Feeling the heat: Investigating interoception and motivation as risk factors for exertional heatstroke

Charles Verdonk [(a)], Camille Mellier [(b)], Keyne Charlot [(c)], Arnaud Jouvion [(d)], Marion Trousselard [(a,b)], Emmanuel Sagui [(a)], Alexandra Malgoyre [(b,c)], and Pierre-Emmanuel Tardo-Dino [(c)]

[(a)] French Armed Forces Biomedical Research Institute
Department of Neuroscience and cognitive science
Unit of Neurophysiology of stress
91220 Brétigny-sur-Orge, France

[(b)] French Military Health Service Academy
75005 Paris, France

[(c)] French Armed Forces Biomedical Research Institute
Department of Operational Environments
Unit of Physiology of exercise and physical activities in extreme conditions
91220 Brétigny-sur-Orge, France

[(d)] French Military Teaching Hospital Laveran
13000 Marseille, France

Corresponding author: Charles Verdonk, verdonk.charles@gmail.com

Verdonk C, Mellier C, Charlot K, Jouvion A, Trousselard M, Sagui E, Malgoyre A, and Tardo-Dino PE. Feeling the heat: Investigating interoception and motivation as risk factors for exertional heatstroke. medRxiv [Preprint]. 2025.

Preprint DOI: 10.1101/2022.08.12.22278401

Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org .

This article is a preprint and has not been certified by peer review

ABSTRACT

Background. Exertional heatstroke (EHS) stands as the most severe manifestation within the spectrum of heat-related illnesses arising during sport competition or physical activity within specific contexts such as military training. Despite substantial progress in comprehending the physiological aspects of EHS, current evidence underscores the necessity for a more comprehensive perspective that incorporates psycho-cognitive factors.

Methods. The present study introduces a psycho-cognitive model for EHS and initiates its empirical validation through self-report measures in a case-control study. Our central hypothesis suggests that EHS may emanate from a disruption in the cost-benefit trade-off associated with prolonged physical activity. Specifically, we propose that EHS could be a consequence of *overvaluing* the benefits linked to physical activity due to excessive motivation to succeed and *undervaluing* effort exertion costs resulting from low interoceptive awareness, characterized by disrupted processing of signals related to the body's internal state.

Results. Analysis of our psychometric data revealed that individuals with a history of EHS (cases, N=51) self-report diminished interoceptive awareness compared to their healthy counterparts (controls, n=43). There was no significant difference in the global motivation trait between cases and controls. Furthermore, cases exhibited a less developed trait mindfulness compared to controls.

Conclusion. Our study establishes theoretical foundations and offers preliminary support for a psycho-cognitive model of EHS. The results suggest that relatively straightforward measures, such as self-report questionnaires, can be instrumental in identifying intrinsic (i.e., individual-specific) risk factors for EHS. The psycho-cognitive approach to understanding EHS holds promise for informing innovative prevention strategies aimed at mitigating its risk in sports competitions and military settings.

Keywords: Body awareness; exertional heatstroke; interoception; motivation; mindfulness

INTRODUCTION

Exertional heatstroke (EHS) is the most serious condition in the spectrum of heat illnesses that can occur during sport competition or physical activity within specific contexts such as military training (Epstein and Yanovich, 2019). The incidence of EHS remains relatively low in sport competitions (Stearns et al., 2017), however it might become a major health concern in the future because of global warming. Previous research has revealed a large number of risk factors for EHS, including extrinsic factors (e.g., environmental stress such as high temperature or high humidity) as well as intrinsic factors (i.e., individual-specific factors, such as sleep deprivation or alcohol consumption) (Gardner et al., 1996; Abriat et al., 2014; Epstein and Yanovich, 2019). From a physiological standpoint, EHS is classically described as a non-compensable heat stress where heat loss does not balance heat gain during a prolonged physical effort (see the Supplement for a graphical overview of the suspected physiological mechanisms of EHS) (Epstein and Yanovich, 2019; Laitano et al., 2019). Despite substantial progress in understanding pathophysiology of EHS, which has contributed to the development of preventive strategies for reducing the risk of EHS in sport competitions (Parsons et al., 2020; Mountjoy et al., 2021), the current models are still limited to inform the risk of EHS at the individual level.

Interestingly, several studies have highlighted that psycho-cognitive factors (e.g., motivation) can influence the injury risk during sport competition (Ivarsson et al., 2017). For instance, overmotivation has been suggested as a potential risk factor for EHS on the basis of investigation of a relatively small cohort of fatal cases (Rav-Acha et al., 2004). More recently, Corbett et al. (2017) have investigated the impact of motivation on thermophysiological strain, and they have demonstrated that competition-induced overmotivation leads to increased thermophysiological cost that may not be perceived (consciously) by the participant (Corbett et al., 2017). This finding suggests that overvaluation of benefits, resulting from overmotivation to succeed, might contribute to the disruption of cost-benefit trade-off that characterizes adjusted physical effort. The equilibrium between costs and benefits is thought to be a central determinant of behavior. Alterations in this cost-benefit trade-off have been shown to be at the heart of various neuropsychiatric disorders, such as Parkinson's disease and depression (Chaudhuri and Schapira, 2009; Albert and Benkelfat, 2013), and are believed to affect mental health outcomes, including well-being (Saward et al., 2024).

In the present paper, we introduce a model that characterizes EHS by the alteration of cost-benefit trade-off within the context of prolonged physical effort. Specifically, we propose that EHS

could be the consequence of *overvaluation* of benefits in combination with *undervaluation* of costs associated with physical effort (Fig. 1).



Fig. 1. Schematic illustration of the proposed psycho-cognitive model for exertional heatstroke. **(a)** Physical effort in safety conditions relies on a sustained balance between the costs and benefits of effort exertion. **(b)** We argue that exertional heatstroke is characterized by alteration of cost/benefit trade-off. Specifically, the overvaluation of benefits associated with physical effort, as a consequence of overmotivation to succeed, and/or the undervalued costs of effort exertion that result from low body awareness, disrupt the cost/benefit trade-off and lead individuals to maintain physical effort, which can ultimately lead to exertional heatstroke.

