Aalborg Universitet

Delayed effects of attention on pain sensitivity and Conditioned Pain Modulation

Hoegh, Morten; Seminowicz, David A.; Graven-Nielsen, Thomas

Delayed effects of attention on pain sensitivity and Conditioned Pain Modulation

Morten Hoegh[1], David A. Seminowicz[2,1], Thomas Graven-Nielsen[1*]

[1] Center for Neuroplasticity and Pain (CNAP), SMI, Aalborg University, Denmark

[2] Department of Neural and Pain Sciences, School of Dentistry, Center to Advance Chronic Pain Research, University of Maryland, Baltimore, United States

*Corresponding Author:

Prof. Thomas Graven-Nielsen, Ph.D., DMSc.

Center for Neuroplasticity and Pain (CNAP)

SMI, Department of Health Science and Technology

Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg University

Fredrik Bajers Vej 7 D3, DK-9220 Aalborg, Denmark

Phone: +45 9940 9832, Fax: +45 9815 4008, E-mail: tgn@hst.aau.dk

Conflicts of interest: Nocitech is partly owned by Aalborg University.

Significance: Pain sensitivity is reduced after an attention-task in healthy men. The delayed effects from attention only have minor effects on Conditioned Pain Modulation (CPM), and results support that attention-driven analgesia works independently of CPM. Results indicate that individual strategies for pain inhibition exist and that an overlap between the mechanisms of CPM and selective attention is limited. Moreover, painful phasic stimuli may increase the number of healthy volunteers with negative CPM-effects.

ABSTRACT

Background: Efficacy of pain modulation is assessed as the difference in pain sensitivity during a painful conditioning, compared to before (conditioning pain modulation, CPM). Attention can be assessed with the Stroop-task, in which participants report the number of words on a screen; either congruent or incongruent with the value of the words. Attention away from painful stimuli during CPM enhances the CPM-effect. However, it is unknown if attention influences CPM-effects when the two are done in sequence.

Methods: Healthy men (n=25) underwent cuff-algometry CPM-assessment where the pressure-pain detection and tolerance thresholds (PTT) were recorded on one leg with and without contralateral conditioning. Two identical sessions of four test-stimuli equal to PTT (5s, 1-min interval, scored on a visual analogue scale, VAS) with a painful conditioning from the second to the last test-stimulus were performed. Stroop-sessions were followed by test-stimuli with or without painful conditioning.

Results: The VAS scores in the first two sessions showed excellent reliability (ICC=0.92). VAS scores were lower in sessions with Stroop compared to sessions without Stroop (p=0.05) indicating an analgesic effect of Stroop. Participants were sub-grouped into CPM-responders and CPM-non-responders according to CPM-effects in the first two sessions. CPM-non-responders (n=13) showed facilitation to

repeated noxious stimuli in all sessions with no effect of conditioning or Stroop (p=0.02).

Conclusion: Attention and CPM both modulate pain in healthy men. Attention-induced analgesia works in CPM-non-responders. Results indicate that attention and CPM are not the same and that they do not demonstrate additive effects when applied in sequence.

INTRODUCTION

The ability to inhibit one pain with another is impaired in some patients (Arendt-Nielsen et al., 2018), and a link to cognition has been suggested (Bushnell et al., 2013). The pain-inhibits-pain-effect is assessed by conditioned pain modulation (CPM) (Yarnitsky et al., 2015). The reliability of CPM is moderate to excellent (Kennedy et al., 2016; Petersen et al., 2017). CPM is not always associated with pain inhibition in healthy participants (Potvin and Marchand, 2016), and non-responders may respond differently to cognitive load. Attention away from pain during CPM has an additive effect on pain inhibition (Moont et al., 2010) and the analgesic effect of attention correlates with pain inhibition after controlling for confounders (Oosterman et al., 2010). Pain-inhibition during distraction and CPM are not the same (Lautenbacher et al., 2007; Moont et al., 2010; 2012). In support of this, CPM-effects do not diminish when repeated over 20 minutes (Hoegh et al., 2018) while attention-induced analgesia does (Silvestrini and Rainville, 2013). However, some authors suggest that CPM and attention could depend on the capacity of the same descending control systems (MacLeod, 1992; Silvestrini and Rainville, 2013; Stroop, 1935).

