



King's Research Portal

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hirsch, C., Meeten, F., Newby, J., O'Halloran, S., Gordon, S., Krzyzanowski, H., & Moulds, M. (in press). Looking on the bright side reduces worry in pregnancy: training interpretations in pregnant women. *Clinical Psychology in Europe*.

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Looking on the bright side reduces worry in pregnancy: training interpretations in pregnant women

Hirsch, C. R.^{* 1}, Meeten, F.^{* 2}, Newby, J. M.^{3,4}, O'Halloran, S.¹, Gordon, C.¹, Krzyzanowski, H.¹ & Moulds, M. L.³

* Joint 1st author

affiliations

¹Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, UK

²School of Psychology, University of Sussex, UK

³School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

⁴Black Dog Institute, Hospital Road Randwick, New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

Submitted: May 28th 2020

Resubmitted March 8th 2021

Author note

We are very grateful to the pregnant women who took part in the study. CH receives salary support from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), Mental Health Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. We have no conflicts of interest to declare.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr Colette R. Hirsch,
Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King’s
College London, De Crespigny Park, London SE5 8AF, UK. Email:
colette.hirsch@kcl.ac.uk; Phone: +44 207 848 0697

In press Clinical Psychology in Europe accepted 22nd March 2021

**RUNNING HEAD: RUNNING HEAD: TRAINING POSITIVE INTERPRETATIONS IN
PREGNANT WORRIERS**

Keywords: perinatal mental health, worry, interpretation bias, cognitive bias mediation (CBM),
pregnancy, anxiety

Highlights

- Modification of interpretation bias in pregnant women with high levels of worry was examined.
- Participants received interpretation bias training or an active control condition.
- Training led to less negative interpretations and fewer negative thought intrusions.
- Modifying negative interpretation bias in pregnant women may have clinical utility.

Statement of conclusions

Computerised training to reduce negative interpretation during pregnancy is effective. This
paves the way for longer-term interventions to reduce anxiety and worry in pregnant women.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Abstract

Background

Recent evidence suggests that anxiety is more common than depression in the perinatal period, however there are few interventions available to treat perinatal anxiety. Targeting specific processes that maintain anxiety, such as worry, may be one potentially promising way to reduce anxiety in this period. Given evidence that negative interpretation bias maintains worry, we tested whether interpretation bias could be modified, and whether this in turn would lead to less negative thought (i.e., worry) intrusions, in pregnant women with high levels of worry.

Method

Participants ($N = 47$, at least 16 weeks gestation) were randomly assigned to either an interpretation modification condition (CBM-I) which involved training in accessing positive meanings of emotionally ambiguous scenarios, or an active control condition in which the scenarios remained ambiguous and unresolved.

Results

Relative to the control condition, participants in the CBM-I condition generated significantly more positive interpretations and experienced significantly less negative thought intrusions.

Conclusions

Our findings indicate that worry is a modifiable risk factor during pregnancy, and that it is possible to induce a positive interpretation bias in pregnant women experiencing high levels of worry. Although preliminary, our findings speak to exciting clinical possibilities for the treatment of worry and the prevention of perinatal anxiety.

1 control (Samtani & Moulds,2017); for example, worry and rumination. Worry is a form of
2 RNT that is predominantly verbal, difficult to control and involves entertaining potential
3 negative outcomes for future situations (Borkovec 1994; Hayes et al., 2010). Rumination is
4 another form of RNT, and primarily involves focusing on events in the past, as well as one's
5 perceived personal inadequacies, current mood/symptoms and their causes and consequences
6 (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991; Hirsch et al. 2020). Both of these forms of RNT are experienced as
7 unwanted negative intrusive thoughts that come to mind unbidden, and capture attention such
8 that it is difficult to shift focus away from the thought. Worry is a form of RNT that is
9 predominantly verbal, difficult to control and involves entertaining potential negative
10 outcomes for future situations (Borkovec 1994; Hayes et al., 2010). Moulds et al. (2018)
11 proposed that RNT could be an important factor to target in interventions to improve
12 perinatal distress. In keeping with this, a recent study of pregnant women (Hirsch, Meeten et
13 al., 2020) demonstrated that worry and RNT more generally was associated with increased
14 levels of perinatal anxiety and depression. The predictive role of worry in the development
15 and maintenance of anxiety is well-established, and recent research has indicated that this
16 may similarly apply in the perinatal context. For example, Schmidt et al. (2016) reported that
17 levels of worry in the first four months of pregnancy predicted anxiety and depression
18 symptoms in the third trimester.

19 One key cognitive process proposed to contribute to pathological worry is negative
20 interpretation bias: the transdiagnostic tendency to perceive ambiguous information or events
21 as threatening or negative (Hirsch & Mathews, 2012; Hirsch et al., 2016). Krahe et al. (2019)
22 found that greater levels of negative interpretation were associated with increased worry.
23 Similarly, Hirsch, Meeten et al. (2020) demonstrated that higher levels of both worry and
24 anxiety in pregnant women are associated with more negative interpretation bias. These
25 findings speak to the clinically related possibility that modifying interpretation bias may

1 reduce worry. One experimental methodology that has shown promise in this regard is
2 cognitive bias modification for interpretation (CBM-I).