Our first assumption is that overmotivation might cause individuals to overvalue benefits that they associate with physical effort (e.g., personal satisfaction, win in the context of competition). Overmotivation has previously been suggested as a potential risk factor for EHS (Rav-Acha et al., 2004; Epstein and Yanovich, 2019), but it has never been tested empirically. Classical theories

of motivation assume that people initiate and persist at behaviors to the extent that they believe the behaviors will meet their needs. In the field of psychology, the term 'needs' refers to innate psychological 'nutriments' that are essential for ongoing psychological growth, integrity, and well-being. In the self-determination theory of motivation (SDT), three psychological needs—for competence, relatedness, and autonomy—are considered essential for understanding motivated behavior (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Ryan and Patrick, 2009). SDT distinguishes *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* types of motivation regulating one's behavior. Briefly, the *intrinsic* motivation is defined as doing an activity because of its inherent satisfaction, e.g., for the enjoyment associated with the activity. By contrast, the *extrinsic* motivation refers to doing an activity for obtaining some outcome separable from the activity *per se*, e.g., for the gain of social reward resulting from win in sport competition. Of note, the SDT conceptualizes qualitatively different types of extrinsic motivation as measured with the Global Motivation Scale (see the Method for detailed description of the scale). In our model, the motivation is considered as a stable psychological trait rooted in the individual's personality (Scheffer and Heckhausen, 2018), i.e. a global motivational orientation, which differs from situational motivation that refers to motivation toward a given activity at a specific point in time, according to the hierarchical model of self-determined motivation (Vallerand, 2007).

Our second assumption is that sensitivity to bodily signals might influence how individuals self-regulate their physical activity. Indeed, one can bring awareness to internal body changes caused by physical effort (e.g., heart rate increase, fatigue, hyperthermia) and ascertain the embodied cost of physical activity. If the cost is assessed as being high, the update of the cost-benefit trade-off may lead to a decrease in commitment to physical activity, or even a complete stop, to maintain good safety conditions. By contrast, individuals exhibiting low sensitivity to bodily signals may maintain physical effort despite physiological cost, which can ultimately lead to exertional heatstroke. The psycho-cognitive construct of body awareness is a that refers to individuals' ability to feel engaged by information coming from within their body and noticing subtle changes (Mehling et al., 2009). From a neurophysiological standpoint, bodily signals continuously provide the brain with a moment by moment mapping of the body's physiological state, also called interoception, whose integration at higher-order cortical regions, notably the insula, results in the emergence of interoceptive awareness (Craig, 2002; Berntson and Khalsa, 2021). Interestingly, the insula has been shown to encode cost information during a force task and triggers participants' decision to stop their physical effort (Meyniel et al., 2013). The authors also found that motivation may impact neural processes underpinning effort allocation, specifically by pushing back limits and allowing the body to work closer from exhaustion

Regarding the potential long term clinical applications of our model, we believe that shedding new light on psycho-cognitive factors that influence the risk of EHS could ultimately lead to novel preventive interventions. For instance, if low interoceptive awareness characterizes individuals at high risk for EHS, a relevant prevention strategy could be an intervention that enhances interoceptive awareness via effects on the cognitive processing of bodily signals. Contemplative practice, such as mindfulness meditation, has been shown to enhance body awareness by training the mind to pay sustained attention to the body experience, and deliberately returning attention to it whenever distracted (Lutz et al., 2015; Treves et al., 2019). It could be argued that the more fully individuals are apprised of what is occurring within their body, the more adaptive and value-consistent their behaviours are likely to be during physical effort.

To summarize, our psycho-cognitive model of EHS suggests that overvaluation of benefits, as a consequence of overmotivation, and undervaluation of costs associated with physical activity, resulting from low interoceptive awareness, could lead individuals to ignore body warning signs of EHS (e.g., hyperthermia, tachycardia, tachypnea) thus preventing any attempt to self-regulate physical activity in safety conditions (Fig. 1). In the present study, we confronted our model to psychometric data including self-reported trait motivation, interoceptive awareness, and trait mindfulness, in a cohort of subjects with or without a history of EHS. We predicted that subjects with a history of EHS (cases) would show higher levels of trait motivation, lower interoceptive awareness, and lower levels of trait mindfulness, compared to healthy subjects (controls).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Participants

We recruited 51 patients with a history of EHS (cases) from the French Military Teaching Hospital Laveran (Marseille, France), between 2014 and 2020. Cases are service personnel of the French Army who have had a EHS during either training or operation, and whose diagnosis and treatment has been provided by medical teams from the French Military Health Service. Cases completed the self-report questionnaires when they were visited at the hospital for the assessment of their operational readiness, which occurred on average 616 ± 602 days after the onset of the EHS. There was no exclusion criterion for cases. Controls (n=43) were drawn from various units of the French Army, as part of their mandate in the national territory (Bretigny -sur-Orge, France), from March 9, 2021 to May 12, 2021. All controls reported no history of EHS, no medication, and no history of psychiatric or somatic disorders. Controls completed the self-report questionnaires in a dedicated experimental session that was planned during their spare time.

2. Psycho-cognitive self-reported measures

2.1. Interoceptive body awareness

The 32-item Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA) questionnaire measures eight facets of body awareness: (1) *Noticing*: awareness of uncomfortable, comfortable, and neutral body sensations; (2) *Not-distracting*: tendency not to be distracted by oneself from sensations of pain or discomfort; (3) *Not-worrying*: tendency not to worry with sensations of pain or discomfort; (4) *Attention regulation*: ability to sustain and control attention to body sensation; (5) *Emotional Awareness*: awareness of the connection between body sensations and emotional states; (6) *Self-regulation*: ability to regulate psychological distress by attention to body sensations, (7) *Body listening*: actively listens to the body for insight, and (8) *Trusting*: experiences one own's body as safe and trustworthy. The questionnaire is scored using a six-point scale, with responses ranging from 0 (never) to 5 (always). For each of the eight subscales, the score was counted by averaging the scores of items belonging to each subscale (items 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were reversed).(Mehling et al., 2012; Willem et al., 2021) In the present work, the MAIA questionnaire demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency in Cases (Cronbach alpha = 0.90) and in Controls (Cronbach alpha = 0.89).