The Stroop task (MacLeod, 1992; Stroop, 1935) is an attention-demanding task that may influence endogenous pain modulation for up to 5 minutes (Hamer et al., 2003). Stroop has been used to study the role of cognitive load on pain sensitivity (Marouf et al., 2014; Oosterman et al., 2010; Wilder-Smith et al., 2013). Stroop can distract healthy volunteers during experimental pain leading to an analgesic effect (Bantick et al., 2002; Fechir et al., 2009; Martinsen et al., 2018; 2014; Oosterman et al., 2010; Wilder-Smith et al., 2013) but only one out of these studies reported analgesia *after* Stroop (Martinsen et al., 2014).

Painful stimuli do not appear to have any effect on reaction time (Aniskin et al., 2011) or brain activation patterns during Stroop (Seminowicz et al., 2004). Three studies reported correlations between CPM-efficacy and shorter reaction time during Stroop in healthy volunteers (Coppieters et al., 2015; Marouf et al., 2014; Meeus et al., 2015). However, one study was based on a small sample size (Meeus et al., 2015), two studies did not find any statistical significant CPM-effect (Coppieters et al., 2015; Meeus et al., 2015), and the third study did not find significant correlations between CPM and Stroop (Marouf et al., 2014) questioning the generalisability of results. A fourth study found a positive correlation between pain inhibition during CPM and pain inhibition during Stroop (Wilder-Smith et al., 2013). None of the four studies controlled for the influence of pain on attention or the degree of CPM-effects at baseline.

The aim of this study was to assess the difference between conditioned pain and unconditioned pain without or immediately after Stroop task performance. It was hypothesised that pain sensitivity would be reduced immediately after Stroop but that pain would not affect reaction time during Stroop. It was hypothesised that both

Stroop and CPM activate descending pathways and therefore that CPM-responders have stronger Stroop-induced analgesia than CPM-non-responders.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Subjects

Participants were all male and between 18 and 72 years old (mean 30.2 ± 10.8 standard deviation). One participant was 72 and the median age was 28. All were recruited via social media and flyers on and around a university and university college. Exclusion criteria included: a diagnosed sleep, neurological, mental or musculoskeletal disorder; less than 6 hours of sleep within the past 24 hours; any recent lesions to the skin or other tissues in the experimental area; any report of pain, use of sleep medication or pain medication within the last two days; any medical diagnosis indicating stress or chronic pain. All participants were informed about the experiment and provide written consent before entering into the study. The study was approved by the local Ethics Committee (N-20170033) and was performed in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration.

Experimental protocol

Throughout the study, participants were placed comfortably with back support in a sitting position with legs extended and a small pillow under the knees. A computer screen (15") was placed slightly off to the left at a distance from which they could comfortably read the text during the Stroop task.

Pain measurements at baseline included bilateral *pain detection thresholds* (PDTs) and *pain tolerance thresholds* (PTTs) and *conditioned pain modulation* (CPM), which were all recorded by cuff pressure algometry on the lower legs (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2017) (Figure 1).

To test for reliability of the phasic test-stimuli with conditioning (CPM), two sessions were conducted (Pain-I and Pain-II). In these sessions test-stimuli were equal to PTT and painful conditioning was applied on the contralateral leg starting with the second test-stimulus and continuing until the end of the last test-stimulus. Pain-I and Pain-II were also used as controls for the Stroop-pain-conditioning session (see below).

The test-stimuli in the three experimental sessions were always preceded by Counting Stroop task (Bush et al., 1998; Seminowicz et al., 2004). This way the participants were not distracted by Stroop during pain or vice versa (Ivanec et al., 2007; Legrain et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2012). The three sessions were delivered in a randomised order and consisted of test-stimuli either equal to 90% of PDT (Stroop-no-pain), to PTT (Stroop-pain), or to PTT with painful conditioning (Stroop-pain-conditioning). In the latter session conditioning was applied on the contralateral leg and tonically maintained from the second through fourth test-stimuli. In order to measure the immediate effect of Stroop, a phasic test-stimulus paradigm was applied (McPhee and Graven-Nielsen, 2018).

