

1 **'Uncertainty attunement' has explanatory value in understanding autistic**  
2 **anxiety**

3  
4 Eloise Stark<sup>1,2\*</sup>, James Stacey<sup>2</sup>, Will Mandy<sup>3</sup>, Morten L. Kringelbach<sup>1,4</sup>,  
5 and Francesca Happé<sup>5</sup>  
6

7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

8 <sup>2</sup> Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, Warneford Hospital, Oxford, UK

9 <sup>3</sup> Research Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University  
10 College London, 1-19 Torrington Place, London, UK

11 <sup>4</sup> Center for Music in the Brain, Department of Clinical Medicine, Aarhus University,  
12 Denmark

13 <sup>5</sup> Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry,  
14 Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK  
15

16 \* Correspondence: [eloise.stark@psych.ox.ac.uk](mailto:eloise.stark@psych.ox.ac.uk) (E. Stark).  
17

18 **Keywords:** autism, cognition, predictive processing, uncertainty, anxiety  
19  
20  
21

22 We wholeheartedly thank Bervoets, Milton and Van de Cruys [1] for their helpful and  
23 important addition to the debate surrounding autism and anxiety. Bervoets et al. aim  
24 to clarify the concept of ‘intolerance of uncertainty’ and argue that it does not fit well  
25 within a predictive processing framework and is ultimately unhelpful in understanding  
26 anxiety in autism.

27

28 The stance of Bervoets et al. on intolerance of uncertainty, in our opinion, does not  
29 adequately capture the complexity of the construct. As described within our original  
30 paper [2], intolerance of uncertainty is a multifaceted construct comprising  
31 components at different levels of explanation – (i) a desire for predictability and an  
32 active engagement in seeking certainty, and (ii) uncertainty paralysis or a feeling of  
33 being cognitively or behaviourally ‘stuck’ in situations of uncertainty [3, 4].

34

35 We agree that specific elements of the construct do render intolerance of uncertainty  
36 superfluous in the face of precision-based predictive processing accounts of autism.  
37 As Bervoets and colleagues argue, predictive processing as a biological mechanism  
38 situates the mind inherently as a minimiser of uncertainty. Uncertainty intolerance is  
39 therefore indistinguishable from predictive processes by this account.

40

41 However, our original Opinion piece situates the *consequences* of salient  
42 mismatches between predictions and outcomes (prediction errors) as more integrally  
43 linked to the subjective and physiological experience of anxiety. Specifically, we  
44 proposed that uncertainty paralysis – the feeling of being cognitively or behaviourally  
45 ‘stuck’ in situations of uncertainty – may be physiologically linked to anxiety. For  
46 example, the ‘freeze’ response is often a hallmark of anxiety and is a common  
47 response to perceived threat. In non-autistic individuals, freezing responses have  
48 been related to higher state anxiety [5]. In this regard, a careful analysis of the  
49 constituents of intolerance of (or ‘attunement to’) uncertainty, and extraction of the  
50 temporal dynamics of predictive processing and subsequent anxiety will help us to  
51 extrapolate how these constituent parts may lead to an anxious state in autistic (and  
52 non-autistic) individuals.

53

54 Similarly, we agree with Bervoets and colleagues that partitioning predictive  
55 processes relating to uncertainty estimation is an important endeavour to fully

56 comprehend the construct of ‘intolerance of uncertainty’ that scientists and  
57 psychologists have been measuring and discussing since the 1990s [4]. Yet  
58 importantly, uncertainty estimation is likely to involve both conscious, metacognitive  
59 mechanisms where the individual is actively and subjectively monitoring their mental  
60 processes, and ‘subpersonal mechanisms’ or mental processes that operate below  
61 the level of subjective awareness [6].

62

63 While existing measures may not tap into the ‘subpersonal mechanisms’ or  
64 underlying uncertainty estimation on a biological level, we do believe that studying  
65 attitudes towards uncertainty and parent reports of uncertainty distress in their  
66 children bears value in understanding the metacognitive and behavioural elements of  
67 managing perceived uncertainty. Although uncertainty (and intolerance thereof) may  
68 be a universal construct that has neurobiological underpinnings in predictive  
69 processing mechanisms, it has helpful explanatory value in conceptualising  
70 individual distress (such as during the COVID-19 pandemic [7]) and has personal  
71 relevance to many, including autistic people.

