trial in healthy humans. *PLOS ONE* 2017;12:e0182959–e0182959.
- [4] Benedetti F, Lanotte M, Lopiano L, Colloca L. When words are painful: Unraveling the mechanisms of the nocebo effect. *Neuroscience* 2007;147:260–271.
- [5] Carvalho C, Caetano JM, Cunha L, Rebouta P, Kaptchuk TJ, Kirsch I. Open-label placebo treatment in chronic low back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Pain* 2016;157:2766–2772.
- [6] Colagiuri B, Quinn VF. Autonomic arousal as a mechanism of the persistence of nocebo hyperalgesia. *J Pain* 2018;19:476–486.
- [7] Colagiuri B, Quinn VF, Colloca L. Nocebo Hyperalgesia, Partial Reinforcement, and Extinction. *J Pain* 2015;16:995–1004.
- [8] Colloca L, Petrovic P, Wager TD, Ingvar M, Benedetti F. How the number of learning trials affects placebo and nocebo responses. *Pain* 2010;151:430–439.
- [9] Colloca L, Sigaud M, Benedetti F. The role of learning in nocebo and placebo effects. *Pain* 2008;136:211–218.
- [10] Engelhard IM, Leer A, Lange E, Olatunji BO. Shaking that icky feeling: Effects of extinction and counterconditioning on disgust-related evaluative learning. *Behav Ther* 2014;45:708–719.
- [11] Gracely RH, Grant MAB, Giesecke T. Evoked pain measures in fibromyalgia. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2003;17:593–609.
- [12] Jensen KB, Kosek E, Petzke F, Carville S, Fransson P, Marcus H, Williams SCR, Choy E, Giesecke T, Mainguy Y. Evidence of dysfunctional pain inhibition in Fibromyalgia reflected in rACC during provoked pain. *PAIN®* 2009;144:95–100.
- [13] Kang S, Vervliet B, Engelhard IM, van Dis EAM, Hageraars MA. Reduced return of threat expectancy after counterconditioning versus extinction. *Behav Res Ther* 2018;108:78–84.
- [14] Kaptchuk TJ, Friedlander E, Kelley JM, Sanchez MN, Kokkotou E, Singer JP, Kowalczykowski M, Miller FG, Kirsch I, Lembo AJ. Placebos without deception: A randomized controlled trial in irritable bowel syndrome. *PLoS ONE* 2010;5.
- [15] Kelley JM, Kaptchuk TJ, Cusin C, Lipkin S, Fava M. Open-label placebo for major depressive disorder: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Psychother Psychosom* 2012;81:312–314.
- [16] Kerkhof I, Vansteenwegen D, Baeyens F, Hermans D. Counterconditioning: An effective technique for changing conditioned preferences. *Exp Psychol* 2011;58:31–38.
- [17] Kleine-Borgmann J, Schmidt K, Hellmann A, Bingel U. Effects of open-label placebo on pain, functional disability, and spine mobility in patients with chronic back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Pain* 2019;160:2891–2897.
- [18] Locher C, Nascimento AF, Kirsch I, Kossowsky J, Meyer A, Gaab J. Is the rationale more