Catastrophizing, stress and attention

Pain catastrophizing has been associated with a reduced CPM-effect (Traxler et al., 2019) and Stroop has sometimes been considered a stress-test (Usui and Nishida, 2017). To control for these factors and to measure the self-perceived attention during Stroop, three self-reported outcomes were collected: *Pain Catastrophizing Scale* (PCS) questionnaire in Danish (Kjøgx et al., 2014) or English (Sullivan et al., 1995), *perceived stress* (Geva et al., 2014) and *perceived attention* (Maurer and Pierce, 1998). Stress and attention were scored on a numerical rating scales (NRS, 0-10; with 10 being '*maximum stress/attention'* and 0 equal to '*no stress/attention*'). A total of six stress-ratings were collected: at baseline (prior to any test-stimuli), after baseline assessments, after Pain-II and after each of the three Stroop-sessions. Subjects also asked to rate their attention towards the Stroop task in the beginning and in the end of each session – i.e. a total of six times in three sessions.

Stroop task

The Stroop task was used to increase cognitive load through cognitive inhibition, that is the ability to inhibit cognitive "habits" (i.e. inhibit *the first thing that comes to mind upon a visual stimulus and follow a strict rule under time pressure*) (Stroop, 1935). In the present experiment, the Counting Stroop task (or Number Stroop) (Bush et al., 1998; Seminowicz et al., 2004) was used and participants were asked to count the amount of words on the screen and to report them using a numeric keyboard. The words on the screen (*one, two, three* or *four*) were either congruent with the amount of words (e.g. the word "two" appear twice) or incongruent (e.g. the word "one" appear twice). Accuracy (in percent) as well as reaction time were recorded for analysis (Bush et al., 1998) in ePrime (v3.0, Psychology Software Tools,

Sharpsburg, PA, USA). The participants had the choice of words being in Danish or English (depending on nationality).

Participants were exposed to four 1-min blocks of Counting Stroop in each of the last three sessions (Stroop-no-pain, Stroop-pain, Stroop-pain-conditioning). The Stroop-no-pain session controlled for differences in Stroop reaction time and accuracy as a consequence of pain. Within each block, incongruent and congruent tasks were mixed (Geva et al., 2014; Maurer and Pierce, 1998) to keep participants vigilant as previous studies show correlations between reaction time and pain assessment (Bantick et al., 2002; Oosterman et al., 2010) and between reaction time and assessment of CPM (Meeus et al., 2015). The experimental sessions were different in regards to pressure intensity but identical in terms of Counting Stroop, and the order of the three Stroop-sessions was randomized between participants.

Cuff algometry

A computer-controlled cuff pressure algometer (NociTech, Denmark, and Aalborg University) was used to assess PDT and PTT (test-stimuli) as well as to induce the conditioning stimulus. The computer-controlled air compressor was mounted with two independent 7.5 cm tourniquets (silicone high-pressure cuff, VBM Medizintechnik GmbH, Sulz, Germany) (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2017), an electronic VAS (0-10 cm), and a stop button. Endpoints of the VAS were defined verbally for participants before assessment (0 equal to 'no pain' and 10 cm equal to 'maximal pain'). Participants were instructed on how to use the stop button in case they wanted to terminate cuff-inflation and stop the study. The tourniquets were fitted on top of the most voluminous aspect of the triceps surae muscle on the lower legs. The

upper and lower borders of the cuff were visually marked on the participant's skin to ensure the cuffs remained in place throughout the experiment. This method has previously been shown to produce reliable measurements of CPM based on PDT and PTT (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2017), with CPM based on PDT providing the most stable and robust CPM-effects (Hoegh et al., 2018). Healthy men appear to have more efficient CPM compared to healthy women (Skovbjerg et al., 2017) and thus the current study was performed only in men.

At baseline, PTT and PDT assessments were recorded by inflating the cuff slowly (1 kPa/s) during which subjects scored the perceived pressure-pain intensity in real time on the VAS, until they pressed the stop button (defining PTT). If a participant did not reach PTT before a stimulation intensity of 100 kPa the cuff deflated automatically. For data-analysis the cuff pressure equal to perceived pain of 1 out of 10 on the VAS was defined as PDT (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2017).

Conditioned Pain Modulation (CPM)

The baseline CPM assessments were done by repeating the cuff inflation on the dominant leg simultaneously with a tonic painful cuff inflation on the non-dominant leg equal to the PTT level on that leg. The conditioning was stopped when the PPT level was reached on the dominant leg. The CPM-effect was calculated as the difference between PDT during conditioning minus PDT without conditioning. A positive CPM-effect represents reduced pain sensitivity during conditioning.