3 The goal of CBM-I is to facilitate consistent generation of positive interpretations of
4 ambiguous information (where the interpretation could be positive or threatening) via
5 repeated computerised practice. Specifically, participants listen to ambiguous scenarios, with
6 ambiguity being resolved by the final word in a positive manner (e.g., ‘Your boss sends you
7 an email asking you to call them so they can discuss your work with you. When you ring
8 them, they tell you that you that your recent work has been excellent (terrible).’). In previous
9 single session CBM-I studies, participants have been presented with up to 90 scenarios (e.g.,
10 Hirsch et al., 2009) disambiguated in a benign manner.

11 There is evidence that a single session of CBM-I can modify interpretation bias and in
12 turn reduce worry in high worriers (Hirsch et al., 2009; Feng et al., 2020), as well as those
13 with generalised anxiety disorder (GAD) (Hayes et al., 2010). In another GAD sample,
14 Hirsch et al. (2018) demonstrated that multi-session positive CBM-I training (first session
15 completed in the lab, remaining sessions online) resulted in a more positive interpretation
16 bias and reduced worry and anxiety one month later compared to an active control condition.
17 More recently, community participants with high levels of RNT (worry and/or rumination)
18 completed an enhanced version of CBM-I in which participants were instructed to generate
19 positive resolutions to ambiguous scenarios (rather than be presented with a positive
20 resolution) for half of the scenarios, in order to aid generalisation and engagement.
21 Participants were also instructed to generate positive images of the outcome for each
22 scenario. This led to more positive interpretation bias, fewer negative interpretations, and
23 lower levels of RNT, anxiety and depression, relative to a control condition in which
24 ambiguity was unresolved and participants did not generate positive imagery (Hirsch, Krahe,

1 Whyte, Bridge, et al. 2020). These findings prompt the clinically interesting possibility that
 2 interpretation bias training can be adapted as a potential intervention for anxiety.

3 To determine whether CBM-I can help reduce worry and anxiety via a fully web-
 4 based platform which involved no face-to-face contact with researchers during assessment or
 5 training (or control sessions), we conducted a study with a sample of individuals with GAD
 6 with or without comorbid major depressive disorder (Hirsch, Krahe, Whyte, Krzyzanowski,
 7 et al., 2020). Training was highly effective at reducing negative interpretations over the
 8 intervention period compared to the control condition. Importantly, reductions in worry,
 9 rumination, anxiety and depression were evident at three-months follow-up. Furthermore,
 10 effects were mediated by changes in interpretation bias. These findings raise the possibility of
 11 CBM-I forming a low-intensity intervention for pregnant women at risk of escalating levels
 12 of anxiety or depression due to heightened RNT. As an online intervention, it could be
 13 completed at a location and time that are convenient for pregnant women, and thus has scope
 14 to be more readily integrated into daily life compared to traditional face-to-face interventions.

15 The possibility that CBM-I may have utility in facilitating a more positive
 16 interpretation bias in pregnant women who engage in high levels of worry remains untested.
 17 Given that pregnant women who worry have a more negative interpretation bias (Hirsch,
 18 Meeten et al., 2020), and the proposal that targeting RNT, such as worry, in pregnancy may
 19 have the potential to prevent and treat postpartum anxiety (Moulds et al., 2018), testing
 20 whether CBM-I can shift interpretive bias in pregnant high worriers represents a logical first
 21 step. Accordingly, we recruited pregnant women with self-reported high levels of worry who
 22 were randomly allocated to either (i) CBM-I (i.e., interpretation training enhanced with
 23 positive imagery and self-generation) or (ii) control (no resolution of ambiguity nor positive
 24 imagery) conditions. We hypothesised that participants in the CBM-I condition would
 25 generate more positive interpretations and thus demonstrate a positive interpretation bias

1 compared to those in the control condition. We also hypothesised that participants in the
 2 CBM-I condition would experience fewer negative thought intrusions (indicative of worry)
 3 during a behavioural worry task in which they were instructed to focus on their breathing,
 4 relative to participants in the control condition.

5

6 **Method**

7 **Study registration**

8 The study was registered on Open Science Framework with number <https://osf.io/ye84g/>.

9 **Participants**

10 Forty-nine women with high levels of self-reported worry (scoring ≥ 56 ¹ on the Penn
 11 State Worry Questionnaire cf. Hayes, Hirsch, & Mathews, 2010) completed the study and 47
 12 women completed useable data (see Table 1 for demographic information). Participants were
 13 required to be sixteen or more weeks pregnant, fluent in English, with normal or corrected
 14 vision and hearing, and have no history of either stillbirth or three or more miscarriages.
 15 Participation involved attending a session in the lab, and participants were reimbursed £25
 16 for taking part.

17 Individuals who expressed interest in the study were sent a screening questionnaire
 18 via Qualtrics, an online data acquisition platform. One hundred and sixty three women
 19 completed the screening questionnaire, of whom 64 did not meet the inclusion criteria.
 20 Ninety nine respondents were eligible to take part in the study on the basis of their responses
 21 and were invited via email to take part in the study. Sixty-three of these responded to the

¹ In a sample of individuals diagnosed with GAD, a PSWQ score of 56 was one standard deviation below the mean (Molina & Borkovec, 1994) and is commonly used as a cut-off in research (Feng et al. 2020; Hirsch, Perman et al. 2015). Accordingly, we classified participants as high worriers if their PSWQ score was ≥ 56 .