- important than deception? A randomized controlled trial of open-label placebo analgesia. *Pain* 2017;158:2320–2328.
- [19] Marques AP, Santo A de S do E, Berssaneti AA, Matsutani LA, Yuan SLK. Prevalence of fibromyalgia: literature review update. *Rev Bras Reumatol* 2017;57:356–363.
- [20] Meeuwis SH, Van Middendorp H, Pacheco-Lopez G, Ninaber MK, Lavrijsen APM, Van Der Wee N, Veldhuijzen DS, Evers AWM. Antipruritic Placebo Effects by Conditioning H1-antihistamine. *Psychosom Med* 2019;81:841–850.
- [21] Meulders A, Karsdorp PA, Claes N, Vlaeyen JWS. Comparing counterconditioning and extinction as methods to reduce fear of movement-related pain. *J Pain* 2015;16:1353–1365.
- [22] Meulders A, Vansteenwegen D, Vlaeyen JW. The acquisition of fear of movement-related pain and associative learning: a novel pain-relevant human fear conditioning paradigm. *Pain* 2011;152:2460–2469.
- [23] Meulders A, Vlaeyen JW. Mere intention to perform painful movements elicits fear of movement-related pain: an experimental study on fear acquisition beyond actual movements. *J Pain* 2013;14:412–423.
- [24] Miller FG, Wendler D, Swartzman LC. Deception in Research on the Placebo Effect. *PLoS Med* 2005;2:e262.
- [25] Montgomery GH, Kirsch I. Classical conditioning and the placebo effect. *Pain* 1997;72:107–113.
- [26] Peerdeman KJ, Geers AL, Della Porta D, Veldhuijzen DS, Kirsch I. Underpredicting pain: an experimental investigation into the benefits and risks. *Pain* 2021;162:2024–2035.
- [27] Peerdeman KJ, van Laarhoven AIM, Keij SM, Vase L, Rovers MM, Peters ML, Evers AWM. Relieving patients' pain with expectation interventions. *PAIN* 2016;157:1179–1191.
- [28] Petersen GL, Finnerup NB, Colloca L, Amanzio M, Price DD, Jensen TS, Vase L. The magnitude of nocebo effects in pain: A meta-analysis. *PAIN®* 2014;155:1426–1434.
- [29] Petzke F, Clauw DJ, Ambrose K, Khine A, Gracely RH. Increased pain sensitivity in fibromyalgia: Effects of stimulus type and mode of presentation. *Pain* 2003;105:403–413.
- [30] Raes AK, de Raedt R. The Effect of Counterconditioning on Evaluative Responses and Harm Expectancy in a Fear Conditioning Paradigm. *Behav Ther* 2012;43:757–767.
- [31] Sandler AD, Bodfish JW. Open-label use of placebos in the treatment of ADHD: A pilot study. *Child Care Health Dev* 2008;34:104–110.
- [32] Schaefer M, Harke R, Denke C. Open-label placebos improve symptoms in allergic rhinitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Psychother Psychosom* 2016;85:373–375.
- [33] Schaefer M, Sahin T, Berstecher B. Why do open-label placebos work? A randomized controlled trial of an open-label placebo induction with and without extended information about the placebo effect in allergic rhinitis. *PloS One* 2018;13:e0192758.
- [34] Thomaidou MA, Veldhuijzen DS, Meulders A, Evers AWM. An experimental investigation into the mediating role of pain-related fear in boosting nocebo hyperalgesia. *Pain* 2021;162:287–299.
- [35] Thomaidou MA, Veldhuijzen DS, Peerdeman KJ, Wiebing NZS, Blythe JS, Evers AWM. Learning mechanisms in nocebo hyperalgesia: the role of conditioning and extinction processes. *Pain* 2020;161:1597–1608.
- [36] Van Laarhoven AIMM, Vogelaar ML, Wilder-Smith OH, van Riel PLCMCM, Van De Kerkhof PCMM, Kraaimaat FW, Evers AWM. Induction of nocebo and placebo effects on itch and pain by verbal suggestions. *Pain* 2011;152:1486–1494.

- [37] Vase L, Robinson ME, Verne GN, Price DD. Increased placebo analgesia over time in irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) patients is associated with desire and expectation but not endogenous opioid mechanisms. *Pain* 2005;115:338–347.
- [38] Vase L, Robinson ME, Verne GN, Price DD. The contributions of suggestion, desire, and expectation to placebo effects in irritable bowel syndrome patients: An empirical investigation. *Pain* 2003;105:17–25.
- [39] Wolfe F, Smythe HA, Yunus MB, Bennett RM, Bombardier C, Goldenberg DL, Tugwell P, Campbell SM, Abeles M, Clark P, Fam AG, Farber SJ, Fiechtner JJ, Michael Franklin C, Gatter RA, Hamaty D, Lessard J, Lichtbroun AS, Masi AT, McCain GA, John Reynolds W, Romano TJ, Jon Russell I, Sheon RP. The american college of rheumatology 1990 criteria for the classification of fibromyalgia. *Arthritis Rheum* 1990;33:160–172.

Figures and tables

Fig. 1. Overview of the study design. In part 1 (open-label nocebo induction), participants were randomly assigned (3:1) to the experimental group (nocebo conditioning) or the control group (sham conditioning). During the learning phase of nocebo conditioning, participants received moderate pain (4.5-5.5 on 0-10 Numeric Rating Scale; NRS) during 'DNS on' trials and slight pain (2-3 on 0-10 NRS) during 'DNS off' trials. The sham group received stimuli of slight and moderate intensity, not specifically associated with 'DNS on' or 'DNS off' (i.e., 10 moderate intensity and 10 slight intensity stimuli were randomly paired to the 20 trials). Both groups received slight pain stimuli for all trials in the test phase. In part 2 (open-label nocebo reduction), participants from the experimental group were randomly assigned (1:1:1) to one of three groups: counterconditioning, extinction, or continued nocebo conditioning. During counterconditioning, 'DNS on' trials were now paired with no pain (0-1 on 0-10 NRS) and 'DNS off' trials with slight pain in the learning phase. During extinction, all trials were paired with a slight pain intensity. Continued nocebo conditioning was identical to nocebo conditioning in part 1. Participants in the placebo conditioning group received no pain during 'DNS on' trials and slight pain on 'DNS off' trials, which is identical to the procedure of counterconditioning. The test phases in all groups in part 2 were identical to the test phases in part 1.