Phasic test stimulations

The phasic cuff stimulations had rapid onset (100 kPa/s) and lasted for 5 s each. A total of four cuff stimuli were conducted in each session (starting at 62, 127, 191 and

256 s). Before each train of stimuli there was an approximately 1-minute period during which the Stroop task was performed (for Stroop sessions) or where subjects were instructed to rest quietly (for Pain-I and Pain-II sessions). The total duration of a session was approximately 4 min and 20 s and all sessions were separated by 5 min rest to account for accumulating effects (Hoegh et al., 2018). For each test-stimulus the peak VAS-score was extracted. In the sessions with conditioning on the contralateral leg, the conditioning pain intensity was rated verbally on a NRS (0-10, 10 defined as maximal pain) after each of the four test-stimuli.

Participants were sub-grouped into 'CPM-responders' and 'CPM-non-responders' based on pain VAS-scores from phasic test-stimuli during the conditioning (average of 2-4th VAS-score in Pain-I and Pain-II) subtracted from the unconditioned test-stimulus VAS-score (average of the 1st stimulus in Pain-I and Pain-II). Participants who experienced more pain during the conditioned test-stimuli (2-4th) compared to the unconditioned (1st) were classified as CPM-non-responders and participants with no change or reduced pain sensitivity during the conditioned test-stimuli were classified as CPM-responders (Potvin and Marchand, 2016).

Statistics

Based on pilot studies power calculation indicated that twenty-five healthy male volunteers was necessary to have a power of 0.8 and an alpha on 0.05 (SD 1.5 points on a visual analogue scale, VAS). Data are presented as mean and standard error of the mean (SEM) unless otherwise specified. All data but age was normally distributed (visual inspection of Q-Q plot) or log-transformed (log10) to approach normal distribution before statistical analysis. Effect sizes are reported as partial eta

squared (η_p^2) and interpreted so that effect sizes above 0.14 are considered large and effect sizes below 0.01 as small (Lakens, 2013).

Stroop reaction time and accuracy were analysed in two-way repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with factors *congruency* (congruent, incongruent) and *Stroop-sessions* (Stroop-no-pain, Stroop-pain, Stroop-pain-conditioning). Spearman correlation was made between an average of congruent and an average of incongruent reaction time and accuracy, respectively, with age. Self-perceived attention scores were analysed in a two-way repeated-measures ANOVA with factors *time* (beginning, end) and Stroop-sessions. Furthermore, both ANOVAs of Stroop-performance (reaction time and accuracy), as well as the ANOVA of attention were analysed with *CPM-group* as an additional factor to explore difference between the groups.

Self-perceived *stress* scores before and after Stroop were analysed as an average of the three stress-scores without Stroop (baseline, post-baseline, post Pain-II) and an average of the three scores in sessions with Stroop (Stroop-no-pain, Stroop-pain, Stroop-pain-conditioning) in a paired t-test. We also examined the relationship between PCS-scores and stress scores in CPM-responders and CPM-non-responders, using Pearson correlations.

Interclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) of VAS-scores from the two identical Pain-I and Pain-II sessions was performed in a form 3,1 (two-way mixed-effect model with consistency) for each pair of test-stimuli with single and average measures and 95% confidence intervals reported (Koo and Li, 2016; Shrout and Fleiss, 1979). ICCs between 0.5 and 0.75 indicate moderate reliability, 0.75 to 0.90 indicate good reliability and above 0.90 is considered excellent reliability (Koo and Li, 2016).

The baseline CPM-measurement was analysed with a paired sample t-test of PDT (conditioned vs unconditioned test-stimulus). The effect of conditioning during Pain-I and Pain-II sessions were analysed in a two-way repeated measures ANOVA with *test-stimulus* (1st, average of 2-4th) and *session* (Pain-I, Pain-II).

The difference in VAS-scores between conditioned and unconditioned test-stimuli (i.e. CPM-effects) within the subgroups (CPM-responders and CPM-non-responders, respectively), was analysed in paired t-tests. Furthermore, VAS-scores were analysed in a three-way repeated-measures ANOVA with within-subject factors *test-stimuli* (1st test-stimulus, average of 2-4th test-stimuli) and *sessions* (Pain$_{avg}$, Stroop-pain, Stroop-pain-conditioning) and between-subject factor *CPM-groups* (CPM-responders, CPM-non-responders).