2.2. Self-determined motivation

The 28-item Global Motivational Scale (GMS) assesses three types of intrinsic motivation (IM): (1) *IM to knowledge* : pleasure while learning, exploring or trying to understand something new, (2) *IM to accomplishment* : pleasure to accomplish or create something, and (3) *IM to stimulation* : pleasure to have a stimulating discussion or intense feelings of cognitive pleasure; three types of extrinsic motivation (4) *identified regulation* : doing something because it matches ones values, (5) *introjected regulation* : doing something because it is supposed to be good for oneself, and (6) *external regulation* : doing something in order to have a reward or to avoid punishment ; and (7) *amotivation* : lack of extrinsic or intrinsic motivation. The questionnaire is scored using a seven-point scale with responses ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (totally). For each of the seven subscales assessed by 4 items, the score was counted by averaging the scores of items belonging to each subscale.(Vallerand et al., 1992) In the present work, the GMS demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency in Cases (Cronbach alpha = 0.88) and in Controls (Cronbach alpha = 0.93).

2.3. Trait mindfulness

The 14-item Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI) measures dispositional trait mindfulness by indexing facets of Presence (*i.e.* being aware of all experiences in the present moment) and Non-judgmental acceptance (*i.e.* understanding that things are not necessarily how one wishes them to be). This questionnaire is semantically independent from a meditation context and it is applicable to all population groups, in particular to those with no practice of mindfulness meditation. The questionnaire is scored using a four-point scale, with responses ranging from 1 (rarely) to 4 (almost always). A total mindfulness score was computed by adding the rating for all items, except for the 13th item which was reversely scored.(Walach et al., 2006; Trousselard et al., 2010) In the present work, the FMI demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency in Cases (Cronbach alpha = 0.80) and in Controls (Cronbach alpha = 0.77).

3. Statistical analyses

Data analyses were performed using JASP (version 0.11.1, https://jasp-stats.org/). We used both standard statistical tests and Bayesian equivalents to extend insight and guiding interpretation of significance (p values), according to how likely the alternative hypothesis is versus the null. Indeed, a disadvantage of null hypothesis significance testing is that non-significant p values (e.g., when reporting no significant difference between Cases and Controls for self-reported trait motivation) cannot be interpreted as support for the null hypothesis.(Rouder

et al., 2009; Wagenmakers et al., 2018) To circumvent this issue and confirm whether the potential non-significant findings reported represent support for the null hypothesis, we calculated the Bayes factor (BF): specifically, we computed the log scale of BF_{10} (noted $\log(BF_{10})$) that can be easily interpreted such that a negative value indicates support for the null hypothesis, whereas a positive value indicates evidence in favour of the alternative hypothesis (see *Supplementary Table 1* for an interpretation scale of $\log(BF_{10})$(Jeffreys, 1961)). Statistical analyses were performed using Mann-Whitney nonparametric tests, as data from Cases and Controls were not normally distributed. If a significant difference was observed, we computed the effect size (to evaluate the magnitude of the difference) using a measure suited to nonparametric analyses: 95% confidence interval of the rank biserial correlation.(Glass, 1966) For the Bayesian analyses, we used the default JASP priors that assume a medium effect size on a Cauchy distribution of 0.707 for independent t-tests.

RESULTS

1. Demographic and biometric characteristics

Table 1 summarizes the basic statistics on demographic (age and gender) and biometric (weight, height, and body mass index) measures in cases and controls. Cases and controls did not differ for age ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.37$, suggesting strong evidence for the null hypothesis), gender ($\log(BF_{10}) = -2.03$, suggesting extreme evidence for the null hypothesis), weight ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.50$, suggesting very strong evidence for the null hypothesis), height ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.43$, suggesting strong evidence for the null hypothesis), and body mass index ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.44$, suggesting strong evidence for the null hypothesis).

Table 1

Summary of demographic (age and gender) and biometric (weight, height, and body mass index) data for cases with a history of exertional heatstroke (cases) and controls.

	Cases (n=51)	**Controls** (n=43)	P-value†	$\log(BF_{10})$†
Characteristics				
Age (years), M (SD)	27.80 (6.38)	27.30 (6.48)	0.65	-1.37
Male gender, n (%)	48 (94)	40 (93)	0.83	-2.03
Weight (kg), M (SD)	76.94 (8.41)	77.28 (9.33)	0.89	-1.50
Height (cm), M (SD)	176.24 (7.80)	177.02 (5.17)	0.67	-1.43
Body Mass Index ($kg.cm^{-2}$), M (SD)	24.79 (2.45)	24.65 (2.76)	0.57	-1.44

† Mann-Whitney nonparametric tests (continuous data) and χ^2 test (categorical data); M: mean; SD: standard deviation; kg: kilograms; cm: centimeters; $\log(BF_{10})$: log scale of Bayes factor BF10

2. Interoceptive body awareness

Five dimensions of interoceptive body awareness were significantly lower in cases compared to controls: *Body listening* (Mann-Whitney U (U) = 717, $p \leq 0.01$, 95% confidence interval (CI) of rank-biserial correlation (rbs) = [0.12 - 0.54]), *Attention regulation* (U = 730, $p \leq 0.01$, 95% CI of rbs = [0.11 - 0.53]), *Emotional awareness* (U = 767, $p \leq 0.05$, 95% CI of rbs = [0.07 - 0.50]), *Self-regulation* (U = 780, $p \leq 0.05$, 95% CI of rbs = [0.06 - 0.49]), and *Noticing* (U = 839, $p \leq 0.05$, 95%

CI rbs = [0.003 - 0.44]). Furthermore, cases and controls did not differ for three dimensions of interoceptive body awareness: *Not-worrying* (log(BF_{10}) = -1.36, suggesting strong evidence for the null hypothesis), *Trusting* (log(BF_{10}) = -0.39, suggesting moderateevidence for the null hypothesis), and *Not-distracting* (log(BF_{10}) = -0.20, suggesting anecdotal evidence for the null hypothesis). Fig. 2 summarizes how cases and controls differ in terms of self-reported interoceptive body awareness. Descriptive statistics of self-reported interoceptive body awareness in cases and controls are reported in *Supplementary Table 2*.



