

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 **Craving is everything:**

11
12
13
14 **An eye tracking exploration of attentional bias in binge**

15
16
17
18
19 **drinking.**

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Zoé Bollen¹, Nicolas Masson², Samuel Salvaggio², Fabien D'Hondt^{3,4,5} & Pierre

28
29
30 Maurage^{1,*}

31
32
33
34
35
36
37 *¹ Louvain for Experimental Psychopathology research group (LEP),*

38
39
40 *Psychological Science Research Institute, Université catholique de Louvain,*

41
42
43
44 *Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 ² *Numerical Cognition Group, Psychological Science Research Institute and*
10
11
12 *Neuroscience Institute, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve,*
13
14
15
16 *Belgium.*

17
18
19
20 ³ *Univ. Lille, INSERM, U1172, Centre Lille Neuroscience & Cognition, Lille,*
21
22
23 *France*

24
25
26 ⁴ *CHU Lille, Clinique de Psychiatrie, CURE, Lille, France*

27
28
29
30 ⁵ *Centre national de ressources et de résilience Lille-Paris (CN2R), Lille, France*
31
32
33

34
35 Word count: 6985

36
37
38 Running head: Attentional bias in binge drinking
39
40
41
42

43
44 *All correspondence should be sent to:

45
46
47 Pierre Maurage, Université catholique de Louvain, Faculté de Psychologie

48
49
50 Place du Cardinal Mercier, 10, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

51
52
53
54 Tel: +32 10 479245. Fax:+32 10 473774. E-mail: pierre.maurage@uclouvain.be
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Abstract

Background: Attentional bias towards alcohol-related stimuli is a core characteristic of severe alcohol use disorders (AUD), directly linked to clinical variables (alcohol consumption, relapse). Nevertheless, the extent of this bias in subclinical populations remains poorly documented. This is particularly true for binge drinking, an alcohol consumption pattern highly prevalent in youth, characterized by an alternation between excessive intakes and withdrawal periods.

Aims: We used eye tracking to: (a) measure the attentional bias in binge drinking, (b) determine its time course, by dissociating early/late processing stages, (c) clarify its specificity for alcohol-related stimuli, compared with other appetitive stimulations, and (d) explore its modulation by current craving intensity.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 *Methods:* Forty-two binge drinkers and 43 matched controls performed a visual
11
12 probe task, requiring to process visual targets preceded by pairs of pictures, with
13
14 three conditions (alcohol *vs.* soft drink, alcohol *vs.* high-calorie food, high-calorie
15
16 food *vs.* low-calorie food).
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 *Results:* No group difference was observed for early processing (first area of
24
25 interest visited). Dwell times highlighted a bias towards soft drinks and healthy
26
27 food among controls, without any global bias towards alcohol in binge drinkers.
28
29
30
31 Centrally, a comparison of binge drinkers with low versus high current craving
32
33 intensity indicated that binge drinking was associated with a bias towards alcohol
34
35 and high calorie food only in the presence of high craving towards these stimuli.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Conclusion:* The attentional bias towards alcohol reported in severe AUD is only
45
46 found in binge drinkers in the presence of high craving, and is generalized to
47
48 other appetitive cues.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords

Alcohol, attentional bias, eye tracking, alcohol use disorders, binge drinking

For Peer Review

Introduction

Binge drinking, constituting a frequent excessive alcohol consumption pattern in adolescents and young adults (Archie et al., 2012), is now considered as a specific drinking habit. Its distinctive characteristics are the presence of excessive but episodic consumption, leading to repeated alternation between intense intoxications and withdrawal periods, associated with a strong motivation to rapidly reach drunkenness (Rolland & Naassila, 2017). The multiple withdrawal periods related to binge drinking appear harmful at both cognitive and cerebral levels when compared to more regular consumption patterns without extreme alcohol intoxications (López-Caneda et al., 2013). Indeed, binge drinking has recently been the focus of a large range of psychological and neuroscience explorations (e.g., Scaife & Duka, 2009; Lannoy et al., 2019), consistently showing its consequences on cognitive abilities such as memory and executive

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 functions (see Carbia et al., 2018; Hermens et al., 2013 for reviews). As a whole,
10
11
12
13 binge drinking is thus a specific alcohol consumption pattern related with well-
14
15
16 established neuropsychological and cerebral negative effects.
17

18
19
20 Although attentional biases towards alcohol-related stimuli emerged during the
21
22
23 two last decades as a key process in alcohol use disorders (AUD), none of the
24
25
26 numerous studies that focused on neurocognitive abilities in binge drinking has
27
28
29 assessed the presence and extent of these biases in a clearly defined sample of
30
31
32
33 binge drinkers. Attentional biases are globally defined as the tendency to
34
35
36 preferentially allocate one's attentional resources to alcohol cues when such cues
37
38
39 are presented together with other stimuli (usually neutral or soft drink cues). They
40
41
42
43 are supposed to play a major role in the emergence and persistence of AUD, by
44
45
46 attracting attention towards alcohol-related stimuli and thus leading to the
47
48
49
50 increase of the incentive motivational properties of such stimuli. This
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 subsequently leads to an increase of alcohol consumption, craving (i.e., the
10
11
12 intense urge and desire to drink alcohol, constituting a primary subjective
13
14
15 motivational state promoting compulsive consumption; Flaudias et al., 2019;
16
17
18 Skinner and Aubin, 2010) and relapse risk (Cox et al., 2014; Field and Eastwood,
19
20
21 2005; Manchery et al., 2017, but see also Field et al., 2014). Many behavioral
22
23
24 studies have demonstrated the presence of attention biases towards alcohol-
25
26
27 related stimuli in severe AUD (see Field and Cox, 2008 for a review). Moreover,
28
29
30 several studies have revealed a direct link between the strength of the attentional
31
32
33 bias and the severity of alcohol-related problems (Jones et al., 2006) or the
34
35
36 relapse risk over a 6-month follow-up period (Garland et al., 2012). Despite some
37
38
39 currently ongoing debates (Boffo et al., 2019; Cristea et al., 2016; Wiers et al.,
40
41
42 2018), this pivotal role of attentional bias in severe AUD has been reinforced by
43
44
45 recent investigations (Heitmann et al., 2018; Rinck et al., 2018) showing that
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 training paradigms able to reduce this attentional bias efficiently diminished
10
11
12 alcohol consumption and relapse risk, suggesting a causal link between
13
14
15
16 attentional biases and alcohol-related problems.
17
18

19
20 The presence of the attentional bias goes beyond severe AUD as it may also
21
22
23 concern subclinical consumption patterns (e.g., heavy drinking, regular drinking
24
25
26 or hazardous drinking). Several experimental investigations have shown an
27
28
29 attentional bias in populations presenting subclinical chronic consumption habits
30
31
32
33 (e.g., Cox et al., 2015; Fadardi and Cox, 2009; Field and Eastwood, 2005; Weafer
34
35
36 and Fillmore, 2013). However, while findings obtained in severe AUD appears
37
38
39 stable, inconsistent results have been found in subclinical populations (Ceballos
40
41
42
43 et al., 2009; Field et al., 2005, 2011; Sharma et al., 2001), which could partly be
44
45
46
47 explained by the serious lack of coherence regarding the terminology, inclusion
48
49
50
51 criteria and thresholds chosen in these studies to categorize alcohol consumption
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 patterns. The population explored is indeed often poorly specified: participants
10
11
12 are mostly recruited among college students, assuming a high level of alcohol
13
14
15 consumption in this population, and the control of potentially biasing variables
16
17
18 (e.g., presence of comorbid depressive/anxious states or other addictive
19
20
21 disorders, variations in alcohol consumption frequency/intensity) is usually
22
23
24 limited. To address this issue and clarify the presence of attentional bias towards
25
26
27 alcohol in subclinical populations, the present paper will focus binge drinking, as
28
29
30 it is a very frequent consumption pattern in youth and constitutes a clearly defined
31
32
33 and specific consumption pattern, in which attentional biases have not yet been
34
35
36 explored. The binge drinking definition criteria have long been a matter of debate,
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 but a consensus has progressively emerged to promote the computation of a
44
45
46
47
48 binge drinking score evaluating the key characteristics of this habit (Crego et al.,
49
50
51 2009; Townshend and Duka, 2002). This binge drinking score, focusing on
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 consumption speed, drunkenness frequency and drunkenness ratio, has been
10
11
12 largely used in recent papers (e.g., Bø et al., 2017; Gierski et al., 2017; Laghi et
13
14
15 al., 2016; Smith et al., 2017), and we will also capitalize on this score to offer an
16
17
18
19 optimal characterization of binge drinkers.
20
21

22
23 The visual probe task (VPT, see Methods section for a full description) is the most
24
25
26 common task to study attentional bias. Nevertheless, inferring the presence of an
27
28
29 attentional bias exclusively through the classical VPT behavioral measures [i.e.,
30
31
32 reaction times (RT) and performance] is questionable, which could partly explain
33
34
35 the very low internal reliability of the task (Ataya et al., 2012). Indeed, such
36
37
38 measures only provide insights about the final output of all the successive stages
39
40
41 involved in alcohol cues processing (Field and Cox, 2008), without dissociating
42
43
44 early (i.e., initial orientation of attentional resources) and late (i.e., modulation of
45
46
47 attentional allocation between stimuli) processing stages. Cognitive control is
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 thought to increase with the successive stimulus processing stages, and it is thus
10
11
12 essential to distinguish early and late stages to appropriately measure the
13
14
15
16 attentional biases induced by alcohol stimuli and specify its core processes.
17
18