An exploratory analysis was made to facilitate further understanding of the difference between CPM-responders and CPM-non-responders. For this analysis the ΔVAS, i.e. differences in VAS scores between each of the three sessions (Pain$_{avg}$, Stroop-pain and Stroop-pain-conditioning) were calculated: Pain$_{avg}$ minus Stroop-pain (=CPM-Stroop-effect), Pain$_{avg}$ minus Stroop-pain-conditioning (=Stroop-effect) and Stroop-pain minus Stroop-pain-conditioning (=Stroop-Conditioning-effect). The three delta-values were analysed for 1st test-stimulus and 2-4th test-stimuli, respectively, in separate two-way repeated measures ANOVA with factors *ΔVAS* (CPM-Stroop-effect, Stroop-effect and Stroop-Conditioning-effect) and *CPM-groups* (CPM-responders, CPM-non-responders).

Correction with Greenhouse-Geisser was applied when sphericity was violated in the ANOVAs. Pairwise deletion was used in case of missing data. Statistical significance was accepted at p ≤ 0.05 and post-hoc repeated measures comparisons were corrected by Bonferroni (Bon).

RESULTS

Stroop task with and without painful stimuli

In the Stroop task, *reaction time* was slower during incongruent trials compared to congruent (Figure 2A; ANOVA: $F_{(1, 24)}$ = 48.44, p < 0.0005, η_P^2 = 0.669) and no difference was observed between the three Stroop task sessions. There was no significant correlation between age and reaction time or accuracy during Stroop Task. *Accuracy* on the Stroop task was also not different between Stroop sessions and participants were more accurate during the congruent compared to the incongruent tasks (Figure 2B: ANOVA; $F_{(1, 24)}$ = 43.49, p < 0.0005, η_P^2 = 0.644). Self-perceived attention towards the Stroop task was high (7.9 ± 0.2) and there were no interactions or main effects of time or session in the self-perceived attention during Stroop. No interactions were found between any of the outcomes related to Stroop performance and CPM-groups. This suggests that the Stroop task was successfully applied without influence of the pain sessions on Stroop task performance.

Perceived stress and pain catastrophizing

Self-perceived stress was very low on average (1.5 ± 0.3) throughout the study. *Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS)* scores were also low on average (7.6 ± 1.1). Stress-scores before Stroop and during Stroop-sessions were not significantly different and no correlations were found between PCS-scores and stress or CPM-response.

Perception of cuff test-stimuli

Average VAS-scores of the test-stimuli (Table 1) in the five sessions were 6.3 ± 0.3 (Pain-I), 6.1 ± 0.3 (Pain-II), 0.5 ± 0.2 (Stroop-no-pain), 5.3 ± 0.4 (Stroop-pain) and 5.4 ± 0.4 (Stroop-pain-conditioning).

Cuff test-stimuli shows excellent reliability

Data from one person was missing in the first session (4th test-stimulus, Pain-I) and consequently data from this person was excluded in the other session (4th test-stimulus, Pain-II). A total of 99 data sets from 25 people in four sessions were used to calculate reliability.

The overall test-retest reliability between VAS-scores in Pain-I and Pain-II sessions showed excellent reliability (ICC = 0.96 (95% confidence interval: 0.93 – 0.98, $F_{(7, 161)}$ = 2.86, p = 0.008) for the average VAS-score across the four test-stimuli. The reliability of the first, unconditioned test-stimulus was defined as good (Figure 3; ICC = 0.83, 95% confidence interval: 0.61 – 0.92, $F_{(1, 24)}$, p < 0.0005) and the reliability for an average of 2-4th test-stimuli was excellent (Figure 3; ICC = 0.92, 95% confidence interval: 0.82 – 0.97, $F_{(1, 24)}$, p < 0.0005). See table 2 for individual ICC.

Conditioned pain modulation

The intensity of the conditioning stimulus was 47.3 ± 14.8 kPa throughout baseline and experimental sessions. There was a positive CPM-effect at baseline, with an PDT during conditioning (38.7 ± 3.4 kPa) significantly greater than PDT before conditioning (31.7 ± 2.3 kPa; t(24) = - 4.14, p < 0.0005).