1 email and were offered a testing date. Of these, 49 participants completed the study, while 6
 2 were found to be ineligible on the day of testing due to their score on Penn State Worry
 3 Questionnaire (Meyer et al., 1990; PSWQ) being below cut off, 7 withdrew before attending
 4 the testing session and one had the session cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Two
 5 participants' data was not included in the study as their responses to the Recognition Test
 6 Comprehension Questions indicated they had either not understood or not engaged with the
 7 task. The final sample of 47 participants were aged between 22 and 42 years ($M = 32.89$, $S.D$
 8 $= 4.69$), and ranged between 16 and 39 weeks pregnant ($M = 27.64$, $S.D = 6.82$). Twelve
 9 participants had one child already, and two participants had two children. The other 35
 10 participants were pregnant with their first child.

11

12 Table 1

13 Mean demographic and statistics characteristics and questionnaires (standard deviation in
 14 parenthesis)

	CBM-I	Control	<i>t(45)</i>	<i>p</i>
	N= 23	N= 24		
Age	33.35 (4.78)	32.46 (4.65)	0.65	0.52
Weeks of gestation	26.96 (7.10)	28.29 (6.62)	0.67	0.51
PSWQ	64.30 (5.67)	66.13 (5.66)	1.10	0.28
RTQT	39.70(10.63)	40.67 (7.01)	0.37	0.71
PASS	43.09 (15.83)	47.54 (17.87)	0.90	0.37
EDPS	11.87 (3.55)	14.21 (5.37)	1.76	0.09
PHQ-9	8.87 (3.88)	11.00 (6.09)	1.42	0.16
GAD-7	8.52 (4.12)	11.42 (5.36)	2.07	0.04
RRS	54.48 (13.30)	52.63 (13.54)	0.47	0.64

1 *Note.* CBM-I = cognitive bias modification for interpretation; Weeks of gestation = number of weeks pregnant
 2 at time of testing; PSWQ = Penn State Worry Questionnaire, RTQT = Trait Repetitive Thinking Questionnaire,
 3 PASS = Perinatal Anxiety Screening Scale, EPDS = Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale, GAD7 =
 4 Generalised Anxiety Disorder Questionnaire, PHQ9 = Patient Health Questionnaire, RRS = Ruminative
 5 Response Scale.

6 **Sample size**

7
 8 An a-priori power calculation with an alpha of .05 and power of .80 was computed in
 9 GPower. The effect size was determined by a recent study examining the effects of
 10 interpretation bias manipulation on the Recognition Test (Feng et al., 2020). Projected sample
 11 size was 26 per condition. As we did not know whether pregnancy would influence the
 12 capacity to modify interpretation bias, we elected to increase the planned number of
 13 participants recruited per condition to 30. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020,
 14 face-to-face testing was ultimately prohibited. Accordingly, we ceased recruitment and
 15 testing prematurely, after testing 49 participants. Of these, two participants were excluded on
 16 the basis of poor performance on the recognition test comprehension questions, resulting in
 17 final samples of $n = 23$ and $n = 24$ in the CBM-I and control conditions, respectively.

18
 19 **Measures & Materials**

20 *Questionnaires*

21 *Penn State Worry Questionnaire (PSWQ; Meyer, Miller, Metzger, & Borkovec, 1990).* The
 22 PSWQ consists of 16 statements related to worry (e.g., *My worries overwhelm me*) which are
 23 rated from 1 (*not at all typical of me*) to 5 (*very typical of me*). The PSWQ has high internal
 24 consistency (present sample Cronbach's $\alpha = .70$), convergent and criterion validity (Hayes et
 25 al., 2010), and good test-retest reliability (Meyer et al., 1990).

26 *Other standardised questionnaires.* Perinatal anxiety was assessed using the Perinatal
 27 Anxiety Screening Scale (PASS; Somerville et al., 2014; Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$ in current
 28 sample). Perinatal depression was assessed with the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale
 29 (EPDS; Cox, Holden, & Sagowsky, 1987; Cronbach's $\alpha = .84$). General depressed mood was

1 assessed using the Patient Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9, Kroenke & Spitzer, 2002;
2 Cronbach's $\alpha = .84$) and general anxiety symptoms using the Generalized Anxiety Disorder
3 7-item scale (GAD-7; Spitzer et al., 2006; Cronbach's $\alpha = .87$). Trait RNT was assessed with
4 the Repetitive Thinking Questionnaire (RTQ-T [trait]; McEvoy, Tribodeau, & Asmundson,
5 2014; Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$). Ruminative Response Scale (RRS; Nolen-Hoeksema & Morrow,
6 1991; Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$) was used to assess depressive rumination².

7 **Tasks**

8 **Worry induction.** Participants identified a current worry topic (related to their
9 pregnancy or other aspects of their life) and were asked a series of questions to prime salient
10 features. They were then instructed to silently worry about this topic as they normally would
11 for five minutes.