19
20 A reliable way to assess attentional bias is to go beyond such classical measures
21
22
23 by using eye tracking. This tool provides insights regarding the time course of the
24
25
26 bias, by measuring eye movements and gaze position throughout the entire task,
27
28
29
30 with high temporal resolution (Popa et al., 2015). Eye tracking directly and
31
32
33 precisely measures the consecutive steps involved in attentional processing, thus
34
35
36 offering a deeper understanding of the underlying processes (Armstrong and
37
38
39 Olantunji, 2012). In particular, eye tracking indexes allow to separate early
40
41
42 processes from later ones. On the one hand, the *first area of interest (AOI) visited*
43
44
45
46 informs about attentional bias in the first stages of stimulus processing, reflecting
47
48
49
50 an initial attentional capture that occurs quickly and early during a trial. On the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 other hand, the *dwell time* (i.e., overall fixation time on each stimulus) reflects
10
11
12 processes that progressively deploy over time and that are related to the
13
14
15 controlled maintenance of attention on alcohol-related stimuli (McAteer et al.,
16
17
18
19 2015, 2018; Monem and Fillmore, 2017). Therefore, the eye tracking method
20
21
22 clarifies the spatial and temporal dynamics of the reported bias, from the initial
23
24
25 orienting to the more controlled attentional processing stages, and thereby
26
27
28 improves the reliability of the traditional paradigms (Christiansen et al., 2015;
29
30
31 Miller and Fillmore, 2010). Results from studies using this technique among
32
33
34 subclinical populations with excessive alcohol use (i.e., heavy, hazardous or
35
36
37 regular drinkers) clearly showed that indexes based on eye movements provide
38
39
40
41 a more robust attentional bias assessment than RT (e.g., Christiansen et al.,
42
43
44 2015; Field et al., 2011). While these results mainly indicated the presence of
45
46
47
48 attentional bias towards alcohol-related stimuli in heavy drinkers at the later and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 more controlled stages of information processing (McAteer et al., 2015, 2018;
10
11
12 Miller and Fillmore, 2010; Monem and Fillmore, 2017), the time course of the bias
13
14
15
16 remains to be more deeply understood through the comparison between different
17
18
19
20 eye tracking indexes.
21

22
23 Another uncertainty regarding attentional bias in AUD is its specificity towards
24
25
26 alcohol-related stimuli. Previous studies have mostly investigated the presence
27
28
29
30 of attentional bias towards alcohol by presenting alcohol-related stimuli together
31
32
33
34 with non-alcoholic non-appetitive or emotionally neutral stimuli. However, it is not
35
36
37 clear whether the bias is specifically caused by the alcohol-related nature of the
38
39
40 cues or at least partly by their highly appetitive nature. Recent research exploring
41
42
43
44 inhibitory control failure (presumably caused by attentional bias) in young drinkers
45
46
47
48 have compared alcohol-related stimuli with non-alcoholic appetitive stimuli and
49
50
51 non-alcoholic non-appetitive stimuli, and have shown significant effect of both
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 appetitive cues, beyond their alcohol-related nature (Monk et al., 2017; Qureshi
10 et al., 2019). The appetitive value of the stimuli should thus be further explored
11
12
13
14
15
16 through attentional bias paradigms, as a generalized bias towards all appetitive
17
18
19
20 cues without any preference for the alcohol-related ones would imply a strong
21
22
23 revision of the assumptions concerning attentional bias in AUD.
24
25

26
27 Finally, the role played by craving in the presence and intensity of this bias is still
28
29
30 unclear. The incentive-sensitization theory (Robinson and Berridge, 1993)
31
32
33 describes attentional bias as the result of repetitive alcohol exposures, leading to
34
35
36 a more sensitized dopaminergic system that subsequently enhances the
37
38
39 incentive-motivational properties of alcohol cues. Becoming more salient, these
40
41
42 cues grab the consumer's attention. According to this theory, the sensitization of
43
44
45 the dopaminergic system also results in the emergence of subjective craving
46
47
48 towards the substance (i.e., an appetitive experienced motivational state) that is
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 strongly related to attentional bias. Similar predictions of a reciprocal excitatory
10
11
12 relationship between the two processes are also found in the extensions of this
13
14
15 model (Franken, 2003; Ryan, 2002) and have been widely confirmed by the
16
17
18 literature. Although most studies exploring alcohol-related attentional bias in
19
20
21 subclinical populations did not assess participants' craving, a meta-analysis of 68
22
23
24 datasets has demonstrated a significant association between the magnitude of
25
26
27 attentional bias and the strength of subjective craving (Field et al., 2009). An eye
28
29
30 tracking study (Hobson et al., 2013) has even suggested that craving intensity is
31
32
33 a stronger determinant of attentional bias than the level of alcohol consumption
34
35
36 in regular drinkers. Nevertheless, these associations have not been supported by
37
38
39 more recent studies (van Duijvenbode et al., 2017; Wilcockson et al., 2019) and
40
41
42 thus need further investigation.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 In view of the above-mentioned limits related to previous studies, the four main
10
11
12 objectives of the present one is to: (1) explore, for the first time, the presence of
13
14
15
16 attentional bias in a specific population of subclinical alcohol consumers, namely
17
18
19 binge drinkers, using eye tracking measures. We hypothesize that binge drinkers,
20
21
22
23 when compared to controls, will show an attentional bias towards alcohol-related
24
25
26 stimuli; (2) investigate the time course of the potential bias by combining the VPT
27
28
29 with eye tracking measures. This integration will allow to explore the successive
30
31
32 steps involved in attentional processing and to dissociate early and late
33
34
35 components of attentional bias. We hypothesize that the bias will mostly occur
36
37
38 during the later and more controlled stages of attentional processing (indexed by
39
40
41 dwell times) in binge drinking, in line with previous results in other subclinical
42
43
44 populations (McAteer et al., 2015; 2018; Miller and Fillmore, 2010); (3) determine
45
46
47
48 whether the bias is exclusively related to alcohol or can be generalized to other
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 appetitive stimuli. To do so, a comparison between alcohol-related stimuli, neutral
10 ones (i.e., pictures of soft drink or healthy food) and other appetitive ones (i.e.,
11
12 pictures of high calorie food) will be performed. We hypothesize that an
13
14 attentional bias will be present for other appetitive stimuli when compared to
15
16 neutral ones, and thus that the attentional bias is not specifically related to alcohol
17
18 in subclinical AUD. The presence of such a generalized bias towards appetitive
19
20 stimuli would question the experimental and clinical interest of the so-called
21
22 alcohol-related bias; (4) explore the role played by subjective craving for alcohol
23
24 or food on the magnitude of the bias towards alcohol-related or food-related
25
26 stimuli, as we hypothesize that the eye tracking correlates of the attentional bias,
27
28 and particularly those related to late processing stages (i.e., dwell time) will be
29
30 strongly modulated by the current craving intensity towards appetitive cues.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited via an online screening questionnaire sent through social networks to students from UCLouvain (Belgium). The survey assessed socio-demographic (i.e., age, gender, mother tongue) and nutritional (i.e., diet, consumption frequency per food types) variables. A thorough evaluation of alcohol consumption characteristics during the last 6 months was also conducted encompassing the evaluation of the mean number of alcohol units per week and per occasion (an occasion being defined as an event lasting several hours, e.g., dinner with friends, evening party), the mean number of drinking and binge drinking (defined as the consumption of more than 6 units) occasions per week, the consumption speed (in units per hour), the drunkenness frequency (i.e. number of drunkenness episodes; "How many times have you been drunk during

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 the last 6 months”, drunkenness being defined as including the loss of
10
11
12 motor/verbal coordination, the loss of self-control and/or nausea), the
13
14
15 drunkenness ratio (i.e. percentage of drunkenness episodes compared to all
16
17
18 drinking episodes), and the age at first alcohol consumption. Participants were
19
20
21 informed about the number of alcohol units per type of alcoholic beverages (an
22
23
24 alcohol unit corresponding to 10 gr of pure ethanol in Belgium) and were asked
25
26
27 to fill in a questionnaire assessing alcohol-related disorders (Alcohol Use
28
29
30 Disorder Identification Test, AUDIT; French validation: Gache et al., 2005).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Exclusion criteria for both groups were the presence of: a parental history of
38
39
40 severe AUD; a personal past or current severe alcohol use disorder (as
41
42
43 diagnosed through DSM-5 criteria); a daily alcohol consumption; a personal past
44
45
46 or present psychological, addictive (except nicotine and occasional cannabis use)
47
48
49
50
51 psychiatric or neurological disorder (including clinical depressive or anxious
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 state); uncorrected visual deficits; low French speaking abilities; vegetarian or
10
11
12
13 vegan diets.

14
15
16 Two groups of participants (binge drinkers, controls) were constituted (see Table
17
18
19
20 1) based on alcohol consumption characteristics, including binge drinking score
21
22
23 (Townshend and Duka, 2005), AUDIT score (Gache et al., 2005). The binge
24
25
26 drinking score was computed by using the following formula: (4 x consumption
27
28
29 speed) + drunkenness frequency + (0.2 x drunkenness percentage). Following
30
31
32
33 online screening, eighty-five participants (75 right-handed) were selected to take
34
35
36 part in the experiment: 42 binge drinkers (BD; binge drinking score \geq 22; AUDIT
37
38
39 score \geq 9) and 43 control participants (CTL; binge drinking score \leq 12; AUDIT
40
41
42
43 score \leq 9). A power computation (performed in R 3.6.1) indicated that a sample
44
45
46
47 size of 53 was required to detect a conventional medium effect size (Cohen,
48
49
50
51 1982) with 0.80 power, as fulfilled by our sample size. To control for the influence
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 of psychopathological comorbidities, participants filled in questionnaires using
10
11
12 Qualtrics software (Qualtrics, LLC), assessing depressive symptoms (Beck
13
14
15
16 Depression Inventory, BDI-13; French validation: Beck et al., 1998), anxiety
17
18
19 (State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, STAI; French validation: Bruchon-Schweitzer and
20
21
22
23 Paulhan, 1993) and impulsivity (UPPS-P Impulsive Behavior Scale; French
24
25
26 validation: Billieux et al., 2012). All participants were asked to refrain from
27
28
29
30 consuming alcohol during the days preceding the experimental session and were
31
32
33
34 questioned about their recent consumption before starting the experiment.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Procedure