There was no significance difference between Pain-I and Pain-II sessions of VAS-scores in the conditioned (2-4th) test-stimuli compared to the unconditioned (1st)test-stimulus (ANOVA: F(1, 24) = 3.63, p = 0.07, η_P^2 = 0.131). However, an interaction between *test-stimulus* and *session* (ANOVA: F(1, 24) = 4.80, p = 0.04, , η_P^2 = 0.167) allowed for post-hoc analysis, which showed that VAS-scores were lower during the 1st test-stimulus in the Pain-II session compared to Pain-I (Bon: p = 0.02). No significant differences were found between the conditioned and unconditioned test-stimuli in the Pain-I session, but an increase in VAS-scores from the 1st to the 2-4th test-stimuli was found in the Pain-II session (Bon: p = 0.02), as an indication of a negative CPM-effect in the Pain-II session. This led to an exploratory analysis of CPM-responders and CPM-non-responders on averaged Pain-I and Pain-II (Pain$_{avg}$).

Based on Pain$_{avg}$ (i.e. VAS-scores without Stroop) 13 participants had increased VAS-scores during conditioning and were considered *CPM-non-responders* and 12 participants were considered *CPM-responders*. Within-group analysis showed that PDT decreased from 6.0 ± 0.5 to 5.5 ± 0.5 cm on the VAS (t(11) = - 3.80, p = 0.03) for *CPM-responders*, while the CPM-non-responders showed facilitation during conditioning from 5.8 ± 0.4 to 7.0 ± 0.2 cm on the VAS (t(12) = 4.10, p = 0.001).

Pain is inhibited after Stroop

A three-way ANOVA of VAS-scores for test-stimuli across the sessions and groups revealed an interaction between *CPM-groups* and *time* (Figure 4; ANOVA: $F_{(1, 23)}$ = 15.84, p = 0.001, η_P^2 = 0.408) and a main effects for *session* (ANOVA; $F_{(2, 46)}$ = 5.56, p = 0.007, η_P^2 = 0.195) and *time* (ANOVA; $F_{(1, 23)}$ = 4.85, p = 0.04, η_P^2 = 0.174). Main effects showed that VAS-scores were higher during $Pain_{avg}$ when compared to each of the Stroop-sessions (Bon: p ≤ 0.05). A post-hoc analysis of the interaction showed that the *CPM-non-responders* showed facilitation during the 2-4th test-stimuli (Figure 4; Bon: p < 0.0005) compared with the 1st test-stimulus.

The differences between sessions and CPM-groups

The difference in the VAS-scores between the three sessions (CPM-Stroop-effect, Stroop-effect and Stroop-Conditioning-effect) showed a week trend towards a difference during the 1st test-stimulus (Figure 5A; ANOVA: $F_{(1.3, 31.3)}$ = 3.13, p = 0.08, η_P^2 = 0.120) and no interaction between sessions and CPM-groups was found. However, a difference was found between sessions during the 2-4th test-stimuli (Figure 5B; ANOVA: $F_{(1.3, 31.0)}$ = 5.45, p = 0.02, η_P^2 = 0.193). Pairwise comparisons showed that the change in VAS was lower in *Stroop-Conditioning-effect* compared to *Stroop-effect* (Bon: p = 0.02) but not to *CPM-Stroop effect*.

DISCUSSION

This study explored the influence of a non-sensory (attention) task on pain-induced analgesia (i.e. CPM), and it shows that Stroop (attention) does not significantly influence CPM. Nonetheless, Stroop inhibited pain in healthy men for up to one minute after the attention-task has ended. Despite this the analgesic effects of Stroop, it was not able to transform CPM-non-responders into CPM-responders. Instead, results show that Stroop has an effect on both CPM-responders and CPM-non-responders, providing a strong indication for different mechanisms.

Attention manipulation

Participants reported a high degree of attention during the Stroop task but there were no differences between reaction time or accuracy on the task in the three sessions (Stroop-no-pain, Stroop-pain, Stroop-pain-conditioning), indicating that Stroop performance was unaffected by the painful test-stimuli in this study, which is in accordance with the hypothesis. These results are supported by existing evidence from brain imaging research, which also find minimal influence of pain on brain activation patterns during Stroop task (Seminowicz and Davis, 2007a; Seminowicz et al., 2004) or differences in Stroop performance during pain compared to without pain (Aniskin et al., 2011; Seminowicz and Davis, 2007b). Moreover the reaction time and accuracy were comparable to previous studies (Seminowicz et al., 2004). Furthermore, the results in this study support a comprehensive study on the influence of pain on different aspects of attention, which conclude that pain has no influence on selective attention using a conflict task comparable to the Stroop task (Moore et al., 2012).