Fig. 2. Graphical comparison of cases with a history of exertional heatstroke (orange line) and controls (blue line) with respect to eight facets of interoceptive body awareness, as assessed with the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness questionnaire. Significant (p<0.05) differences are highlighted in bold. *Interpretation scale: * p≤0.05, ** p≤0.01; H_0ns: anecdotal evidence for the null hypothesis, H_0*: moderate evidence for the null hypothesis, H_0**: strong evidence for the null hypothesis.*

3. Self-determined motivation

Cases and controls did not differ for almost all factors of motivation: *IM to accomplishment* ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.50$, suggesting very strong evidence for the null hypothesis), *Introjected regulation* ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.53$, suggesting very strong evidence for the null hypothesis), *Identified regulation* ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.53$, suggesting very strong evidence for the null hypothesis), *IM to stimulation* ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.51$, suggesting very strong evidence for the null hypothesis), *IM to know* ($\log(BF_{10}) = -1.21$, suggesting strong evidence for the null hypothesis), and *External regulation* ($\log(BF_{10}) = -0.90$, suggesting moderate evidence for the null hypothesis). Only the factor *Amotivation* was significantly lower in cases compared to controls ($U = 729$, $p \leq 0.01$, 95% CI of rbs = [0.11 - 0.53]). Fig. 3 summarizes similarities between cases and controls in terms of self-determined motivation. Descriptive statistics of self-determined motivation in cases and controls are reported in *Supplementary Table 3*.



IM: Intrinsic motivation
** $p \leq 0.01$
H_0 *: moderate evidence for evidence for H_0
H_0 **: strong evidence for evidence for H_0
H_0 ***: very strong evidence for evidence for H_0

Fig. 3 - Graphical comparison of cases with a history of exertional heatstroke (orange line) and controls (blue line) with respect to seven factors of self-determined motivation, as assessed with the Global Motivation Scale. The only significant difference is highlighted in bold. *Interpretation scale: ** p≤0.01; H_0*: moderate evidence for the null hypothesis, H_0**: strong evidence for the null hypothesis*, *H_0***: very strong evidence for the null hypothesis.*

4. Trait Mindfulness

Cases showed lower scores for the two mindfulness dimensions that are assessed with the FMI, relative to controls: *Presence* (U = 761, p ≤ 0.05, 95% CI of rbs = [0.08 - 0.50]), and *Acceptation* (U = 730, p ≤ 0.01, 95% CI of rbs = [0.11 - 0.52]) (Fig. 4). Descriptive statistics of trait mindfulness in cases and controls are reported in *Supplementary Table 4*.



Fig. 4. Significant differences were found between cases with a history of exertional heatstroke (in orange) and controls (in blue) for mindfulness dimensions of *Presence* and *Acceptance*, as assessed with the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI). *Interpretation scale: * p≤0.05, ** p≤0.01*

DISCUSSION

General discussion

This paper introduces a testable model that explores psycho-cognitive factors influencing the risk of exertional heatstroke (EHS). Our theoretical framework encompasses two key components: the self-determination theory of motivation (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Ryan and Patrick, 2009) and the concept of body awareness (Mehling et al., 2009). At its core, our hypothesis posits that EHS may arise from a disruption in the cost-benefit trade-off associated with prolonged physical activity (Fig. 1). Specifically, we suggest that EHS could be the result of an *overvaluation* of the benefits linked to physical activity due to excessive motivation to succeed and, simultaneously, there may be an *undervaluation* of the physiological costs associated with effort exertion, stemming from low interoceptive awareness, i.e. disrupted processing of signals about the body's internal state. To test our theoretical model, we conducted a study in a cohort of subjects, distinguishing between those with a history of exertional heatstroke (cases) and those without (controls), utilizing self-report measures of motivation and interoceptive awareness.

The primary observation reveals that cases reported significantly lower interoceptive awareness compared to controls across the dimensions of Body listening, Attention regulation, Emotional awareness, Self-regulation, and Noticing, as assessed through the MAIA questionnaire (Mehling et al., 2012; Willem et al., 2021). The diminished scores on the Body Listening, Attention Regulation, and Self-Regulation subscales suggest that individuals with a history of EHS may encounter challenges actively and consistently listening to their body to gain ongoing insights into their body's internal state. In the context of physical activity, this could signify a potential difficulty in detecting physiological signs of exhaustion (e.g., hyperthermia, tachycardia, tachypnea) that may prevent individuals from self-regulating their physical effort, thus increasing the risk of EHS. Moreover, the low score on the Noticing subscale indicates that individuals with a history of EHS, while potentially able to sense some body signals, struggle to differentiate between negative body sensations (e.g., warning body signs of EHS) and sensations associated with physical effort in safe conditions. The reduced score on the Emotional Awareness subscale, reflecting difficulty attributing specific physical sensations to physiological manifestations of emotions (Mehling et al., 2012; Willem et al., 2021), suggests that individuals with a history of EHS may be less responsive to negative stimuli both within their bodies and in the external environment. Taken together, these findings may pave the way for the development of novel prevention strategies aimed at reducing the risk of EHS. Specifically, it is conceivable that interventions focusing on enhancing the cognitive process of interoceptive awareness could play a crucial role in mitigating the risk of

EHS. By training individuals to better perceive and interpret body sensations, such programs have the potential to foster heightened interoceptive awareness, which in turn may empower individuals to implement more effective self-regulation strategies during physical activity, thereby reducing the likelihood of EHS occurrences.

The second main observation is that cases demonstrated a less developed trait mindfulness compared to controls, as assessed with the FMI (Walach et al., 2006; Trousselard et al., 2010). It is pertinent to note that engaging in mindfulness practice has been demonstrated to foster the development of trait mindfulness (Brown and Ryan, 2003; Kiken et al., 2015) and enhance body awareness by training the mind to pay attention to body sensations (e.g., through the body scan exercise) (Treves et al., 2019). These findings suggest that a mindfulness-based program, designed to train individuals to access their body sensations deliberately and continuously, may be a promising candidate as a prevention strategy to mitigate the risk of EHS. It is important to emphasize that only studies manipulating mindfulness (e.g., through mindfulness intervention) will offer conclusive evidence regarding whether mindfulness practice causally reduces the risk of EHS. We recognize that conducting such studies poses a significant methodological challenge because of the perceived rarity of EHS events (Stearns et al., 2017; Epstein and Yanovich, 2019).