42
43
44 Participants provided written informed consent to take part in the study and were
45
46
47 not aware of the hypotheses tested. Just before the task, online questionnaires
48
49
50
51 evaluated current (i.e. right now) craving, using Qualtrics software. Visual
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Analogue Scales (0-100) assessed the craving intensity respectively related to alcohol, salty and sugary food. A complementary craving measure was performed using the Alcohol Craving Questionnaire Short Form Revised (for alcohol craving) and adapted forms for salty and sugary food. We only report (see median split analyses below) the results related to the craving median split performed on the Visual Analogue Scales, as the correlations between the two craving measures were high (i.e., Alcohol craving: $r=.634$, $p<.001$; Salty food craving: $r=.675$, $p<.001$; Sugary food craving: $r=.692$, $p<.001$) and as similar results were obtained when performing the median split on craving questionnaires (see Supplementary Materials). Then, participants were seated in front of a blank screen and tested individually in a quiet room. They received verbal instructions to perform the task, without being aware of its rationale. The experimental task was a computerized behavioral task composed of three blocks and lasted 45 minutes. A 9-point

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 calibration of participant's eye gaze position was set up at the beginning of each
10
11
12 block, through a display screen using SR Research Experiment Builder software
13
14
15 (SR Research Ltd., Mississauga, Ontario, Canada). After the task, participants
16
17
18 were asked to fill in the online questionnaires assessing psychological
19
20
21 comorbidities. The study protocol was performed in accordance with the ethical
22
23
24 standards established by the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the
25
26
27 Ethics Committee of the Psychological Sciences Research Institute (UCLouvain).
28
29
30
31
32
33 At the end of the experiment, participants were debriefed and received a
34
35
36 compensation of ten euros for completing the experiment.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Apparatus**

45
46
47 Participants were seated on an adjustable desk chair, facing an eye tracker
48
49
50 camera placed 60 cm away from a Dell PC equipped with a 21.5-inch LCD screen
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 (resolution 1080 x 1920; refresh rate 60 Hz). Their head movements were
10
11
12 reduced using a forehead and chin stabilizer. The presentation of the
13
14
15 experimental task and its synchronization with the eye tracking were controlled
16
17
18 using OpenSesame software (Mathôt et al., 2012). Eye movements were
19
20
21 recorded using an Eye-link 1000 tower-mounted eye tracker (SR Research,
22
23
24 Canada; sampling rate of 1000 Hz; average accuracy range 0.25° to 0.5°, gaze
25
26
27 tracking range of 32° horizontally and 25° vertically).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 VPT

38
39
40 At the beginning of each trial, a central fixation dot appeared on the black
41
42
43 background screen and participants were asked to fixate their gaze on it. This
44
45
46 instruction ensured that participants initially focused their visual attention at the
47
48
49 center of the screen in each trial. The fixation dot was also used as a drift check
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 to confirm the reliability of the eye gaze calibration. Once the eyes of the
10 participant were detected at the center of the screen by the eye tracking device,
11
12 participant were detected at the center of the screen by the eye tracking device,
13
14
15 the fixation dot was removed and directly followed by the onset of two pictures.
16
17 They were displayed randomly on the left and right side of the computer screen
18
19
20 for a 2000ms period and then replaced by a probe (i.e., a white arrow on a black
21
22 background, pointing up or down) appearing at the location previously occupied
23
24 by one of the pictures. Participants were instructed to respond to the orientation
25
26 of the probe by pressing the “up” or “down” key on a keyboard, as quickly and
27
28 well as possible. Each trial was separated by an inter-trial interval of random
29
30 duration (between 500 and 1500ms). Faster responses to probes replacing the
31
32 alcohol-related stimulus (compared to the neutral one) are interpreted as an
33
34 attentional bias towards alcohol-related stimuli.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Participants completed three versions of the VPT: one presenting alcohol and
10
11
12 soft drink stimuli (i.e., *Drink block*, see Figure 1), one presenting alcohol and food
13
14
15 stimuli (i.e., *Drink-Food block*) and one presenting salty or sugary food and
16
17
18 healthy food (*Food block*). The three blocks were administrated in the following
19
20
21 order: the *Drink block* was presented first to obtain the standard measure of the
22
23
24 alcohol-related attentional bias, followed by the *Drink-Food block* or the *Food*
25
26
27 *block*, in a counterbalanced order. Visual probes replaced the two types of
28
29
30 pictures with equal frequency. Each block contained 84 trials in total, including
31
32
33 four practice trials (i.e., the same task performed on stimuli not included in the
34
35
36 experimental phase) that participants first completed.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insert Figure 1 here

Stimuli

Three pictures sets were used for the VPT tasks. For the *Drink block*, 20 pairs of colored alcoholic beverages pictures (e.g., bottle of vodka, can of beer) and matched non-alcoholic beverages pictures (e.g. bottle of water, soft drink can) without context, extracted from the validated ABPS pictures battery (Pronk et al., 2015), were displayed on a white background. The brand and writings of the beverage were systematically blurred and each picture pair was matched on perceptual features such as size (250x250 pixels; 6.05x6.05° visual angle), brightness and salience. For the *Drink-Food block*, we used a set of pictures depicting other alcoholic drinks from ABPS battery and high calorie food from Food-Pics battery (e.g., ice cream bowl, hamburger; Blechert et al., 2014). All pictures were matched on brightness and salience using the SHINE toolbox

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 (Willenbockel et al., 2010). The same matching procedure was used for the *Food*
10
11
12
13 *block*, including a set of other pictures from the Food-Pics battery depicting high
14
15
16 calorie food, all matched with pictures of low calorie food (e.g., fruits, vegetables)
17
18
19 on basic perceptual features such as size (250x250 pixels; 6.05x6.05° visual
20
21
22 angle), brightness and salience using the SHINE toolbox. Stimuli were presented
23
24
25
26 in black and white in the *Drink-Food* and *Food blocks*. This is because the large
27
28
29 variation in colors across food stimuli made it impossible to match them on this
30
31
32 parameter, and it has thus been decided to present these stimuli in black and
33
34
35 white to avoid any strong perceptive difference (known to strongly influence eye
36
37
38 tracking measures) between stimuli types.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Data reduction and statistical analyses**

49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Data reduction procedure was performed for RT. Trials with incorrect responses
10
11
12 (3.65% of trials) were removed prior to analysis, as well as trials with RT lower
13
14
15 than 200ms (0.03% of trials) or higher than 2000ms (0.25% of trials). The spatial
16
17
18 and temporal parameters of eye movements were extracted using Eyelink® Data
19
20
21 Viewer (SR Research Ltd., Mississauga, Ontario, Canada). Gaze samples were
22
23
24 qualified as fixations or saccades according to the standard Eyelink algorithms.
25
26
27
28
29 The dependent variables measured were the first AOI visited, which indicates the
30
31
32 area that was first fixated at the beginning of each trial, and the dwell time, defined
33
34
35 as the sum of fixation times on one of the areas during the whole trial. For the
36
37
38 first AOI visited, the sum of the percentages for both stimuli is not equal to 100%,
39
40
41
42
43
44 as the first fixation could be outside the two areas of interest. Likewise, the sum
45
46
47 of dwell times for both stimuli is not equal to 2000ms, as the fixations could be
48
49
50
51 outside the two areas of interest.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software package (version
10
11
12 25.0). Between-group comparisons (i.e., independent t-tests) were performed on
13
14
15
16 demographic and psychopathological characteristics, as well as on alcohol
17
18
19 consumption variables. To estimate the internal reliability, we computed
20
21
22
23 Cronbach's alpha for the following attentional bias measures: (1) reaction time;
24
25
26 (2) first AOI visited; (3) gaze dwell time. Following a well-established procedure
27
28
29
30 (Ataya et al., 2012; Christiansen et al., 2015; van Ens et al., 2019), we calculated
31
32
33 bias scores separately for each pair of pictures, leading to 20 bias scores for each
34
35
36 attentional bias measure within each version of the VPT (*Drink*, *Drink-Food* and
37
38
39 *Food blocks*). Separate repeated-measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs)
40
41
42 were performed on RT for each block with GROUP (BD *vs.* CTL) as between-
43
44
45 subjects factor and TYPE (Alcohol *vs.* Soft drink, Alcohol *vs.* High Calorie Food,
46
47
48 Salty or Sugary Food *vs.* Healthy Food) as within-subjects factor. The TYPE factor
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 thus groups, for each picture category, the trials in which the probe appeared at
10
11
12 the same location than these pictures (e.g., all trials in which the arrow replaced
13
14
15 the alcohol-related stimuli for “Alcohol” type). Eye tracking measures were
16
17
18 explored by using two 2x2 ANOVAs (First AOI visited and Dwell Time) performed
19
20
21 for each version of the VPT with GROUP (BD, CTL) as between-subjects factor
22
23
24 and TYPE (Alcohol *vs.* Soft drink, Alcohol *vs.* High Calorie Food, Salty or Sugary
25
26
27 Food *vs.* Healthy Food) as within-subjects factor. For each ANOVA, comparisons
28
29
30 within GROUP and within TYPE were investigated, as well as interactions between
31
32
33 the two factors. Regarding craving analyses, Pearson’s two-tailed correlations
34
35
36 with Bonferroni correction were first performed between attentional bias
37
38
39 measures (i.e., RT, first AOI visited, dwell time for each stimulus type) and craving
40
41
42 measures (i.e., Visual Analogue Scale scores) to investigate the influence of
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 craving levels on the magnitude of the attentional bias towards alcohol and food-
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 related stimuli in the whole sample. Multiple regressions for attentional bias were
10
11
12 then conducted in each version of the VPT to explore the predictive power of
13
14
15 craving (for alcohol, salty food, and sugary food), alcohol-related factors (AUDIT
16
17 score, BD score) and psychopathological comorbidities (depression, state/trait
18
19 anxiety, and impulsivity) on attentional bias indexed by dwell times. Based on
20
21
22 correlational results and in line with Hobson et al. (2013), median splits were then
23
24
25 conducted on craving levels. 2x2 ANOVAs were then performed on RT, first AOI
26
27
28 and dwell time separately for each group (BD, CTL) and each version of the VPT,
29
30
31 with ALCOHOL/SALTY FOOD/SUGARY FOOD CRAVING (High Cravers vs. Low
32
33
34 Cravers) as between-subjects factor and TYPE (Alcohol vs. Soft drink, Alcohol vs.
35
36
37 High Calorie Food, Salty or Sugary Food vs. Healthy Food) as within-subjects
38
39
40 factor. Finally, two complementary 2x2 ANOVAs (with GROUP as between-
41
42
43 subjects factor and TYPE as within-subjects factor) were performed (see
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Supplementary Materials for the results) on: (1) first fixation laterality for each
10
11
12 version of the VPT, to test the presence of a potential pseudo neglect effect
13
14
15
16 (Bowers and Heilmans, 1980); (2) dwell time for the first (T1: 0-1000ms) and
17
18
19 second (T2: 1000-2000ms) stimuli presentation time periods, in the *Drink block*
20
21
22 comparing alcohol and soft drinks, to investigate the time course of the bias and
23
24
25
26 distinguish early and late processing stages.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Results