12 **Interpretation assessment task - Recognition Task (Hirsch et al., 2018; adapted**
13 **from Mathews & Mackintosh, 2000).** The first phase of this task requires participants to read
14 a series of ambiguous scenarios. The last word of each scenario (which leaves the ambiguity
15 unresolved) is presented as a word fragment, and participants are instructed to fill in the first
16 missing letter of that word. Next, participants complete a comprehension question (yes/no)
17 about the scenario (see Appendix A for example). In the second phase, participants are
18 presented with a scenario title and four statements in random order, then indicate how similar
19 each statement is to the meaning of the original scenario. The statements include one positive
20 target (in keeping with the positive interpretation of the original scenario), one negative
21 target, and one positive and one negative foil unrelated to the scenario meaning. Participants
22 rate each statement on a scale from 1 (*very different in meaning*) to 4 (*very similar in*
23 *meaning*). Interpretation bias is assessed by calculating a positivity index, which is calculated

² VAS mood ratings were also taken during the study, but were not available for analysis due to the university being closed because of COVID-19.

1 by subtracting the mean ratings for negative targets from the mean ratings for positive targets.
2 Higher scores therefore indicate a more positive interpretation bias.

3 ***Breathing Focus Task (Feng et al., 2020; adapted from Ruscio & Borkovec, 2004).***

4 In the version of the task employed in this study, participants first practiced the breathing
5 focus task. Next, they were instructed to engage in worry about a current worry topic for five
6 minutes, and then completed a five-minute breathing focus task. During this task, participants
7 were instructed to focus on their breathing. They were given a series of prompts (i.e., 12
8 computerised tones) throughout the task; each time they heard a prompt, participants were
9 asked to indicate if they were focusing on their breathing as instructed, or if their mind had
10 wandered to another topic (i.e., they were experiencing a thought intrusion). If the latter,
11 participants were asked to indicate the valence of the intrusion (i.e., positive, negative or
12 neutral). Negative thought intrusions are interpreted to be indicative of worry, as per previous
13 CBM-I studies (e.g., Feng et al., 2020).

14 **CBM-I condition**

15 ***Imagery Practise Task - adapted from Holmes et al. (2006) and used in Hirsch et al.***
16 ***2019; Feng, et al. 2020.*** Participants in the CBM-I condition completed an online imagery
17 practice task to help them generate vivid and positive mental images, and to instruct them on
18 how to hold them in mind (see Feng et al., 2020).

19 ***Cognitive Bias Modification for Interpretation (CBM-I).*** CBM-I is an online,
20 scenario-based task that requires participants to listen (over headphones) to 40 scenarios
21 which present common worry-related situations that are initially emotionally ambiguous.
22 Participants in the active condition were provided with a positive resolution (i.e. ending) of
23 the ambiguous scenario for 20 trials, and instructed to generate their own positive resolution
24 for the 20 remaining trials. Participants are instructed to use mental imagery to vividly picture
25 the resolution. After each scenario, participants are presented with a ‘Yes/No’ comprehension

1 question, designed to emphasise the desired interpretation of the scenario. They then receive
2 feedback ('correct/incorrect') on these answers. Participants then rate the positivity of the
3 scenario, on a scale of 0 ('not at all') to 100 ('extremely') (see Appendix A for example).

4 **Control condition**

5 *Filler Task.* The Feng et al. (2019) filler task used to match the time taken to
6 complete the imagery training in the CBM-I condition.

7 *Sham Training.* Similar to CBM-I training, participants listened to 50 ambiguous
8 worry-related scenarios over headphones. An increased number of trials was required to
9 match the duration of CBM-I training. In this condition ambiguity remained unresolved, and
10 participants were not instructed to generate particular outcomes. Participants completed
11 comprehension questions without feedback, thus allowing for either positive or negative
12 interpretations without correction.

13 **Procedure**

14 Participants completed the PSWQ online within the 24 hours prior to the experimental
15 testing session, to ensure that they still met study eligibility criteria. Before coming into the
16 lab, participants were randomly allocated to the CBM-I or control condition on the basis of
17 an allocation by an independent researcher. They then completed the study tasks associated
18 with their allocated condition. See Figure 1. for an overview of the study procedure.

19

20

20 **Results**

21 *Questionnaire measures for CBM-I and Control conditions*

22 See Table 1 for means of questionnaire measures and statistics for participants
23 included in the analysis. The only significant between-condition difference to emerge was for
24 GAD-7; such that participants in the control condition reported higher anxiety. Importantly,
25 however, we note that the conditions did not differ on the PASS, – i.e., a measure of perinatal

1 anxiety specifically (rather than a measure of general anxiety developed for non-pregnant
2 populations).

3 *Assessing the impact of CBM-I on interpretation bias (Hypothesis 1)*

4 To examine the effect of condition on interpretation bias, we conducted a regression
5 analysis with mean positivity index score as the dependent variable. Condition³ significantly
6 predicted post-training positivity index score, ($b = 0.54$, $SE = .19$, $p = .007$, 95% CIs [0.16,
7 0.92]). The mean positivity index was higher for the CBM-I ($M = 0.35$ $SD = 0.64$) than the
8 control ($M = 0.19$, $SD = 0.65$) condition, confirming that CBM-I was effective in facilitating
9 a positive interpretation bias.

10 *Assessing the impact of CBM-I on negative thought intrusions (Hypothesis 2)*


11 To examine the effect of condition on negative thought intrusions, we conducted a
12 bootstrapped (due to non-normality of data) regression analysis with number of negative
13 thought intrusions from the breathing focus task as the dependent variable. Condition
14 significantly predicted post-training positivity index score ($b = -1.11$, $SE = .45$, $p = .02$, 95%
15 CIs [-1.96, -0.28]). Consistent with the hypothesis, participants in the CBM-I condition
16 reported significantly fewer intrusions ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 1.01$) than did those in the control
17 condition ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 1.85$).