The final observation in our study reveals that individuals with a history of EHS did not exhibit differences from healthy subjects concerning motivational trait (i.e., global motivation), as assessed by the GMS (Vallerand et al., 1992). Notably, the use of Bayesian statistical tests allowed us to provide moderate to strong evidence in favor of the absence of difference between cases and controls, rather than a simple declaration that the null hypothesis cannot be statistically rejected (Rouder et al., 2009; Wagenmakers et al., 2018). Although this finding is confined to self-report global motivation measure (as discussed in our limitations section), it contributes to a psychometric argument derived from the GMS against a key assumption in our theoretical model, specifically that EHS could arise from an overmotivation to succeed (Fig. 1). At present, it remains uncertain whether the lack of association observed between global motivation and history of EHS is pertinent to refine our model in suggesting that the factor motivation may be not relevant to inform the risk of EHS, or whether it reflects intrinsic limitations of self-report measures (e.g., limitations of introspection, social-desirability biases; (Baumeister et al., 2007)) to capture the psycho-cognitive construct of motivation.

Limits of the theoretical model and its preliminary testing

For simplicity, our psycho-cognitive model of EHS only considers the trait component of motivation that refers to the global motivational orientation of individuals at the personality level.

According to the hierarchical model proposed by Vallerand (2007), self-determined motivation can be described at additional levels of generality. The lowest level of generality corresponds to the situational motivation, which pertains to the motivation experienced by an individual toward a given activity at a specific point in time (Vallerand, 2007). In our work, we did not measure the situational motivation because psychometric data were collected outside any context of physical activity. Our data show that self-reported global motivation (trait motivation) does not help differentiate subjects with a history of EHS from healthy subjects. This suggests that limiting assessment of the motivational factor to its last level of generality (*i.e.* the personality level) might not be informative about the risk of EHS. Future studies are encouraged to investigate the situational motivation as a potential alternative factor that could influence the risk of EHS. It could be suggested that normal (or low) global motivation combined with a high situational motivation could ultimately result in a high level of self-determined motivation. In other words, motivational factors from different levels of generality could potentially have a cumulative effect on how individuals are engaged in an activity. To test this hypothesis, experimental settings need to include measurements of both trait motivation and situational motivation, or experimentally manipulate situational motivation of the participant by using incentive motivation paradigm (Pessiglione et al., 2007). Classically, measurement of situational motivation relies on self-report instruments, such as the Situational Motivation Scale (Guay et al., 2000; Clancy et al., 2017). Yet, self-report instruments are often criticized because they may be vulnerable to limitations of introspection and social-desirability biases, and are potentially limited by individual's unwillingness or inability to report their veridical psycho-cognitive state (Baumeister et al., 2007). We argue that even self-report instruments provide valuable information and are particularly attractive for field research, they should not be considered in isolation in future cognitive research into EHS. Interestingly, some works combining behavioural measures and neurocomputational models of motivation have opened promising opportunities to address the aforementioned issue related to self-report questionnaires. For instance, in the incentive motivation task developed by Pessiglione *et al* (2007), behavioral measures (e.g. the peak of force with which the participant squeezes the power grip) can be modeled as functions that approximate the solutions of an optimal motor-control model (which maximizes the cost/benefit tradeoff) at the individual level (Pessiglione et al., 2007; Le Bouc et al., 2016). Such a neurocomputational approach has the advantage of providing motivation related measures (e.g. the parameter of expected reward) that are not contaminated by individual differences in other psycho-cognitive components (e.g., emotional thoughts, changes in attention, etc.). Therefore, we encourage future studies investigating motivational underpinnings of EHS to use this neurocomputational approach that

has great potential to enhance the process of relating differences (in behaviour and neural processes) between healthy subjects and individuals who are at risk of EHS.

Regarding the other main component of our model that refers to interoceptive body awareness, it has been formalized as a multifaceted psycho-cognitive process that can be interrogated with complementary methods (Garfinkel et al., 2015; Khalsa and Lapidus, 2016), including self-report instruments and objective measurements (e.g., behavioural test or biomarker). Objective measurements of interoceptive body awareness mainly focus on cardiac interoception that refers to the process of sensing, storing and representing information about the state of the cardiovascular system (Khalsa and Lapidus, 2016). These measurements are mostly performed under conditions of physiological rest, *i.e.* without any significant experimentally-induced cardiovascular manipulation, which raises questions about their potential relevance to inform interoceptive dysfunction in the context of EHS. Indeed, physical effort is characterized by strong, continuous perturbations that affect the cardiovascular system (e.g. increased heart rate and arterial pressure). Interestingly, the pharmacological manipulation of cardiac arousal (via the administration of isoproterenol that modulates sympathetic nervous system) may provide an attractive experimental framework, because it has the advantage of a maskable manipulation of arousal (including placebo condition) that allows for measurements of responding bias (Khalsa et al., 2009). Beside behavioural tests that provide an indirect output of interoceptive signal processing, the neural bases of cardiac interoception can be investigated by probing brain activity in response to cardiac signals. The Heartbeat Evoked Potential, which refers to evoked changes in brain activity (measured using magnetoencephalography, electroencephalography, or intracranial neural recordings) that occurs after a heartbeat, has been proposed as a neurophysiological marker of interoceptive function/dysfunction (Park and Blanke, 2019; Coll et al., 2021).

To summarize, future studies are encouraged to pursue the development and validation of a psycho-cognitive model for EHS in using neurocomputational approach of motivation with the incentive motivation paradigm (Pessiglione et al., 2007), and objective measurements of interoceptive body awareness (e.g., heartbeat perception task (Brener and Ring, 2016) or analysis of the heartbeat evoked potential (Park and Blanke, 2019)) based on a paradigm involving pharmacological manipulation of cardiac arousal (Khalsa et al., 2009).