36 Demographic and psychopathological measures

37
38
39 As shown in Table 1, groups were well matched, as BD and CTL did not differ for
40
41
42 age [$t(83)=.620, p=.537$], gender ratio [$\chi^2(1, N=85)=.294, p=.588$], depression
43
44
45 [$t(83)=.704, p=.483$], trait anxiety [$t(83)=1.096, p=.276$] or state anxiety
46
47
48 [$t(83)=.046, p=.963$]. By contrast, BD showed higher impulsivity [$t(83)=2.476,$
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

$p=.015$], alcohol craving [$t(83)=4.174$, $p<.001$] and salty food craving
 [$t(83)=3.031$, $p=.003$]. Finally, and as expected, BD participants had larger BD
 [$t(83)=10.751$, $p<.001$] and AUDIT scores [$t(83)=13.978$, $p<.001$].

Table 1. Demographic, psychopathological, and alcohol consumption measures
 [mean (SD)] for Binge Drinkers (BD) and Control (CTL) participants.

	BD (n=42)	CTL (n=43)
Demographic measures		
Gender ratio (male/female) ^{ns}	20/22	20/23
Age ^{ns}	21.36 (2.20)	21.07 (2.00)
Psychopathological measures		
Beck Depression Inventory ^{ns}	4.61 (3.90)	4.29 (3.40)

State Anxiety Inventory ^{ns}	33.79 (10.00)	36.14 (9.70)
Trait Anxiety Inventory ^{ns}	42.36 (10.90)	42.47 (10.80)
UPPS-P *	46.05 (7.30)	42.16 (7.20)
Alcohol consumption measures		
Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test **	17.38 (5.00)	4.72 (3.10)
Binge Drinking Score **	43.91 (23.19)	5.35 (3.89)
Number of units per week **	22.74 (12.28)	3.15 (3.54)
Number of occasions per week **	3.51 (1.36)	1.47 (1.24)
Number of units per occasion **	5.71 (2.82)	2.20 (1.91)
Number of binge drinking episodes per week **	1.47 (1.50)	0.13 (0.17)
Consumption speed (units/hour) **	3.39 (1.07)	1.06 (0.74)
Number of drunkenness episodes (last 6 months) **	27.68 (19.36)	0.91 (1.31)
Drunkenness ratio (last 6 months) **	19.25 (28.92)	2.02 (6.17)

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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Age at first alcohol consumption *	14.41 (0.95)	14.68 (2.61)
Craving measure (Visual Analogue Scale)		
Alcohol craving **	28.48 (27.0)	8.58 (15.5)
Salty food craving *	32.83 (25.6)	17.21 (21.8)
Sugary food craving ^{ns}	33.76 (25.3)	26.14 (20.6)

Note. ^{ns} = Non-significant, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Experimental measures

Internal reliability (Table 2)

Cronbach's alpha was very low for classical measures (i.e., RT). Conversely, it was high for eye tracking measures (i.e., First AOI visited and dwell time), being

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 above the .70 cut-off conventionally considered as the minimum for acceptable
10
11
12 internal reliability (Kline, 1999).
13
14
15
16
17 -----
18
19

20 **Table 2.** Internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of the *Drink*, *Drink-Food* and *Food*
21
22 *blocks* of the VPT, for RT and eye tracking measures.
23
24
25

	Reaction time	First AOI visited	Dwell time
<i>Drink block</i>	.138	.781	.939
<i>Drink-Food block</i>	.082	.924	.911
<i>Food block</i>	.013	.970	.923

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 Note : Trials with RT outliers (i.e., lower than 200ms or higher than 2000ms) were
41
42
43
44 excluded from the analyses.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 *RT (Table 3)*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 A main TYPE effect was found in the *Drink-Food block* [$F(1,83)=8.958$, $p=.004$,
10 $\eta^2=.097$], showing shorter RT for food compared to alcohol. No significant main
11
12
13
14
15
16 TYPE effect was found in the *Drink* and *Food blocks*, and no significant main
17
18
19
20 GROUP effect nor interaction were found in any block (all p-values $>.05$).
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Table 3.** Reaction Times [RT, mean (SD)] in ms for Drink, Drink-Food and Food
28
29
30 VPT tasks [mean (SD)] for Binge Drinkers (BD) and Control (CTL) participants.
31
32
33
34
35
36

Variable	Condition	Type	BD (n=42)	CTL (n=43)
RT	Drink	Alcohol	582 (115)	574 (122)
		Soft Drink	582 (115)	572 (121)
	Drink-Food	Alcohol	586 (120)	573 (118)
		Food	577 (112)	564 (111)

Food (salty)	Salty	572 (102)	571 (121)
	Healthy	570 (106)	566 (111)
Food (sugary)	Sugary	572 (110)	570 (125)
	Healthy	579 (118)	568 (123)

Eye tracking measures (Table 4)

- **First AOI visited.** A main TYPE effect was found in the *Drink-Food block* [$F(1,83)=60.566, p<.001, \eta^2=.422$], showing higher frequency of first fixations on food compared to alcohol. No significant main TYPE effect was found in the *Drink* and *Food blocks* and no significant main GROUP effect nor interaction were found in any block (all p-values >.05).

- **Dwell time.** A main TYPE effect was found in the *Drink* [$F(1,83)=6.273, p=.014, \eta^2=.070$], *Drink-Food* [$F(1,83)=32.518, p<.001, \eta^2=.281$] and *Food*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 [F(1,83)=4.135, $p=.045$, $\eta^2=.047$] *blocks*, showing longer dwell time on soft drinks
10
11
12 and food compared to alcohol, and on healthy food compared to sugary food.
13
14
15
16 Centrally, a GROUP-TYPE interaction was found in the *Drink* [F(1,83)=5.040,
17
18 $p=.027$, $\eta^2=.057$), *Drink-Food* [F(1,83)=8.146, $p=.005$, $\eta^2=.089$] and *Food*
19
20 [F(1,83)=6.899, $p=.010$, $\eta^2=.077$] *blocks*. In the *Drink block*, CTL showed longer
21
22 dwell time on soft drinks compared to alcohol [$t(42)=2.884$, $p=.006$], while no
23
24 difference was observed in BD. In the *Drink-Food block*, both groups showed
25
26 longer dwell time on food compared to alcohol [BD: $t(41)=2.523$, $p=.016$; CTL:
27
28 $t(42)=5.217$, $p<.001$], BD showing a smaller difference than CTL [$t(83)=2.702$,
29
30 $p=.008$]. In the *Food block*, CTL showed longer dwell time on healthy food
31
32 compared to salty [$t(42)=2.940$, $p=.005$] and sugary food [$t(42)=2.335$, $p=.024$],
33
34 and compared to BD [$t(83)=2.445$, $p=.017$]. No significant main GROUP effect was
35
36 found in any block (all p-values $>.05$).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4. Eye tracking indexes for Drink, Drink-Food and Food VPT tasks [mean (SD)] for Binge Drinkers (BD) and Control (CTL) participants.