18

19

³ As GAD7 scores were significantly different at baseline we re-ran the regression analysis with mean centred GAD7 scores and an interaction variable of (mean centred) GAD7 and condition. Neither GAD7 scores ($p = .67$) or the interaction term ($p = .54$) were significant predictors in the model. Condition remained a significant predictor ($p = .02$).

Figure 1 Overview of study procedure



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Discussion

In this first study of interpretation training in pregnant worriers, we successfully induced a positive interpretation bias using CBM-I. Consistent with Hirsch et al. (2009) and Feng et al. (2019), participants in the CBM-I condition reported fewer negative thought intrusions relative to the control condition, supporting a causal role for interpretation bias in maintaining worry in pregnant women. As the first study to employ CBM-I to test questions about interpretation bias and worry in pregnant women, our results extend the CBM literature in important ways. First, on a methodological note, they demonstrate the applicability and effectiveness of CBM-I in the perinatal context. Second, they confirm that interpretation bias maintains worry in pregnant women. Whilst this relationship is well-established in the broader literature (Hirsch et al., 2009; Feng et al., 2019; Hirsch, Krahe, Whyte, Bridge, et al. 2020.), given the unique and multi-faceted circumstances and changes (e.g., biological, cognitive) which characterise the perinatal period, our results are theoretically important in confirming this link in a perinatal sample.

Third, by indicating that worry is a modifiable psychological risk factor in pregnancy, our findings have clinical promise. As noted earlier, the treatment of perinatal anxiety has received limited research attention. Further, the treatments that have been developed are primarily generic such that they are comprised of standard CBT techniques, including challenging cognitions by generating alternative interpretations (e.g., Forsell et al., 2017; see Moulds et al., 2018). In contrast, CBM-I seeks to enhance access to positive interpretations in a more direct, automatic way. Our findings suggest that developing novel approaches which draw on experimental findings and directly target factors have been identified to maintain anxiety (e.g., worry) to potentially supplement existing treatment approaches may be a promising future clinical direction.

1 Moreover, our findings speak to the issue of prevention. In light of growing evidence
2 that antenatal RNT predicts perinatal mental health problems (de Jong et al., 2016; Schmidt
3 et al., 2016), the prospect of reducing worry in pregnant women by targeting interpretation
4 bias represents an exciting possibility for preventing postpartum anxiety. Topper et al. (2017)
5 found that that a preventive intervention which targeted RNT reduced the onset of depression
6 and anxiety 12 months later. Our finding that antenatal worry is a modifiable risk factor
7 similarly raises the possibility that an intervention targeting worry may also have utility in
8 preventing subsequent mental health problems in the postnatal period.

9 We acknowledge some limitations and suggest future research directions. First, while
10 single-session CBM experiments critically advance understanding of theoretical mechanisms,
11 they do not provide sufficient evidence regarding the sustained consequences of targeting
12 interpretation bias in this way (Hirsch et al., 2018). That said, we note that recent studies
13 using multiple CBM-I sessions (e.g., 10 internet-delivered sessions) have reported
14 encouraging preliminary evidence of the longevity of effects (i.e., improved mood, reductions
15 in RNT at one-month follow-up; Hirsch et al., 2018; Hirsch, Krahe, Whyte, Bridge, et al.
16 2020). Future research which employs multiple sessions with an extended follow-up period is
17 needed before conclusions can be drawn about potential clinical benefit and preventive utility
18 in the perinatal context. Second, we did not gather detailed information about previous
19 numbers of miscarriages or complications in participants' current (or any previous)
20 pregnancy, leaving it unknown whether our findings generalise to pregnant women who have
21 experienced pregnancy loss or complications in participants' current (or any previous)
22 pregnancy.

23 Third, we did not assess interpretation bias or the presence of negative intrusions pre-
24 training, and thus do not know whether groups differed at the outset. However, participants
25 were randomised to condition by a researcher outside of the study team, making these

1 possible explanations for the results unlikely. Fourth, randomisation led to differences in
2 anxiety (GAD-7) between groups. Finally, due to COVID-19 pandemic ruling out completion
3 of data collection, the number of participants was slightly below that recommended in the
4 original sample size calculation.

5 Our findings raise interesting possibilities for future research. In a recent fully web-
6 based study, Hirsch, Krahe, Whyte, Krzyzanowski, et al. (2020) reported that CBM-I led to
7 reductions in depression and anxiety, as well as worry and rumination, in participants with
8 GAD with or without comorbid depression. The effects persisted to 3-month follow-up, and
9 notably, were mediated by changes in interpretation bias. These results raise the exciting
10 possibility that CBM-I could form a low intensity intervention to treat or prevent anxiety and
11 worry, with potential for application in the perinatal context. Further, given evidence that
12 CBM-I may be effective in modifying interpretation bias in the context of a range of mental
13 health conditions (e.g., depression, Hirsch et al., 2018; eating disorders, Turton et al., 2018;
14 social anxiety, Stevens et al., 2018), another potentially fruitful research direction could be to
15 investigate the effectiveness of CBM-I for other perinatal psychological symptoms, beyond
16 anxiety.