Neural mechanisms

Our theoretical model of EHS was framed at an (abstract) psycho-cognitive level of description. Yet, while this approach provides useful intuitions and a simple testable framework, the present work also opens up perspectives for the understanding of the pathophysiology of EHS. By studying a new pathway for uncontrolled hyperthermia at central neurosensory integration level, neurocomputational models and new functional brain exploration techniques could provide arguments to feed a neuroanatomical support for this theoretical model, relying on the effect of temperature increase and on the relationship between motivation and interoception complex neuronal networks (McMorris et al., 2018). Thus, an important future endeavour will be to flesh it out at the neural level. We suggest that the system underlying cost-benefit evaluation for effort allocation during physical activity could be subserved by the posterior insula. Indeed, the posterior insula has been proposed to contain a dynamic representation of the body's internal (physiological) state (Craig, 2002; Hassanpour et al., 2018), and its activity has also been highlighted as reflecting motivation one has to exert a physical effort over a long period of time (Meyniel et al., 2013; Schmit and Brisswalter, 2020). The posterior insula may therefore play a critical role in the decision-making process of maintaining physical effort despite excessive physiological costs that characterizes EHS. Meyniel *et al* (2013) have shown that (over)motivation pushes back the bounds within which cost evidence fluctuates, namely that (over)motivation delays the decision to stop, and also slows accumulation of cost evidence (Meyniel et al., 2013). Interestingly, our psychometric findings shed light on an alternative psycho-cognitive factor influencing accumulation of cost evidence, by showing that EHS is characterized with low self-reported interoceptive body awareness. Indeed, from a neurocomputational perspective, it could be argued that low sensitivity to interoceptive signals could result in a slower accumulation (lower slope) of physiological cost evidence during physical effort, thus contributing to delay achievement of the threshold of decision-making to stop physical activity. Future studies may test this hypothesis by investigating relationship interoceptive body awareness (as assessed with self-report, behavioural or neurophysiological measures) has with parameters related to accumulation slope in the computational model of incentive motivation paradigm (see Meyniel *et al* (2013) for detailed description of the accumulation model and its parameters).

CONCLUSION

In this study, we proposed a psycho-cognitive model for exertional heatstroke (EHS), aiming to offer novel, complementary approaches for identifying potential risk factors associated with this condition. Through empirical testing of our theoretical model using psychometric data, we demonstrated an association between a history of EHS and a diminished interoceptive awareness. This finding suggests that individuals at risk for EHS might exhibit a deficit in assessing the physiological costs associated with physical effort, potentially leading to an underestimation of physical exhaustion induced by prolonged exercise. Additionally, we provided evidence challenging our hypothesis whereby overmotivation might increase the risk of EHS. Indeed, we found no relationship between a history of EHS and self-reported global motivation. It is crucial to note that we focused on the highest level of generality in the construct of motivation, considering it as a personality trait. We encourage future studies to explore other levels of the hierarchical model of motivation (Vallerand, 2007), notably the situational motivation which could play a role in the onset mechanisms of EHS. While interventional studies are necessary to test the efficacy of preventive programs in reducing EHS risk, our findings provide preliminary evidence suggesting the potential effectiveness of mindfulness-based programs (e.g., mindfulness-based stress reduction) as a preventive strategy for EHS. Recognizing that EHS involves the decompensation of various factors, both physiological and psychological, and can vary among individuals, our study contributes to the ongoing efforts to comprehend this complex condition. The validation of a psycho-cognitive model for EHS holds promise for refining risk stratification, predicting individual susceptibility, and identifying pathways and innovative countermeasures in the field of EHS.

Author Notes. This study is part of a project supported by the French Military Health Service. The opinions or assertions expressed herein are the private views of the authors and are not to be considered as official or as reflecting the views of the French Military Health Service.

Acknowledgments. We thank Walid Bouaziz, Caroline Dussaud, Julien Siracusa, Stéphane Baugé, Stephanie Bourdon, Benoit Lepetit, and Laurence Pillard for their technical support and help with data collection.

Author Contributions. CM and PETD conceptualized the research question, collected experimental data and wrote the paper. CV conceptualized the research question, conducted the analyses and wrote the paper. AM, AJ, and KC conceptualized the research question and collected experimental data. MT contributed to conceptualizing the research question. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.

Preregistration. This study was preregistered (NCT04593316).

Ethics Statement. The study has been approved by the regional ethics committee of the Agence Régionale de Santé Occitanie (Comité de Protection des Personnes Sud-Ouest et Outre-Mer II, ID-RCB: 2020-A01967-32) on September 29, 2020. The study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards of the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments.

Informed Consent. Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data accessibility. The data and materials are currently private for peer review.

REFERENCES

1. Epstein Y, Yanovich R. Heatstroke. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2019;**380**:2449-59.
2. Hosokawa Y, Racinais S, Akama T, et al. Prehospital management of exertional heat stroke at sports competitions: International olympic committee adverse weather impact expert working group for the olympic games tokyo 2020. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2021.
3. Stearns RL, Hosokawa Y, Adams WM, et al. Repeated exertional heat stroke incidence in a warm-weather road race. *J Athl Train* 2017;**52**:S106.
4. Abriat A, Brosset C, Brégigeon M, Sagui E. Report of 182 cases of exertional heatstroke in the french armed forces. *Military medicine* 2014;**179**:309-14.
5. Gardner JW, Kark JA, Karnei K, et al. Risk factors predicting exertional heat illness in male marine corps recruits. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* 1996;**28**:939-44.
6. Mountjoy M, Moran J, Ahmed H, et al. Athlete health and safety at large sporting events: The development of consensus-driven guidelines. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2021;**55**:191-7.
7. Parsons JT, Anderson SA, Casa DJ, Hainline B. Preventing catastrophic injury and death in collegiate athletes: Interassociation recommendations endorsed by 13 medical and sports medicine organisations. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2020;**54**:208-15.
8. Laitano O, Leon LR, Roberts WO, Sawka MN. Controversies in exertional heat stroke diagnosis, prevention, and treatment. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 2019;**127**:1338-48.
9. Ivarsson A, Johnson U, Andersen MB, Tranaeus U, Stenling A, Lindwall M. Psychosocial factors and sport injuries: Meta-analyses for prediction and prevention. *Sports medicine* 2017;**47**:353-65.
10. Rav-Acha M, Hadad E, Epstein Y, Heled Y, Moran DS. Fatal exertional heat stroke: A case series. *Am J Med Sci* 2004;**328**:84-7.
11. Corbett J, White DK, Barwood MJ, et al. The effect of head-to-head competition on behavioural thermoregulation, thermophysiological strain and performance during exercise in the heat. *Sports Medicine* 2017;**48**:1269-79.
12. Albert PR, Benkelfat C. The neurobiology of depression—revisiting the serotonin hypothesis. Ii. Genetic, epigenetic and clinical studies. The Royal Society; 2013.
13. Chaudhuri KR, Schapira AHV. Non-motor symptoms of parkinson's disease: Dopaminergic pathophysiology and treatment. *The Lancet Neurology* 2009;**8**:464-74.
14. Maslow AH. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological review* 1943;**50**:370.
15. Deci EL, Ryan RM. The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry* 2000;**11**:227-68.
16. Ryan R, Patrick H. Self-determination theory and physical activity: The dynamics of motivation in development and wellness. *Hellenic journal of psychology* 2009;**6**:107-24.
17. Scheffer D, Heckhausen H. Trait theories of motivation. *Motivation and action*. Springer; 2018, p. 67-112.
18. Vallerand RJ. A hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for sport and physical activity. *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in exercise and sport*. Champaign, IL, US: Human Kinetics; 2007, p. 255-79,356-63.
19. Mehling WE, Gopisetty V, Daubenmier JJ, Price CJ, Hecht FM, Stewart A. Body awareness: Construct and self-report measures. *PloS one* 2009;**4**.
20. Berntson GG, Khalsa SS. Neural circuits of interoception. *Trends in Neurosciences* 2021;**44**:17-28.
21. Craig AD. How do you feel? Interoception: The sense of the physiological condition of the body. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 2002;**3**:655-66.