Variable	Condition	Type	BD (n=42)	CTL (n=43)
First AOI visited (%)	Drink	Alcohol	47.29 (8.8)	45.61 (8.5)
		Soft Drink	46.04 (8.7)	46.83 (9.4)
	Drink-Food	Alcohol	42.89 (7.4)	42.09 (10.8)
		Food	54.64 (5.9)	51.19 (10.5)
	Food (salty)	Salty	49.88 (8.0)	47.73 (9.4)
		Healthy	47.74 (7.1)	47.56 (8.1)
	Food (sugary)	Sugary	49.29 (6.3)	47.09 (10.9)
		Healthy	48.81 (6.8)	47.67 (8.2)
Dwell Time (ms)	Drink	Alcohol	578 (188)	526 (173)

		Soft Drink	584 (153)	638 (252)
	Drink-Food	Alcohol	578 (183)	471 (180)
		Food	657 (180)	709 (283)
	Food (salty)	Salty	673 (213)	641 (256)
		Healthy	645 (189)	777 (296)
	Food (sugary)	Sugary	648 (183)	657 (249)
		Healthy	663 (193)	761 (316)

Craving analyses

- **Craving-related correlations.** Alcohol craving was significantly correlated with dwell time on alcohol-related stimuli (*Drink block*: $r=.533$, $p<.001$; *Drink-Food block*: $r=.355$, $p<.001$). Sugary food craving was significantly correlated with dwell

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 time on sugary food stimuli (*Food block*: $r=.411$, $p<.001$), as well as salty food
10
11
12 craving with dwell time on salty food stimuli (*Food block*: $r=.365$, $p<.001$). No
13
14
15
16 correlation was found between first AOI visited measures or RT measures and
17
18
19 any craving type (all p-values $>.05$).
20
21

22
23 - **Craving-related regression.** In the BD group, the dwell time on alcohol stimuli in
24
25
26 the *Drink block* was predicted by the full model (containing AUDIT, binge drinking,
27
28
29 BDI, STAI-A, STAI-B, UPPS and alcohol craving scores as predictors)
30
31
32
33 [$F(7,41)=3.458$, $p=.007$, $R^2_{Adj}=.296$], but alcohol craving was the only variable
34
35
36 significantly contributing to the prediction ($\beta=.510$, $t=3.812$, $p=.001$). In the *Drink-*
37
38
39
40 *Food block*, dwell time on alcohol stimuli was also predicted by the full model
41
42
43
44 [$F(7,41)=3.162$, $p=.011$, $R^2_{Adj}=.270$] but, here again, alcohol craving was the only
45
46
47 predictor ($\beta=.306$, $t=2.243$, $p=.032$). Dwell time on food stimuli was not
48
49
50
51 significantly predicted by the full model [$F(7,41)=1.495$, $p=.197$, $R^2_{Adj}=.003$]. In
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 the *Food block*, dwell time on salty food stimuli was predicted by the full model
10
11
12 [$F(7,41)=3.417$, $p=.007$, $R^2_{Adj}=.292$), binge drinking score being the only
13
14
15 significant predictor ($\beta =.666$, $t=3.316$, $p=.002$). Similarly, dwell time on sugary
16
17 food stimuli was predicted by the full model [$F(7,41)=3.402$, $p=.007$, $R^2_{Adj}=.291$),
18
19 binge drinking score ($\beta=.519$, $t=2.562$, $p=.015$) and sugary food craving ($\beta=.452$,
20
21 $t=3.230$, $p=.003$) being the significant contributors. In the CTL group, dwell time
22
23 on alcohol stimuli was predicted by the model in *Drink block* [$F(7,42)=3.450$,
24
25 $p=.007$, $R^2_{Adj}=.290$), with STAI-A ($\beta=-.668$, $t=3.016$, $p=.005$) and UPPS scores
26
27 ($\beta=.705$, $t=2.999$, $p=.005$) significantly adding to the prediction. In the *Drink-Food*
28
29
30 *block*, dwell times on alcohol stimuli [$F(7,42)=1.175$, $p=.342$, $R^2_{Adj}=.028$] and food
31
32 stimuli [$F(7,42)=1.014$, $p=.445$, $R^2_{Adj}=.003$] were not predicted by the model. In
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
the *Food block*, the models did not significantly predict dwell time for salty food
[$F(7,42)=1.324$, $p=.268$, $R^2_{Adj}=.051$] and sugary food [$F(7,42)=.845$, $p=.558$,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 $R^2_{Adj}=.027]$ stimuli. All these regression analyses are reported in the
10
11
12
13 Supplementary Materials.

14
15
16 - **Craving-related median split analyses.**

17
18
19 - **Median split procedure.** Median splits were conducted in each group (BD,
20
21
22
23 CTL), based on the craving scores respectively observed for Alcohol, Salty, and
24
25
26
27 Sugary food. Importantly, the resulting subgroups (i.e. BD and CTL subgroups
28
29
30 presenting low versus high alcohol/salty food/sugary food cravings) did not differ
31
32
33
34 regarding alcohol-related or psychopathological variables (see Supplementary
35
36
37 Materials), ensuring that the differences observed between low and high cravers
38
39
40 were specifically related to current craving intensity.

41
42
43
44 - **Median split on RT.** In the *Drink* and *Drink-Food blocks*, no significant
45
46
47
48 interaction was found between TYPE and ALCOHOL, SALTY or SUGARY FOOD
49
50
51 CRAVING (all p-values >.05) in BD and CTL groups. In the *Food block*, an
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 interaction between SUGARY FOOD CRAVING and TYPE was found among BD
10
11
12 [F(1,40)=5.193, $p=.028$, $\eta^2=.115$], but no difference was found when comparing
13
14
15
16 BD with high and low craving [Healthy food: $t(40)=1.113$, $p=.272$; Unhealthy food:
17
18
19 $t(40)=.477$, $p=.636$], and no difference was found in the CTL group.
20
21
22

23 - **Median split on First AOI visited.** In the *Drink*, *Drink-Food* and *Food blocks*,
24
25
26 no significant interaction was found between TYPE and ALCOHOL, SALTY or SUGARY
27
28
29
30 FOOD CRAVING (all p-values $>.05$) in BD and CTL groups.
31
32

33 - **Median split on Dwell Time.** In the *Drink block* (see Figure 2), an interaction
34
35
36 between ALCOHOL CRAVING and TYPE was found among BD [F(1,40)=9.122,
37
38
39 $p=.004$, $\eta^2=.186$], the subgroup with high craving showing longer dwell time for
40
41
42 alcohol-related stimuli [$t(40)=3.175$, $p=.003$]. In the *Drink-Food block*, an
43
44
45 interaction between ALCOHOL CRAVING and TYPE was also found among BD
46
47
48
49 [F(1,40)=8.007, $p=.007$, $\eta^2=.167$], the subgroup with low craving showing longer
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 dwell time for food stimuli [$t(40)=2.057$, $p=.046$]. No significant interaction was
10
11
12 found for SALTY and SUGARY FOOD CRAVING (all p-values $>.05$). In the *Food block*,
13
14
15 an interaction between SALTY FOOD CRAVING and TYPE was found among BD
16
17
18
19 [$F(1,40)=5.585$, $p=.023$, $\eta^2=.123$], showing longer dwell time on salty food for the
20
21
22 subgroup with high craving [$t(40)=2.629$, $p=.012$]. The same interaction was
23
24
25 found for SUGARY FOOD CRAVING [$F(1,40)=5.996$, $p=.019$, $\eta^2=.130$], showing
26
27
28 longer dwell time on sugary food for the subgroup with high craving [$t(40)=3.485$,
29
30
31 $p=.001$]. Finally, a main SUGARY FOOD CRAVING effect was found in BD
32
33
34 [$F(1,40)=4.170$, $p=.048$, $\eta^2=.094$] and CTL [$F(1,41)=9.310$, $p=.004$, $\eta^2=.185$],
35
36
37 showing longer dwell time for the subgroup with high craving. No significant
38
39
40 interactions between ALCOHOL/SUGARY/SALTY CRAVING and TYPE were found
41
42
43
44 among CTL in any block (all p-values $>.05$).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insert Figure 2 here

Discussion

The presence of attentional bias towards alcohol-related cues in severe AUD has been widely established during these last decades (Field and Cox, 2008). The investigation of this bias has recently been extended to various drinking patterns, and its assessment has been improved through the use of innovative techniques.

The present paper aimed at extending this research field by exploring the presence and extent of the attentional bias in binge drinking, using combined RT and eye tracking measures.

Regarding RT, no general (i.e., independent of craving) attentional bias was observed in BD, as no significant difference was shown between BD and CTL in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 any block. This absence of RT results, contrasting with the differences found on
10
11
12 eye tracking measures, supports previous studies showing that VPT only based
13
14
15 on RT does not allow to reliably index the alcohol-related attentional bias in
16
17
18 subclinical populations, while the complementary use of eye tracking provides a
19
20
21 more reliable and robust bias assessment (Marks et al., 2015; Miller and Fillmore,
22
23
24 2010; 2011). The internal reliability analyses performed in the present paper
25
26
27 offered strong support to this proposal, by showing a very poor reliability for RT
28
29
30 measures (Cronbach's alphas lower than .2), and conversely a very high
31
32
33 reliability for eye tracking indexes (Cronbach's alphas higher than .75), and
34
35
36 particularly for dwell time measures (Cronbach's alphas higher than .90).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Regarding eye tracking results, indexes reflecting the initial and early processes
45
46
47 (i.e., first AOI visited) and the late ones (i.e., dwell time) did not demonstrate any
48
49
50
51 global attentional bias towards alcohol cues in BD. This is inconsistent with most
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 previous studies showing the presence of attentional bias in diverse subclinical
10
11
12
13 populations with excessive alcohol consumption patterns (Field et al., 2004;
14
15
16 Hallgreen and McCrady, 2013; Miller and Fillmore, 2011; Townshend and Duka,
17
18
19 2001; van Duijvenbode et al., 2017; Weafer and Fillmore, 2013). Nevertheless, it
20
21
22
23 should be noted that these earlier studies were not focusing on binge drinking
24
25
26 habits, but were rather exploring heavy drinking samples, with large variability in
27
28
29
30 the alcohol consumption patterns considered and in the inclusion/exclusion
31
32
33 criteria determined. Moreover, the present study is not the first failing to replicate
34
35
36 these earlier findings. The only previous study focusing on binge drinking
37
38
39
40 (DePalma et al., 2017) did not report any bias towards alcohol among BD for RT.
41
42
43
44 In the same vein, Schoenmakers et al. (2008) did not observe longer dwell time
45
46
47
48 on alcohol-related pictures in sober heavy drinkers.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Importantly, while no dwell time difference was observed between alcohol-related and soft drink stimuli in BD, CTL presented higher dwell time for soft drinks, suggesting the presence of a bias towards healthier stimuli (or away from alcohol-related ones) in CTL, absent in BD. This bias should lead to reconsider the so-called alcohol-related attentional bias reported in earlier studies. For example, McAteer et al. (2015) stated the presence of an alcohol attentional bias in heavy drinkers, but this result was due to the fact that control participants showed a strong bias for neutral stimuli rather than to a real alcohol-related bias in the experimental group (as dwell times for alcohol and neutral stimuli did not differ in heavy drinkers). In the present study, longer dwell time on soft drink pictures in CTL (when compared to BD) was only observed during the latter half of stimuli presentation. No bias was observed during early attentional processing (considered as the automatic processing stage in earlier studies), explored by