17 In sum, this study is the first to evaluate the effectiveness of single session CBM-I for
18 reducing worry in pregnant women. Our findings provide empirical support for interpretive
19 bias as a mechanism underlying antenatal worry, and thus indicate that worry is a modifiable
20 risk factor during pregnancy. Future investigations with a broader sample warrant
21 investigation (where the current sample were from South London and had not experienced
22 three or more miscarriages) to determine if the findings generalise to a more heterogenous
23 sample. Furthermore, future research with pregnant women diagnosed with GAD is needed to
24 confirm that these results are generalisable to treatment-seeking, clinical samples.
25 Nonetheless, given evidence that worry early in pregnancy predicts later anxiety, these data

TRAINING POSITIVE INTERPRETATIONS IN PREGNANT WORRIERS

- 1 represent an important first step in investigating whether CBM-I holds promise as a
- 2 therapeutic approach to address perinatal mental health problems.

References

- 1
2
3
- 4 Austin, M.P., Highet, N. & Expert Working Group (2017). Mental health care in the perinatal
5 period: Australian clinical practice guideline, *Melbourne: Centre of Perinatal*
6 *Excellence*.
- 7
- 8 Borkovec, T. D. (1994). The nature, functions, and origins of worry. In G. C. L. Davey & F.
9 Tallis (Eds.), *Worrying: Perspectives on Theory, Assessment and Treatment* (pp. 5-
10 33). Oxford, England: John Wiley and Sons.
- 11
- 12 Cox, J. L., Holden, J. M., & Sagovsky, R. (1987). Detection of postnatal depression:
13 development of the 10-item Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale. *The British*
14 *Journal of Psychiatry*, 150, 782-786. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.150.6.782>
- 15
- 16 de Boer, M. R., Waterlander, W. E., Kuijper, L. D., Steenhuis, I. H., & Twisk, J. W. (2015).
17 Testing for baseline differences in randomized controlled trials: an unhealthy
18 research behavior that is hard to eradicate. *International Journal of Behavioral*
19 *Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-015-0162-z>
- 20
- 21 DeJong, H., Fox, E., & Stein, A. (2016). Rumination and postnatal depression: A systematic
22 review and a cognitive model. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 82, 38-49.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2016.05.003>
- 24
- 25 DiPietro, J.A., Hilton, S.C., Hawkins, M., Costigan, K.A. & Pressman, E.K. (2002). Maternal

- 1 stress and affect influence foetal neurobehavioral development. *Developmental*
 2 *Psychology*, 38, 659-668. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.38.5.659>
 3
- 4 Fairbrother, N., Janssen, P., Antony, M. M., Tucker, E., & Young, A. H. (2016). Perinatal
 5 anxiety disorder prevalence and incidence. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 200, 148-
 6 155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2015.12.082>
 7
- 8 Feng, Y. C., Krahé, C., Sumich, A., Meeten, F., Lau, J. Y., & Hirsch, C. R. (2019). Using
 9 event-related potential and behavioural evidence to understand interpretation bias in
 10 relation to worry. *Biological Psychology*, 148, 107746.
 11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2019.107746>
 12
- 13 Feng, Y. C., Krahé, C., Meeten, F., Sumich, A., Mok, C. M., & Hirsch, C. R. (2020). Impact
 14 of imagery-enhanced interpretation training on offline and online interpretations in
 15 worry. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 124, 103497.
 16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2019.103497>
 17
- 18 Forsell, E., Bendix, M., Hollandare, F., von Schultz, B.S., Nasiell, J., Blomdahl-Wetterholm,
 19 M., Eriksson, C., Kvarned, S., van der Linden, J.L., Söderberg, E., Jokinen, J., Wide,
 20 K. & Kaldo, V. (2017). Internet delivered cognitive behavior therapy for antenatal
 21 depression: A randomised controlled trial. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 221, 56-64.
 22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.06.013>
 23
- 24 Goodman, J.H., Watson, G.R. & Stubbs, B. (2016). Anxiety disorders in postpartum

- 1 women: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 203,
 2 292-331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.05.033>
 3
- 4 Hayes, S., Hirsch, C.R., Krebs, G. & Mathews, A. (2010). The effects of modifying
 5 interpretation bias on worry in generalized anxiety disorder. *Behaviour Research and*
 6 *Therapy*, 48,171-178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2009.10.006>
 7
- 8 Hayes, S., Hirsch, C.R., & Mathews, A. (2010). Facilitating a benign attention bias
 9 reduces negative thought intrusions. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 119 235-240.
 10 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018264>
 11
- 12 Hedegaard, M., Henriksen, T.B., Sabroe, S. & Secher, N.J (1993). Psychological distress in
 13 pregnancy and preterm delivery. *British Journal of Medicine*, 307, 234-239.
 14 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7292\(94\)90149-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7292(94)90149-X)
 15
- 16 Hirsch, C.R., Hayes, S. & Mathews, A. (2009). Looking on the bright side: accessing
 17 benign meanings reduces worry. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 118, 44.
 18 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013473>
 19
- 20 Hirsch, C.R., Krahe, C., Whyte, J., Loizou, S., Bridge, L., Norton, S. & Mathews, A. (2018).
 21 Interpretation training to target repetitive negative thinking in generalized anxiety
 22 disorder and depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 86, 1017-
 23 1030. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000310>
 24
- 25 Hirsch, C. R., Krahe, C., Whyte, J., Bridge, L., Loizou, S., Norton, S., & Mathews, A. (2020).