22. Meyniel F, Sergent C, Rigoux L, Daunizeau J, Pessiglione M. Neurocomputational account of how the human brain decides when to have a break. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2013;**110**:2641-6.
23. Farb N, Daubenmier J, Price CJ, et al. Interoception, contemplative practice, and health. *Frontiers in psychology* 2015;**6**.
24. Lutz A, Jha AP, Dunne JD, Saron CD. Investigating the phenomenological matrix of mindfulness-related practices from a neurocognitive perspective. *The American psychologist* 2015;**70**:632-58.
25. Hölzel BK, Lazar SW, Gard T, Schuman-Olivier Z, Vago DR, Ott U. How does mindfulness meditation work? Proposing mechanisms of action from a conceptual and neural perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 2011;**6**:537-59.
26. Treves IN, Tello LY, Davidson RJ, Goldberg SB. The relationship between mindfulness and objective measures of body awareness: A meta-analysis. *Sci Rep* 2019;**9**:1-12.
27. Kabat-Zinn J. Mindfulness-based stress reduction (mbsr). *Constructivism in the Human Sciences* 2003;**8**:73.
28. Mehling WE, Price C, Daubenmier JJ, Acree M, Bartmess E, Stewart A. The multidimensional assessment of interoceptive awareness (maia). *PLoS One* 2012;**7**:e48230.
29. Willem C, Gandolphe MC, Nandrino JL, Grynberg D. French translation and validation of the multidimensional assessment of interoceptive awareness (maia-fr). *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement* 2021.
30. Vallerand RJ, Pelletier LG, Blais MR, Briere NM, Senecal C, Vallieres EF. The academic motivation scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education. *Educational and psychological measurement* 1992;**52**:1003-17.
31. Trousselard M, Steiler D, Raphel C, et al. Validation of a french version of the freiburg mindfulness inventory - short version: Relationships between mindfulness and stress in an adult population. *BioPsychoSocial Medicine* 2010;**4**:1-11.
32. Walach H, Buchheld N, Buttenmüller V, Kleinknecht N, Schmidt S. Measuring mindfulness - the freiburg mindfulness inventory (fmi). *Personality and Individual Differences* 2006;**40**:1543-55.
33. Rouder JN, Speckman PL, Sun D, Morey RD, Iverson G. Bayesian t tests for accepting and rejecting the null hypothesis. *Psychonomic bulletin & review* 2009;**16**:225-37.
34. Wagenmakers EJ, Marsman M, Jamil T, et al. Bayesian inference for psychology. Part i: Theoretical advantages and practical ramifications. *Psychonomic bulletin & review* 2018;**25**:35-57.
35. Jeffreys H. *Theory of probability.* 1961.
36. Glass GV. Note on rank biserial correlation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 1966;**26**:623-31.
37. Brown KW, Ryan RM. The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2003;**84**:822-48.
38. Kiken L, Garland E, Bluth K, Palsson OS, Gaylord SA. From a state to a trait: Trajectories of state mindfulness in meditation during intervention predict changes in trait mindfulness. *Personality and Individual differences* 2015;**81**:41-6.
39. Pessiglione M, Schmidt L, Draganski B, et al. How the brain translates money into force: A neuroimaging study of subliminal motivation. *science* 2007;**316**:904-6.
40. Clancy RB, Herring MP, Campbell MJ. Motivation measures in sport: A critical review and bibliometric analysis. *Frontiers in psychology* 2017;**8**.
41. Guay F, Vallerand RJ, Blanchard C. On the assessment of situational intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The situational motivation scale (sims). *Motivation and emotion* 2000;**24**:175-213.

42. Baumeister RF, Vohs KD, Funder DC. Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: Whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 2007;**2**:396-403.
43. Le Bouc R, Rigoux L, Schmidt L, et al. Computational dissection of dopamine motor and motivational functions in humans. *Journal of Neuroscience* 2016;**36**:6623-33.
44. Garfinkel SN, Seth AK, Barrett AB, Suzuki K, Critchley HD. Knowing your own heart: Distinguishing interoceptive accuracy from interoceptive awareness. *Biological Psychology* 2015;**104**:65-74.
45. Khalsa SS, Lapidus RC. Can interoception improve the pragmatic search for biomarkers in psychiatry? *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 2016;**7**.
46. Khalsa SS, Rudrauf D, Sandesara C, Olshansky B, Tranel D. Bolus isoproterenol infusions provide a reliable method for assessing interoceptive awareness. *International journal of psychophysiology : official journal of the International Organization of Psychophysiology* 2009;**72**:34-45.
47. Coll MP, Hobson H, Bird G, Murphy J. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the relationship between the heartbeat-evoked potential and interoception. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 2021.
48. Park HD, Blanke O. Heartbeat-evoked cortical responses: Underlying mechanisms, functional roles, and methodological considerations. *Neuroimage* 2019;**197**:502-11.
49. Brener J, Ring C. Towards a psychophysics of interoceptive processes: The measurement of heartbeat detection. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 2016;**371**:20160015.
50. McMorris T, Barwood M, Corbett J. Central fatigue theory and endurance exercise: Toward an interoceptive model. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 2018;**93**:93-107.
51. Hassanpour MS, Simmons WK, Feinstein JS, et al. The insular cortex dynamically maps changes in cardiorespiratory interoception. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2018;**43**:426-34.
52. Schmit C, Brisswalter J. Executive functioning during prolonged exercise: A fatigue-based neurocognitive perspective. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 2020;**13**:21-39.