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 first AOI visited and T1 dwell time. Similar results were observed by McAteer et
10
11
12 al. (2015), who suggested that the automaticity of attentional bias, postulated by
13
14
15 several theoretical models, would not be present in regular drinkers but would
16
17
18 rather be specific to severe AUD. Actually, previous studies using RT and
19
20
21 variations in stimuli presentation time observed an automatic capture of attention
22
23
24 towards alcohol-related stimuli in severe AUD when stimuli were presented for
25
26
27 50-100ms, while this alcohol attentional bias was only measured in regular
28
29
30 drinkers after longer presentation times (Field et al., 2004; Noël et al., 2006). In
31
32
33 our study, the similar patterns between groups appeared to vanish during the late
34
35
36 processing stages, since longer dwell time for soft drinks (when compared to
37
38
39 alcohol-related ones) was observed for CTL and not for BD. These findings clarify
40
41
42 the time course of attentional processing, by showing that the difference between
43
44
45 CTL and BD only appeared during the later processing stages, and are not
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 related to an early, automatic capture of attentional resources by alcohol-related
10 stimuli, as observed in severe AUD. The absence of an early bias among BD
11
12
13 could however partly be due to the classical dominance of the left side of the
14
15
16 visual field (see Supplementary Materials) related to reading/writing habits (i.e.,
17
18
19 left gaze bias), leading the participants to preferentially orient their attention to
20
21
22 the left side of the screen at early processing stages, regardless the type of stimuli
23
24
25 presented on the left side (Foulsham et al., 2013; McAteer et al., 2015).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Regarding the specificity of the bias for alcohol, results indicated that BD are also
34
35
36 strongly attracted by other appetitive stimuli as shown by results from the *Drink-*
37
38
39 *Food* block (i.e., RT, first AOI visited and dwell time) which revealed that both
40
41
42
43 groups were more attracted by high calorie food when compared to alcohol. It
44
45
46 thus appears that the potential attentional bias (beyond being only present when
47
48
49 high craving levels are reported as discussed below) is not specific to alcohol-
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 related cues: BD also have a preferential allocation of attentional resources
10
11
12 towards other appetitive stimuli, and even a stronger attraction towards high
13
14
15 calorie food stimuli than alcohol-related ones. Nevertheless, the higher
16
17
18 percentage of first fixations on food (when compared to alcohol) in all participants
19
20
21 might be partly explained by a general complexity effect, food stimuli presenting
22
23
24 a higher degree of visual complexity, potentially influencing the initiation of the
25
26
27 first saccade. Future studies should thus further explore the generalization of the
28
29
30 bias towards other appetitive stimuli.
31
32
33

34
35
36 No attentional bias was found here in BD when considered as a homogeneous
37
38
39 group. However, in line with earlier studies (e.g., Hobson et al., 2013), our results
40
41
42 showed that alcohol craving widely influenced the magnitude of the bias towards
43
44
45 alcohol-related stimuli in BD. The subgroup of high cravers presented a
46
47
48 significant bias towards alcohol, while low cravers presented an anti-alcohol bias,
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 as found in CTL. The attentional bias towards alcohol was thus only found among
10
11
12 BD when combined with high level of craving. The intensity of alcohol craving at
13
14
15 testing time is thus the core determinant of attentional bias magnitude in BD. This
16
17
18 finding is in line with evidence from Field et al. (2013), who also used a median
19
20
21 split on craving level among alcohol-dependent individuals to show that a far
22
23
24 stronger attentional bias was found among patients with high craving. Similarly,
25
26
27 previous studies reported that regular drinkers with high craving presented an
28
29
30 attentional bias towards alcohol cues, while regular drinkers with low craving did
31
32
33 not (Field et al., 2005; Hobson et al., 2013). Hobson et al. (2013) also
34
35
36 demonstrated that eye tracking indexes of attentional bias were related with
37
38
39 craving but not with alcohol consumption, which is consistent with the present
40
41
42 multiple regression analysis showing that dwell time was significantly predicted
43
44
45 by craving but not alcohol consumption or psychopathological variables.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Moreover, the impact of craving on attentional bias among BD is found here when
10
11
12 considering dwell time, but not when considering first AOI visited. The theoretical
13
14
15 and experimental proposal, emerging from severe AUD studies, that craving
16
17
18 influences the early attentional capture might thus not apply to binge drinking,
19
20
21 where craving intensity would rather influence later and more controlled
22
23
24 processes.
25
26
27
28
29

30 As a whole, these findings suggest that the attentional bias observed in
31
32
33 populations with subclinical alcohol consumption, and particularly in binge
34
35
36 drinking, is not explained by alcohol consumption but rather by an interaction
37
38
39 between drinking pattern (i.e., binge drinking) and craving level during the task.
40
41
42
43

44 The role of craving in the intensity of attentional bias had already been suggested
45
46
47 in earlier work (Hobson et al., 2013; Field et al., 2004, 2005), but we show here
48
49
50 that, in subclinical samples, craving levels are not merely intensifying the bias,
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 but rather that the bias is absent among BD with low craving. At the initial stages
10
11
12 of excessive alcohol consumption, the attentional bias might thus not yet
13
14
15 constitute a core and stable characteristic, but would rather be influenced by the
16
17
18 motivational state. This assumption is in line with the theoretical account
19
20
21 proposed by Field et al. (2016) regarding the role of attentional bias in addictive
22
23
24 disorders. They indeed questioned its stability and rather suggested that this bias
25
26
27 would be determined by momentary evaluations of substance-related stimuli,
28
29
30 which fluctuate with current motivational tendencies to consume. Interestingly,
31
32
33 the association between craving and attentional bias has also been observed
34
35
36 between the level of craving for salty or sugary food and the bias towards these
37
38
39 cues. The attentional bias towards food appears in all participants with high
40
41
42 craving for salty or sugary food, while it only occurs in BD regarding alcohol cues.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Future work should extend these results to other appetitive cues and drinking
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 patterns (centrally by comparing BD with heavy drinkers). They should also
10
11
12 explore the influence of other alcohol-related variables (e.g., time since last binge
13
14
15 drinking episode, alcohol consumption during the days preceding the experiment,
16
17
18 withdrawal symptoms), craving-related factors (e.g., explicit liking, satiation level)
19
20
21 and psychopathological comorbidities [while they did not influence the
22
23
24 experimental results, the depression and anxiety scores obtained in our sample
25
26
27 were quite high, in line with earlier studies among University students (e.g., Beiter
28
29
30 et al., 2015; Ibrahim et al., 2013),]. At the methodological level, it should also be
31
32
33 underlined that (1) we used identical stimuli for all participants, but variations in
34
35
36 preferred alcohol drinks might have influenced the attentional bias. Upcoming
37
38
39 studies should explore such influence, notably by using personalized stimuli
40
41
42 when exploring the attentional bias among binge drinkers, as recently
43
44
45 recommended (Christiansen et al., 2015, but see also Jones et al., 2018); (2) our
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 design did not propose a total randomization of the experimental blocks (i.e. the
10
11
12 *Drink block* was systematically presented first). While this choice allowed us to
13
14
15
16 have an uncontaminated measure of the classical attentional bias towards
17
18
19 alcohol-related stimuli, it might have influenced the results observed for the *Drink-*
20
21
22 *Food block*. Indeed, despite the fact that different alcohol-related stimuli datasets
23
24
25
26 were presented in the *Drink block* and *Drink-Food block*, participants had already
27
28
29
30 been confronted with alcohol-related stimuli when starting the *Drink-Food block*,
31
32
33 while food stimuli were presented for the first time. Despite these limitations, this
34
35
36
37 study is the first to demonstrate that the attentional bias towards alcohol-related
38
39
40 in binge drinking is (1) strongly determined by craving intensity and (2) non-
41
42
43
44 specific to alcohol, as it is also found for other appetitive cues.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the grant ADi/DB/1058.2011 from the Fonds Spéciaux de Recherche of the Université catholique de Louvain (Belgium). We thank Gaspard Bechet for his help in data acquisition.

Conflict of Interest

All authors report no conflict of interest.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 Archie S, Zangeneh KA and Akhtar-Danesh N (2012) Concurrent binge drinking
14
15
16 and depression among Canadian youth: prevalence, patterns, and
17
18
19 suicidality. *Alcohol* 46(2): 165–172.
20
21
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcohol.2011.07.001>
23
24
25
26
27 Armstrong T and Olatunji BO (2012) Eye tracking of attention in the affective
28
29
30 disorders: A meta-analytic review and synthesis. *Clinical Psychology*
31
32
33 *Review* 32(8): 704–723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2012.09.004>
34
35
36
37 Ataya AF, Adams S, Mullings E, Cooper RM, Attwood AS and Munafò MR (2012)
38
39
40 Internal reliability of measures of substance-related cognitive bias. *Drug and*
41
42
43 *Alcohol Dependence* 121(1–2): 148–151.
44
45
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.08.023>
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Beck AT, Steer RA and Brown GK (1998) *Beck depression inventory manual*,
10
11
12
13 *2nd*. Paris: Editions du Centre de Psychologie Appliquée.
14

15
16 Beiter R, Nash R, McCrady M, Rhoades D, Linscomb M, Clarahan M, and
17
18
19 Sammut S (2015). The prevalence and correlates of depression, anxiety,
20
21
22
23 and stress in a sample of college students. *Journal of Affective Disorders*
24
25
26
27 173:90–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2014.10.054>.
28

29
30 Billieux J, Rochat L, Ceschi G, Carré A, Offerlin-Meyer I, Defeldre A, Khazaal Y,
31
32
33
34 Besche-Richard C and Van der Linden M (2012) Validation of a short French
35
36
37 version of the UPPS-P Impulsive Behavior Scale. *Comprehensive*
38
39
40
41 *Psychiatry* 53(5): 609–615.
42
43
44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2011.09.001>
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Bleichert J, Meule A, Busch NA and Ohla K (2014) Food-pics: An image database
10
11
12 for experimental research on eating and appetite. *Frontiers in Psychology*

13
14
15
16 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00617>
17
18

19 Boffo M, Zerhouni O, Gronau QF, van Beek RJJ, Nikolaou K, Marsman M and
20
21

22
23 Wiers RW (2019) Cognitive Bias Modification for Behavior Change in
24
25 Alcohol and Smoking Addiction: Bayesian Meta-Analysis of Individual
26
27 Participant Data. *Neuropsychology Review* 29(1): 52–78.
28
29

30
31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-018-9386-4>
34
35

36
37 Bruchon-Schweitzer M and Paulhan I (1993) *Adaptation francophone de*
38
39
40 *l'inventaire d'anxiété Trait-Etat (Forme Y) de Spielberger*. Paris: Editions du
41
42
43
44 Centre de Psychologie Appliquée.
45
46

47 Carbia C, López-Caneda E, Corral M and Cadaveira F (2018) A systematic
48
49
50
51 review of neuropsychological studies involving young binge drinkers.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 90: 332–349.