1 Effects of modifying interpretation bias on transdiagnostic repetitive negative
 2 thinking. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 88, 226.
 3 <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000455>
 4

5 Hirsch, C. R., Krahe, C., Whyte, J., Krzyzanowski, H., Meeten, F., Norton, S., & Mathews, A.
 6 (2020). Internet-Delivered Interpretation Training Reduces Worry and Anxiety in
 7 Individuals with Generalized Anxiety Disorder: A Randomized Controlled Experiment.
 8 Manuscript submitted for publication.
 9

10

11 Hirsch, C.R. & Mathews, A. (2012). A cognitive model of pathological worry. *Behaviour*
 12 *Research and Therapy*, 50, 636-646. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2012.06.007>
 13

14 Hirsch, C.R., Meeten, F., Gordon, C., Newby, J., Bick, D., & Moulds, M. (2020). Repetitive
 15 Negative Thinking and Interpretation Bias in Pregnancy. (Manuscript submitted for
 16 publication).
 17

18 Hirsch, C.R., Meeten, F., Krahe, C. & Reeder, C. (2016). Resolving ambiguity in emotional
 19 disorders: The nature and role of interpretation biases. *Annual Review of Clinical*
 20 *Psychology*, 12, 281-305. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-021815-093436>
 21

22 Hirsch, C. R., Perman, G., Hayes, S., Eagleson, C., & Mathews, A. (2015). Delineating the role
 23 of negative verbal thinking in promoting worry, perceived threat, and anxiety. *Clinical*
 24 *Psychological Science*, 3, 637–647.
 25

- 1 Holmes, E. A., Mathews, A., Dalgleish, T., & Mackintosh, B. (2006). Positive interpretation
 2 training: Effects of mental imagery versus verbal training on positive mood. *Behavior*
 3 *Therapy, 37*, 237-247.
- 4
- 5 Howard, L.M., Megnin-Viggars, O., Symington, I. & Pilling, S. (2014). Antenatal and
 6 postnatal mental health: summary of updated NICE guidance. *British Journal of*
 7 *Medicine, 349*, 7394. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7394>
- 8
- 9 Howard, L.M., Molyneaux, E., Dennis, C., Rochat, T., Stein, A. & Milgrom, J. (2014). Non-
 10 psychotic mental disorders in the perinatal period. *The Lancet, 384*, 1775-1788.
 11 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61276-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61276-9)
- 12
- 13 Krahé, C., Whyte, J., Bridge, L., Loizou, S., & Hirsch, C. R. (2019). Are different forms of
 14 repetitive negative thinking associated with interpretation bias in generalized anxiety
 15 disorder and depression? *Clinical Psychological Science, 7*, 969-981.
 16 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702619851808>
- 17
- 18 Kroenke, K., & Spitzer, R. L. (2002). The PHQ-9: a new depression diagnostic and severity
 19 measure. *Psychiatric Annals, 32*, 509-515. [https://doi.org/10.3928/0048-5713-](https://doi.org/10.3928/0048-5713-20020901-06)
 20 [20020901-06](https://doi.org/10.3928/0048-5713-20020901-06)
- 21
- 22 Loughnan, S. A., Wallace, M., Joubert, A. E., Haskelberg, H., Andrews, G., & Newby, J. M.
 23 (2018). A systematic review of psychological treatments for clinical anxiety during the
 24 perinatal period. *Archives of Women's Mental Health, 21*, 481-490.
 25 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-018-0812-7>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Mathews, A. & Mackintosh, B. (2000). Induced emotional interpretation bias and

anxiety, *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 109, 602-615.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.109.4.602>

McEvoy, P. M., Thibodeau, M. A., & Asmundson, G. J. (2014). Trait repetitive negative

thinking: A brief transdiagnostic assessment. *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, 5, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.5127/jep.037813>

Meyer, T.J., Miller, M.L., Metzger, R.L. & Borkovec, T.D. (1990). Development and

validation of the Penn State Worry Questionnaire. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 28, 487-495. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(90\)90135-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(90)90135-6)

(Molina & Borkovec, 1994)....

Moulds, M.L., Black, M.J., Newby, J.M. & Hirsch, C.R. (2018). Repetitive negative thinking and its role in perinatal mental health. *Psychopathology*, 51, 161-166.

<https://doi.org/10.1159/000488114>

O'Connor, T.G., Heron, J., Glover, V. & Alspac Study Team (2002). Antenatal anxiety predicts child behavioral/emotional problems independently of postnatal depression. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 41, 1470-1477.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200212000-00019>

O'Donnell, K. J., Glover, V., Barker, E. D., & O'Connor, T. G. (2014). The persisting effect of