72

73 Throwing the baby (intolerance of uncertainty) out with the bath water (the  
74 misconceptions inherent in the term, such as implications of inappropriate  
75 emotionality) may not be maximally helpful for moving the field forward. Rather, a  
76 reappropriation of the term ‘intolerance of uncertainty’ or a renaming of the concept  
77 in an attempt to remove the assumption that the individual is oversensitive, rather  
78 than reacting appropriately to their internal working models, may be more  
79 constructive for all; perhaps we should refer transdiagnostically to ‘uncertainty  
80 attunement’?

81

82 Lastly, we do concur that predictive processing and uncertainty are intrinsically  
83 linked, and that the weighting of perceptual inference (or “precision”) is key to this  
84 scientific exploration. However, measuring predictive processing, specifically  
85 encompassing precision weighting, is an incredibly complex venture; as Yon and  
86 Frith argue [6], “we must get more precise about how precision works”.

87

88 Bervoets and colleagues suggest that current measurements of intolerance of  
89 uncertainty are flawed, with reference to the ‘double empathy problem’ and

90 limitations of attitudinal or parent-report questionnaires. They suggest that lab  
91 experiments using controlled inductions of uncertainty and computational modelling  
92 to track uncertainty estimation may be the correct way forward. We applaud this  
93 notion, and hope to see experimental studies in future that are able to track such  
94 computations to see whether autistic and non-autistic individuals show differences.  
95 However, while we await such endeavours, we believe that the large body of extant  
96 literature linking the concept of intolerance of uncertainty to anxiety in autistic  
97 individuals has value. For instance, the Coping with Uncertainty in Everyday  
98 Situations (CUES) trial, which aims to help autistic children to learn strategies to  
99 increase tolerance to uncertainty, appears promising in terms of reducing anxiety in  
100 autistic young people [8].

101

102 To conclude, there are likely to be many routes from cognition to anxiety within  
103 individuals, including autistic individuals. This should not, of course, detract from  
104 careful examinations of systemic factors, such as adversity, trauma and  
105 environmental stressors. Autism represents a vast spectrum, full of heterogeneity,  
106 which is both a wonderful marker of human diversity and a challenge for conceptual  
107 accounts that attempt to explain common experiences through simple models. We  
108 are not wedded to any element, construct or proposed relationship within our original  
109 model. Rather, we hope it will generate further lively debate, experimental work, and  
110 – through these – theoretical and practical progress. As the Physician Lewis Thomas  
111 wrote, “Science is founded on uncertainty” [9]; we await novel empirical tests of our  
112 and other models, and constructs related to individual differences in attunement to  
113 uncertainty.

114

115

116

117

118 **References**

119

- 120 1. Bervoets, J. et al. (2021) Autism and intolerance of uncertainty: An ill-fitting pair.  
121 Trends in Cognitive Science.
- 122 2. Stark, E. et al. (2021) Autistic Cognition: Charting Routes to Anxiety. Trends in  
123 Cognitive Sciences 25 (7), 571-581.
- 124 3. Berenbaum, H. et al. (2008) Intolerance of uncertainty: Exploring its dimensionality  
125 and associations with need for cognitive closure, psychopathology, and personality.  
126 Journal of Anxiety Disorders 22 (1), 117-125.
- 127 4. Birrell, J. et al. (2011) Toward a definition of intolerance of uncertainty: A review of  
128 factor analytical studies of the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale. Clinical psychology  
129 review 31 (7), 1198-1208.
- 130 5. Sagliano, L. et al. (2014) Approaching threats elicit a freeze-like response in  
131 humans. Neuroscience letters 561, 35-40.
- 132 6. Yon, D. and Frith, C.D. (2021) Precision and the Bayesian brain. Current Biology  
133 31 (17), R1026-R1032.
- 134 7. Freeston, M. et al. (2020) Towards a model of uncertainty distress in the context  
135 of Coronavirus (COVID-19). The Cognitive Behaviour Therapist 13.
- 136 8. Rodgers, J. et al. (2017) Towards a treatment for intolerance of uncertainty in  
137 young people with autism spectrum disorder: Development of the coping with  
138 uncertainty in everyday situations (CUES©) programme. Journal of autism and  
139 developmental disorders 47 (12), 3959-3966.
- 140 9. Thomas, L. (1980) On science and uncertainty. Discover 1, 59.

141