10
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.04.013>

13
14
15
16 Ceballos NA, Komogortsev OV and Turner GM (2009) Ocular Imaging of

17
18
19 Attentional Bias Among College Students: Automatic and Controlled

20
21
22 Processing of Alcohol-Related Scenes. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and*

23
24
25
26
27 *Drugs* 70(5): 652–659. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2009.70.652>

28
29
30 Christiansen P, Mansfield R, Duckworth J, Field M and Jones A (2015) Internal

31
32
33 reliability of the alcohol-related visual probe task is increased by utilising

34
35
36
37
38 personalised stimuli and eye-tracking. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 155:

39
40
41
42
43 170–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.07.672>

44
45
46 Cox WM, Fadardi JS, Hosier SG and Pothos EM (2015) Differential effects and

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 temporal course of attentional and motivational training on excessive

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 drinking. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* 23(6): 445–454.

10
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pha0000038>

13
14
15
16 Cox WM, Fadardi JS, Intriligator JM and Klinger E (2014) Attentional bias
17
18
19 modification for addictive behaviors: Clinical implications. *CNS Spectrums*
20
21
22
23 19(3): 215–224. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1092852914000091>

24
25
26 Crego A, Holguín SR, Parada M, Mota N, Corral M and Cadaveira F (2009)
27
28
29 Binge Drinking Affects Attentional and Visual Working Memory Processing
30
31
32
33 in Young University Students. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental*
34
35
36
37 *Research* 33(11): 1870–1879. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530->
38
39
40
41 0277.2009.01025.x

42
43
44 Cristea IA, Kok RN and Cuijpers P (2016) The Effectiveness of Cognitive Bias
45
46
47 Modification Interventions for Substance Addictions: A Meta-Analysis.
48
49
50
51 *PLOS ONE* 11(9): e0162226. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162226>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 DePalma FM, Ceballos N and Graham R (2017) Attentional blink to alcohol cues
10
11
12 in binge drinkers versus non-binge drinkers. *Addictive Behaviors* 73: 67–73.

13
14
15
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.04.020>
17
18

19
20 Fadardi JS and Cox WM (2009) Reversing the sequence: Reducing alcohol
21
22 consumption by overcoming alcohol attentional bias. *Drug and Alcohol*
23
24

25
26
27 *Dependence* 101(3): 137–145.
28

29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2008.11.015>
31
32

33
34 Field M and Cox W (2008) Attentional bias in addictive behaviors: A review of its
35
36 development, causes, and consequences. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*
37
38

39
40 97(1–2): 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2008.03.030>
41
42

43
44 Field M and Eastwood B (2005) Experimental manipulation of attentional bias
45
46 increases the motivation to drink alcohol. *Psychopharmacology* 183(3):
47
48

49
50 350–357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-005-0202-5>
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Field M, Hogarth L, Bleasdale D, Wright P, Fernie G and Christiansen P (2011)

10
11
12 Alcohol expectancy moderates attentional bias for alcohol cues in light

13
14
15
16 drinkers: Alcohol expectancy and attentional bias. *Addiction* 106(6): 1097–

17
18
19
20 1103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2011.03412.x>

21
22
23 Field M, Marhe R, Franken IH (2014) The clinical relevance of attentional bias in

24
25
26 substance use disorders. *CNS Spectrums* 19(3): 225–230.

27
28
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1092852913000321>.

31
32
33 Field M, Mogg K and Bradley BP (2005) Craving and cognitive biases for alcohol

34
35
36 cues in social drinkers. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 40(6): 504–510.

37
38
39
40 <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agh213>

41
42
43 Field M, Mogg K, Mann B, Bennett GA and Bradley BP (2013) Attentional biases

44
45
46 in abstinent alcoholics and their association with craving. *Psychology of*

47
48
49
50 *Addictive Behaviors* 27(1): 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029626>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Field M, Mogg K, Zetteler J and Bradley BP (2004) Attentional biases for alcohol
10
11
12 cues in heavy and light social drinkers: The roles of initial orienting and
13
14
15 maintained attention. *Psychopharmacology* 176(1): 88–93.
16
17
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-004-1855-1>
20
21
22

23 Field M, Munafò MR and Franken IHA (2009) A meta-analytic investigation of
24
25
26 the relationship between attentional bias and subjective craving in
27
28
29 substance abuse. *Psychological Bulletin* 135(4): 589–607.
30
31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015843>
34
35
36

37 Field M, Werthmann J, Franken I, Hofmann W, Hogarth L and Roefs A (2016)
38
39
40 The role of attentional bias in obesity and addiction. *Health Psychology*
41
42
43
44 35(8): 767–780. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000405>.
45
46
47

48 Flaudias V, Heeren A, Brousse G and Maurage P (2019) Toward a triadic
49
50
51 approach to craving in addictive disorders: The metacognitive hub model.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *Harvard Review of Psychiatry* 27: 326–331.

10
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1097/HRP.0000000000000225>

13
14
15
16 Foulsham T, Gray A, Nasiopoulos E and Kingstone A (2013) Leftward biases in
17
18
19 picture scanning and line bisection: A gaze-contingent window study. *Vision*
20
21
22
23 *Research* 78: 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2012.12.001>

24
25
26
27 Franken IHA (2003) Drug craving and addiction: Integrating psychological and
28
29
30 neuropsychopharmacological approaches. *Progress in Neuro-*
31
32
33 *Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* 27(4): 563–579.
34
35
36
37 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-5846\(03\)00081-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-5846(03)00081-2)

38
39
40 Gache P, Michaud P, Landry U, Accietto C, Arfaoui S, Wenger O and Daepfen
41
42
43
44 JB (2005) The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) as a
45
46
47
48 Screening Tool for Excessive Drinking in Primary Care: Reliability and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Validity of a French Version. *Alcoholism: Clinical & Experimental Research*

10
11
12 29(11): 2001–2007. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.alc.0000187034.58955.64>

13
14
15
16 Garland EL, Franken IHA and Howard MO (2012) Cue-elicited heart rate
17
18
19 variability and attentional bias predict alcohol relapse following treatment.

20
21
22
23 *Psychopharmacology* 222(1): 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-011->

24
25
26
27 2618-4

28
29
30 Hallgren K and McCrady B (2013) Interference in the alcohol Stroop task with
31
32
33 college student binge drinkers. *Journal of Behavioral Health* 2(2): 112.

34
35
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.5455/jbh.20130224082728>

38
39
40 Heitmann J, Bennik EC, van Hemel-Ruiter ME and de Jong PJ (2018) The

41
42
43
44 effectiveness of attentional bias modification for substance use disorder
45
46
47 symptoms in adults: A systematic review. *Systematic Reviews* 7(1).

48
49
50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-018-0822-6>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Hermens DF, Lee RSC, De Regt T, Lagopoulos J, Naismith SL, Scott EM and

10
11
12 Hickie IB (2013) Neuropsychological functioning is compromised in binge

13
14
15
16 drinking young adults with depression. *Psychiatry Research* 210:256-262.

17
18
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2013.05.001>

21
22
23 Hobson J, Bruce G and Butler SH (2013) A flicker change blindness task

24
25
26 employing eye tracking reveals an association with levels of craving not

27
28
29
30 consumption. *Journal of Psychopharmacology* 27(1): 93–97.

31
32
33
34 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269881112447990>

35
36
37 Ibrahim AK, Kelly SJ, Adams CE and Glazebrook C (2013) A systematic review

38
39
40 of studies of depression prevalence in university students. *Journal of*

41
42
43
44 *Psychiatric Research* 47(3):391–400.

45
46
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2012.11.015>.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Jones A, Christiansen P and Field M (2018) Failed attempts to improve the
10
11 reliability of the alcohol visual probe task following empirical
12
13 recommendations. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 32(8):922–932.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000414>.