Fig. 2. Flow diagram of the RCT.

Fig 3. Average NRS ratings and Standard Error of the Mean (SEM) of all 3 experimental trials and control trials during the testing phase of nocebo conditioning and sham conditioning. Both for nocebo conditioning and sham conditioning, experimental trials were rated as significantly more painful than control trials. The magnitude of the nocebo effect was significantly larger in the nocebo conditioning group than in the sham conditioning group. * $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$ (two-tailed)

Fig. 4. Level of nocebo reduction from the testing phase of nocebo induction to the testing phase of nocebo reduction. Means and SEM's are depicted across the three groups. Both counterconditioning and extinction led to a significant reduction of the nocebo effect, whereas continued nocebo conditioning did not. Counterconditioning led to a significantly larger reduction than extinction and continued nocebo conditioning; extinction also led to a larger reduction than continued nocebo conditioning * $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$ (two tailed)

Fig. 5. Average NRS scores during experimental trials are displayed for counterconditioning and extinction. The first 3 trials represent the experimental trials during the testing phase of part 1, while the next 10 trials represent experimental trials in the learning phase of part 2 (separated by the vertical line). While counterconditioning shows the largest reduction, the speed of reduction does not differ between the groups.

Figure 6. Average NRS ratings and SEMs of all 3 experimental trials and control trials during the testing phase of counterconditioning and placebo conditioning. Both for counterconditioning and placebo conditioning, experimental trials were rated as significantly less painful than control trials. No significant difference in magnitude of the placebo effect was detected; * $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$, ns = $p \geq 0.05$ (two-tailed).

Table 1

Group means and SDs for calibration values (preceding randomization) and exit questionnaires.

	Subgroups nocebo conditioning									
	Nocebo		Sham/Placebo		Counter-		Extinction		Continued	
	Conditioning (n=85)		Conditioning (n=25)		conditioning (n=27)		(n=29)		Nocebo Conditioning (n=27)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Calibrations										
No pain (kPa)	182.36	86.72	176.32	84.77	173.63	76.95	176.30	84.61	180.56	78.55
Slight pain (kPa)	356.30	122.12	351.10	108.54	342.45	109.06	336.79	124.05	372.52	118.06
Moderate pain (kPa)	570.79	180.84	572.14	157.76	550.46	172.10	519.05	176.96	622.29	166.74
Exit questionnaire										
Trust in experimenter	8.73	1.30	8.53	1.37	8.60	1.37	8.48	1.45	9.17	0.94
Competence	8.68	1.43	8.58	1.40	8.15	1.65	8.78	1.31	9.04	1.26
Response bias	0.70	1.26	0.70	0.99	0.68	1.21	0.74	1.33	0.68	1.30
Experienced pain intensity	2.56	1.23	1.91	1.89	2.81	0.94	2.46	1.28	2.54	1.19
during “DNS on” trials as										
compared to “DNS off”										
trials in part 1*										
Experienced pain intensity	-	-	-2.52	1.53	-2.50	1.75	0.06	1.19	2.00	1.49
during “DNS on” trials as										
compared to “DNS off”										
trials in part 2*										

* Displayed as amount of deviation from no difference between ON and OFF trials, with a positive score indicating a higher amount of pain during DNS on trials compared to DNS off trials and a negative score indicating a lower amount of pain during DNS on trials compared to DNS off trials.

Table 2

Group means and SDs for reported pain during the learning and testing phase of placebo induction and reduction, as well as for the magnitude of the placebo effect and the reduction of the placebo effect.

	Part 1				Part 2				Continued			
	Nocebo		Sham		Counter-		Extinction		Nocebo		Placebo	
	Conditioning		Conditioning		conditioning		(n=29)		Conditioning		Conditioning	
	(n=85)		(n=25)		(n=27)		(n=29)		(n=27)		(n=25)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Nocebo												
induction/reduction												
Learning phase												
NRS experimental trials	5.32	1.04	4.20	0.87	0.72	0.76	3.56	1.51	5.74	1.25	1.17	0.99
NRS control trials	2.73	1.09	4.33	0.87	3.79	1.36	3.08	1.43	3.01	1.26	4.01	1.18
Testing phase												
NRS experimental trials	4.04	1.46	3.46	1.43	3.15	1.32	3.49	1.73	4.30	1.54	3.47	1.34
NRS control trials	2.78	1.44	3.16	1.39	3.80	1.37	2.99	1.65	3.03	1.55	4.08	1.55
Nocebo effect	1.26	0.96	0.31	0.46	-0.65	0.74	0.51	0.74	1.27	1.17	-0.62	1.00
Reduction of nocebo effect (part 1 - part 2)	-	-	-	-	1.98	1.47	0.77	0.90	-0.01	0.90	-	-