- 1 maternal mood in pregnancy on childhood psychopathology. *Development and*
 2 *Psychopathology*, 26, 393-403. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579414000029>
 3
- 4 Ruscio, A.M. & Borkovec, T.D. (2004). Experience and appraisal of worry among high
 5 worriers with and without generalized anxiety disorder. *Behaviour Research and*
 6 *Therapy*, 42, 1469-1482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2003.10.007>
 7
- 8 Samtani, S., & Moulds, M. L. (2017). Assessing maladaptive repetitive thought in clinical
 9 disorders: A critical review of existing measures. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 53, 14–
 10 28. DOI: [10.1016/j.cpr.2017.01.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2017.01.007)
 11
- 12 Schmidt, D., Seehagen, S., Vocks, S., Schneider, S. & Teismann, T. (2016). Predictive
 13 importance of antenatal depressive rumination and worrying for maternal–foetal
 14 attachment and maternal well-being. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 40, 565-576.
 15 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-016-9759-z>
 16
- 17 Somerville, S., Dedman, K., Hagan, R., Oxnam, E., Wettinger, M., Byrne, S., Coo, S., Doherty,
 18 D. & Page, A. C. (2014). The perinatal anxiety screening scale: development and
 19 preliminary validation. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 17, 443-454.
 20 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-014-0425-8>
 21
- 22 Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for
 23 assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 166,
 24 1092-1097. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092>
 25

- 1 Stein, A., Pearson, R.M., Goodman, S.H., Rapa, E., Rahman, A., McCallum, M., Howard, L.M.
 2 & Pariante, C.M. (2014). Effects of perinatal mental disorders on the foetus and child.
 3 *The Lancet*, 384, 1800-1819. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61277-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61277-0)
 4
- 5 Stevens, E.S., Behar, E. & Jendrusina, A.A. (2018). Enhancing the efficacy of cognitive bias
 6 modification for social anxiety. *Behavior Therapy*. 49, 995-1007.
 7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2018.02.004>
 8
- 9 Stewart, D.E., Robertson, E., Dennis, C., Grace, S.L. and Wallington, T. (2003). Postpartum
 10 depression: Literature review of risk factors and interventions. *Toronto: University*
 11 *Health Network Women's Health Program for Toronto Public Health*. URL:
 12 [https://www.who.int/mental_health/prevention/suicide/lit_review_postpartum_depres](https://www.who.int/mental_health/prevention/suicide/lit_review_postpartum_depression.pdf)
 13 [sion.pdf](https://www.who.int/mental_health/prevention/suicide/lit_review_postpartum_depression.pdf)
 14
- 15 Topper, M., Emmelkamp, P.M., Watkins, E. & Ehring, T. (2017). Prevention of anxiety
 16 disorders and depression by targeting excessive worry and rumination in adolescents
 17 and young adults: A randomized controlled trial. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 90,
 18 123-136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2016.12.015>
 19
- 20 Turton, R., Cardi, V., Treasure, J. & Hirsch, C.R. (2018). Modifying a negative interpretation
 21 bias for ambiguous social scenarios that depict the risk of rejection in women with
 22 anorexia nervosa. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 227, 705-712.
 23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.11.089>
 24
- 25 Williams, A.D. & Grisham, J.R. (2013). Cognitive Bias Modification (CBM) of obsessive

1 compulsive beliefs. *BMC Psychiatry*, 13, 256. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-13->

2 256.

3

4

5

6

7

Appendix A

1. Interpretation assessment task - Recognition Task (Hirsch et al., 2018; adapted from Mathews & Mackintosh, 2000) example scenario:

Title: The car park

It is late at night and you are in a multi-storey car park trying to find your car. You have been looking for about ten minutes and still cannot find it. You hear a noise behind you and see a shadow of
Som_th_ng [something].

Question: Did you find your car right away? (Correct answer: no)

In the second phase, participants are presented with a scenario title and four statements in random order, and then asked to indicate how similar each statement was to the meaning of the original scenario. The statements include one positive target (in keeping with the positive interpretation of the original scenario), one negative target, and one positive and one negative foil unrelated to the scenario meaning. Participants rate each statement on a scale of 1 (*very different in meaning*) to 4 (*very similar in meaning*). For example, for the carpark scenario:

- You see a security person approaching to help you (positive target)
- You see someone coming towards you looking threatening (negative target)
- You see some money on the floor and pick it up (positive foil)
- You see that you have forgotten your ticket and will have to pay a fine (negative foil)

Appendix A

2. *Cognitive Bias Modification for Interpretation (CBM-I)*. The CBM-I is an online, scenario-based task that requires participants to listen (over headphones) to 40 scenarios which present common worry-related situations that are initially emotionally ambiguous. Participants in the active condition were provided with a positive resolution (i.e., ending) of the ambiguous scenario for 20 trials, and are instructed to generate their own positive resolution for the 20 remaining trials. Participants are instructed to use mental imagery to vividly picture the resolution. After each scenario, participants are presented with a 'Yes/No' comprehension question, designed to emphasise the desired interpretation of the scenario. They then receive feedback ('correct/incorrect') on these answers. Participants then rate the positivity of the scenario, on a scale of 0 ('not at all') to 100 ('extremely').

Example scenario: You are getting a piece of work back from your supervisor today.

When working on it, you were very busy with other tasks but spent as much time on it as you could manage. When you read your supervisor's feedback, you understand that your work was fine.

Comprehension question: Is your supervisor pleased with your work?

Answer: Yes

Control condition

Filler Task. This was used to match the time the experimental condition completed the imagery training phase. It involved an online survey which asks about participants' daily routine and eating habits, and a short video about starting gardening with simple comprehension questions.

Appendix A

Sham Training. Similar to the CBM-I training, participants listen to ambiguous worry-related scenarios over headphones. Increased number of trials was to match duration of CBM-I training. However, in this condition the ambiguity remains unresolved, and participants are not instructed to generate particular outcomes. Participants completed comprehension questions without feedback - thus allowing for either positive or negative interpretation without correction.