21
22
23 Jones BT, Bruce G, Livingstone S and Reed E (2006) Alcohol-related attentional
24
25 bias in problem drinkers with the flicker change blindness paradigm.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Psychology of Addictive Behaviors 20(2): 171–177.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-164X.20.2.171>

Lannoy S, Heeren A, Dormal V, Billieux J and Maurage P (2019) Is there room
for attentional impairments in binge drinking? A commentary on Carbia et
al. (2018). *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 98: 58–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.01.006>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Lopez-Caneda E, Cadaveira F, Crego A, Doallo S, Corral M, Gomez-Suarez A
10
11
12 and Rodriguez Holguin S (2013) Effects of a Persistent Binge Drinking
13
14 Pattern of Alcohol Consumption in Young People: A Follow-Up Study Using
15
16 Event-Related Potentials. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 48(4): 464–471.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agt046>
24
25

26
27 Manchery L, Yarmush DE, Luehring-Jones P and Erblich J (2017) Attentional
28
29 bias to alcohol stimuli predicts elevated cue-induced craving in young adult
30
31 social drinkers. *Addictive Behaviors* 70: 14–17.
32
33
34
35
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.01.035>
38
39

40
41 Marks KR, Pike E, Stoops WW and Rush CR (2015) The magnitude of drug
42
43 attentional bias is specific to substance use disorder. *Psychology of*
44
45
46
47
48 *Addictive Behaviors* 29(3): 690–695. <https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000084>
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Mathôt S, Schreij D and Theeuwes J (2012) OpenSesame: An open-source,
10
11
12 graphical experiment builder for the social sciences. *Behavior Research*
13
14
15
16 *Methods* 44(2): 314–324. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0168-7>
17
18
19
20 McAteer A, Curran D and Hanna D (2015) Alcohol attention bias in adolescent
21
22
23 social drinkers: An eye tracking study. *Psychopharmacology* 232(17): 3183–
24
25
26 3191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-015-3969-z>
27
28
29
30 McAteer A, Hanna D and Curran D (2018) Age-related differences in alcohol
31
32
33 attention bias: A cross-sectional study. *Psychopharmacology* 235(8): 2387–
34
35
36 2393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-018-4935-3>
37
38
39
40 Miller MA and Fillmore MT (2010) The effect of image complexity on attentional
41
42
43
44 bias towards alcohol-related images in adult drinkers. *Addiction* 105(5):
45
46
47 883–890. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02860.x>
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Miller MA and Fillmore MT (2011) Persistence of attentional bias toward alcohol-
10
11
12 related stimuli in intoxicated social drinkers. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*
13
14
15
16 117(2–3): 184–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.01.016>
17
18

19
20 Monem RG and Fillmore MT (2017) Measuring heightened attention to alcohol
21
22
23 in a naturalistic setting: A validation study. *Experimental and Clinical*
24
25
26
27 *Psychopharmacology* 25(6): 496–502. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pha0000157>
28
29

30
31 Monk RL, Qureshi A, Pennington CR and Hamlin I (2017) Generalised inhibitory
32
33
34 impairment to appetitive cues: From alcoholic to non-alcoholic visual stimuli.
35
36
37 *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 180: 26–32.
38
39
40
41 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.07.038>
42
43

44
45 Noël X, Colmant M, Van Der Linden M, Bechara A, Bullens Q, Hanak C and
46
47
48 Verbanck P (2006) Time Course of Attention for Alcohol Cues in Abstinent
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Alcoholic Patients: The Role of Initial Orienting. *Alcoholism: Clinical and*

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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Experimental Research 30(11): 1871–1877. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2006.00224.x)

0277.2006.00224.x

16 Popa L, Selejan O, Scott A, Mureşanu DF, Balea M and Rafila A (2015) Reading

17 beyond the glance: Eye tracking in neurosciences. *Neurological Sciences*

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

36(5): 683–688. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10072-015-2076-6>

27 Pronk T, van Deursen DS, Beraha EM, Larsen H and Wiers RW (2015)

30 Validation of the Amsterdam Beverage Picture Set: A Controlled Picture Set

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

34 for Cognitive Bias Measurement and Modification Paradigms. *Alcoholism:*

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Clinical and Experimental Research 39(10): 2047–2055.

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

<https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.12853>

44 Qureshi A, Monk RL, Pennington CR, Wilcockson TDW and Heim D (2019)

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

47 Alcohol-related attentional bias in a gaze contingency task: Comparing

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 appetitive and non-appetitive cues. *Addictive Behaviors* 90: 312–317.

10
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.11.034>

13
14
15
16 Rinck M, Wiers RW, Becker ES and Lindenmeyer J (2018) Relapse prevention

17
18
19 in abstinent alcoholics by cognitive bias modification: Clinical effects of

20
21
22 combining approach bias modification and attention bias modification.

23
24
25
26 *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 86(12): 1005–1016.

27
28
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000321>

31
32
33 Robinson TE and Berridge KC (1993) The neural basis of drug craving: an

34
35
36 incentive-sensitization theory of addiction. *Brain research reviews* 18(3):

37
38
39
40 247-291.

41
42
43 Rolland B and Naassila M (2017) Binge Drinking: Current diagnostic and

44
45
46 therapeutic issues. *CNS Drugs* 31:181-186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40263->

47
48
49
50
51 017-0413-4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Ryan F (2002) Attentional bias and alcohol dependence. *Addictive Behaviors*
10
11
12 27(4): 471–482. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4603\(01\)00183-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4603(01)00183-6)
13
14
15

16 Schoenmakers T, Wiers RW and Field M (2008) Effects of a low dose of alcohol
17
18 on cognitive biases and craving in heavy drinkers. *Psychopharmacology*
19
20 197(1): 169–178. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-007-1023-5>
21
22
23
24
25

26 Sharma D, Albery IP and Cook C (2001) Selective attentional bias to alcohol
27
28 related stimuli in problem drinkers and non-problem drinkers. *Addiction*
29
30 96(2): 285–295. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1360-0443.2001.96228512.x>
31
32
33
34
35

36 Skinner MD and Aubin HJ (2010) Craving's place in addiction theory:
37
38 contributions of the major models. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*
39
40 34:606–623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.11.024>
41
42
43
44
45

46 Townshend J and Duka T (2001) Attentional bias associated with alcohol cues:
47
48 Differences between heavy and occasional social drinkers.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *Psychopharmacology* 157(1): 67–74.

10
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002130100764>

13
14
15
16 Townshend JM and Duka T (2002) Patterns of alcohol drinking in a population
17
18
19 of young social drinkers: a comparison of questionnaire and diary
20
21
22 measures. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 37(2): 187–192.

23
24
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/37.2.187>

27
28
29
30 Townshend JM and Duka T (2005) Binge Drinking, Cognitive Performance and
31
32
33 Mood in a Population of Young Social Drinkers. *Alcoholism: Clinical and*
34
35
36
37 *Experimental Research* 29(3): 317–325.

38
39
40
41 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ALC.0000156453.05028.F5>

42
43
44 van Duijvenbode N, Didden R, Korzilius HPLM and Engels RCME (2017)
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Attentional bias in problematic drinkers with and without mild to borderline
intellectual disability: Attentional bias in drinkers with and without MBID.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 61(3): 255–265.

10
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jir.12335>

13
14
15
16 van Ens W, Schmidt U, Campbell IC, Roefs A and Werthmann J (2019) Test-

17
18
19 retest reliability of attention bias for food: Robust eye-tracking and reaction

20
21
22 time indices. *Appetite* 136:86–92.

23
24
25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.01.020>

26
27
28 Weafer J and Fillmore MT (2013) Acute alcohol effects on attentional bias in

29
30
31 heavy and moderate drinkers. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 27(1): 32–

32
33
34 41. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028991>

35
36
37
38
39
40 Wiers RW, Boffo M and Field M (2018) What's in a Trial? On the Importance of

41
42
43 Distinguishing Between Experimental Lab Studies and Randomized

44
45
46 Controlled Trials: The Case of Cognitive Bias Modification and Alcohol Use

47
48
49 Disorders. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs* 79(3): 333–343.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Willenbockel V, Sadr J, Fiset D, Horne G, Gosselin F and Tanaka J (2010) The
10
11
12 SHINE toolbox for controlling low-level image properties. *Journal of Vision*
13
14
15
16 10(7): 653. <https://doi.org/10.1167/10.7.653>.
17
18

19 Wilcockson TDW, Pothos EM and Parrott AC (2019) Substance usage intention
20
21
22 does not affect attentional bias: Implications from Ecstasy/MDMA users and
23
24
25
26 alcohol drinkers. *Addictive Behaviors* 88: 175–181.
27
28
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.09.001>
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure Captions

Figure 1. (A) Illustration of the alcohol-related visual probe task with alcohol-related versus non-alcohol-related (i.e., soft drink) stimuli. The task requires to respond as quickly as possible to the target probe by indicating on which side (left or right) the arrow appeared. The presence of an attentional bias towards alcohol is indexed by faster reaction times when the probe appears at the same location than the alcohol-related stimulus (as illustrated here) in comparison with a probe appearing at the same location than the soft drink; (B) Example of stimuli pairs for each block of the visual probe task (from left to right: *Drink block* with alcohol/soft drink, *Drink-Food block* with alcoholic drink/food, *Food block* with sugary/healthy food).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 **Figure 2.** Dwell time observed in binge drinkers with high craving (BD – HC),
10
11
12 binge drinkers with low craving (BD – LC) and control participants (CTL) in the
13
14
15
16 *Drink* block (A), *Drink-Food* block (B), and *Food* block (C, for the sugary/healthy
17
18
19 food comparison, and D for the salty/healthy food comparison).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. (A) Illustration of the alcohol-related visual probe task with alcohol-related versus non-alcohol-related (i.e., soft drink) stimuli. The task requires to respond as quickly as possible to the target probe by indicating on which side (left or right) the arrow appeared. The presence of an attentional bias towards alcohol is indexed by faster reaction times when the probe appears at the same location than the alcohol-related stimulus (as illustrated here) in comparison with a probe appearing at the same location than the soft drink; (B) Example of stimuli pairs for each block of the visual probe task (from left to right: Drink block with alcohol/soft drink, Drink-Food block with alcoholic drink/food, Food block with sugary/healthy food).

1372x980mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Figure 2.




Figure 2. Dwell time observed in binge drinkers with high craving (BD – HC), binge drinkers with low craving (BD – LC) and control participants (CTL) in the Drink block (A), Drink-Food block (B), and Food block (C, for the sugary/healthy food comparison, and D for the salty/healthy food comparison).

300x200mm (96 x 96 DPI)