Table SII. Responses to manipulation check questions and correlation with the nocebo effect on itch in the classical conditioning group ($n = 20$), observational learning group ($n = 22$), and sham conditioning group ($n = 19$)

Item	Completely n (%)	Somewhat n (%)	Not at all n (%)	Correlation with nocebo effect
Classical conditioning group				
1. Identified the aim of the experiment.	0 (0)	2 (10)	18 (90)	0.07
2. Believed information given by researcher.	16 (80)	4 (20)	0 (0)	−0.44*
3. Noticed association between gels and itch.	14 (67)	3 (16)	3 (16)	−0.07
Observational learning group				
1. Identified the aim of the experiment.	0 (0)	2 (9)	20 (91)	−0.34
2. Believed information given by researcher.	19 (86)	3 (14)	0 (0)	0.27
3. Noticed association between gels and itch.	15 (68)	1 (5)	6 (27)	−0.12
Sham conditioning group				
1. Identified the aim of the experiment.	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (100)	−**
2. Believed information given by researcher.	13 (72)	5 (28)	0 (0)	−0.09
3. Noticed association between gels and itch.	4 (22)	0 (0)	14 (78)	0.12

*Marginally significant correlation ($p = 0.051$). **No correlation could be calculated between item 1 and the nocebo effect because all responses were in the same category.