SUPPLEMENTARY CONTENT

Supplementary Introduction



Supplementary Fig. 1. Pathogenesis of exertional heatstroke: a graphical overview of suspected physiological mechanisms. **(A) Physiological thermoregulation.** Whatever exogene (outdoor) and/or endogene (exercise metabolism), heat exposure draws a regulatory loop. Thermoreceptors inform the thermoregulatory centers (hypothalamus) that will coordinate the response of the effectors. Thus, heat dissipation is obtained by generalized subcutaneous vasodilation and sweat evaporation. The reduction of heat stress can also come from behavioral regulation including the adaptation of the pace (decrease in metabolic production) and the search for shelter and the adaptation of the clothing (decrease of the external heat load). **(B)**

Pathophysiology of exertional heat stroke. The occurrence of exercise heat stroke proceeds from the transition from a compensation of heat load to a non-compensable heat stress phasis (gains greater than heat losses) occurring when the cardiac output no longer allows to provide for thermoregulation needs. This uncontrolled hyperthermia leads to cytotoxic effects and a systemic inflammatory response that can lead to multi-organ failure. In this context of decompensated circulatory balance, the pathophysiological mechanisms would be based on disorders of intestinal permeability with release of activating molecules of the inflammatory and immune system. Endothelial alterations would also be responsible for coagulopathy. The direct cytotoxic effect of the temperature increase could also induce brain alterations, particularly hypothalamic. In a certain case, mutations in the ryanodine receptor RyR 1 (a muscle receptor involved in the release of intracellular calcium during contraction) could promote the occurrence of this decompensation of thermoregulation to exercise, by the disorders of the excitation coupling contraction that they induce (Epstein, 2019; Laitano 2019).

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1

A descriptive and approximate classification scheme for the interpretation of the log scale of Bayes factor BF_{10} (adapted from Jeffreys, 1961).

	Log (BF_{10})	Interpretation	Symbol
Growing evidence in favour of H_1	> 2	extreme evidence for H_1	H_1^{****}
	[1.48 ; 2]	very strong evidence for H_1	H_1^{***}
	[1 ; 1.48]	strong evidence for H_1	H_1^{**}
	[0.48 ; 1]	moderate evidence for H_1	H_1^{*}
	[0 ; 0.48]	anecdotal evidence for H_1	ns
	0	no evidence	ns
Growing evidence in favour of H_0	[-0.48 ; 0]	anecdotal evidence for H_0	ns
	[-1 ; -0.48]	moderate evidence for H_0	H_0^{*}
	[-1.48 ; -1]	strong evidence for H_0	H_0^{**}
	[-2 ; -1.48]	very strong evidence for H_0	H_0^{***}
	< -2	extreme evidence for H_0	H_0^{****}

log(BF_{10}): log scale of Bayes factor BF_{10}; H_1: alternative hypothesis; ns: non-significant; H_0: null hypothesis

Supplementary Table 2

Descriptive statistics for the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA) questionnaire in cases with a history of exertional heatstroke and controls.

	Cases (n=51)		**Controls** (n=43)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Scale ***Noticing***	3.52	0.87	3.88	0.72
Scale ***Not-distracting***	2.46	0.89	2.77	0.90
Scale ***Not-worrying***	2.91	0.89	3.02	0.93
Scale ***Attention regulation***	3.05	0.89	3.55	0.76
Scale ***Emotional awareness***	3.44	0.95	3.88	0.81
Scale ***Self-regulation***	2.97	1.15	3.50	0.98
Scale ***Body listening***	2.37	1.10	3.05	1.10
Scale ***Trusting***	3.80	0.89	4.11	0.96
Total score	24.53	4.81	27.76	4.52

M: mean; SD: standard deviation

Supplementary Table 3

Descriptive statistics for the Global Motivation Scale (GMS) questionnaire in cases with a history of exertional heatstroke and controls.

	Cases (n=51)		**Controls** (n=43)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Scale ***IM to know***	21.61	4.51	22.54	3.89
Scale ***IM to accomplishment***	22.25	4.15	22.07	4.73
Scale ***IM to stimulation***	20.47	4.70	20.56	5.04
Scale ***Identified regulation***	21.92	3.74	21.58	3.87
Scale ***Introjected regulation***	18.18	5.10	17.93	5.54
Scale ***External regulation***	18.96	5.23	17.33	5.96
Scale ***Amotivation***	11.43	4.08	14.51	5.59

M: mean; SD: standard deviation; IM: intrinsic motivation

Supplementary Table 4

Descriptive statistics for the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory in cases with a history of exertional heatstroke and controls.

	Cases (n=51)		**Controls** (n=43)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Scale ***Presence***	18.69	3.02	20.30	2.67
Scale ***Acceptation***	21.57	3.79	23.77	3.70
Total score	40.25	6.18	44.07	5.34

M: mean; SD: standard deviation

Supplementary references

Epstein, Y., & Yanovich, R. (2019). Heatstroke. New England Journal of Medicine, 380(25), 2449-2459.
Jeffreys, H. (1961). Theory of probability (Clarendon Press, Ed.).
Laitano, O., Leon, L. R., Roberts, W. O., & Sawka, M. N. (2019). Controversies in exertional heat stroke diagnosis, prevention, and treatment. Journal of Applied Physiology, 127(5), 1338-1348.