Stress and catastrophizing

In the current study, perceived stress was very low (less than 2/10) and thus changes during the study were minimal (less than 0.5 out of 10) (Jaeschke et al., 1989; Ries, 2005; Tashjian et al., 2009). This clearly shows that participants did not perceive Stroop nor the painful stimulations to be stressful.

The mean PCS-scores (7.6 ± 1.1) were lower than expected in healthy volunteers (Kjøgx et al., 2014) indicating that none of the participants had maladaptive coping strategies involving rumination, magnification or helplessness. Also, PCS-scores did not correlate with stress or CPM-measures indicating that these factors did not confound the results.

The effect of Stroop task on pain intensity

In accordance with the hypothesis, the results show that VAS-scores were lower during Stroop-sessions compared to sessions with stimulus-evoked pain without Stroop and with no differences between Stroop-pain and Stroop-pain-conditioning. These results support top-down analgesia possibly derived via cortical and/or subcortical regions (Damien et al., 2018; Wiech, 2016), and align with the existing literature showing that Stroop is sufficient to reduce pain sensitivity in healthy participants (Bantick et al., 2002; Fechir et al., 2009; Martinsen et al., 2018; 2014; Oosterman et al., 2010; Wilder-Smith et al., 2013) although one study found increased pain with increased cognitive load (Silvestrini and Rainville, 2013) and no significant difference in pain sensitivity was found in another study (Aniskin et al., 2011). Of previous studies only three looked at differences between congruent and incongruent paradigms with regards to pain-sensitivity (Bantick et al., 2002; Martinsen et al., 2018; 2014) and a difference was only found in one of the three

(Bantick et al., 2002). However, Bantick et al. (2002) used retrospective pain reports, which is likely to have affected the results (Pincus et al., 1998). Thus, attention rather than e.g. cognitive load appear to be related to the hypoalgesic effect of Stroop task. Moont et al. (2010) also found no difference in analgesic effects between different levels of cognitive load when attention is applied in parallel with the painful stimulus (i.e. distraction) (Moont et al., 2010).

Conditioning pain modulation

In line with a large body of evidence, this study showed pain reduction during conditioning pain modulation at group-level based on a cuff algometry CPM-paradigm at baseline (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2017; Hoegh et al., 2018; Kennedy et al., 2016; Petersen et al., 2017). The phasic cuff test-stimuli paradigm (5 s pressure stimulations) showed excellent reliability. VAS-scores during the 1st test-stimulus were lower in Pain-II compared to Pain-I. It is unlikely that the difference between Pain-I and Pain-II VAS-scores are related to carry-over effects because they were separated by a 5-min break, which has previously been found to be sufficient to reduce the risk of carry-over effects (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2017; Hoegh et al., 2018; Imai et al., 2016; McPhee and Graven-Nielsen, 2018), was included between the two sessions. Two recent studies have used phasic test-stimuli (Lie et al., 2017; McPhee and Graven-Nielsen, 2018) of which one does not find CPM-effects (McPhee and Graven-Nielsen, 2018) while the other study does show a CPM-effect (Lie et al., 2017). More studies indicate that the duration of a conditioning stimulus is less important for CPM-effects than the intensity of the stimulus (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2017; Smith and Pedler, 2017), however, Lie et al. (2017) show that phasic heat stimuli can induce a CPM-effect but that it is smaller compared to a tonic test-

stimulus. It may be possible that shorter stimulation time in the phasic paradigm is an essential factor in these findings and that longer, phasic test-stimuli may be preferable to shorter phasic test-stimuli.

CPM-responders compared to CPM-non-responders before and after Stroop
It was expected that CPM-responders would benefit more than CPM-non-responders from Stroop-induced analgesia, but the results did not support this.

About 20% of healthy volunteers show no response or pain facilitation during traditional CPM-paradigms (Klyne et al., 2018; Potvin and Marchand, 2016; Skovbjerg et al., 2017), and it has been suggested that subgroup analysis may provide a better understanding of underlying differences between these groups (Potvin and Marchand, 2016; Vaegter and Graven-Nielsen, 2016). A recent study indicated that reliability of CPM-based subgroups could be modality-dependent with computerised cuff-algometry as a reliable method (Vaegter et al., 2018). In the current study, half of the participants (n = 13) were classified as CPM-non-responders, while the other half (n = 12) were CPM-responders (Klyne et al., 2015). The number of CPM-non-responders were higher in the phasic test-stimuli paradigm compared to what would be expected (Klyne et al., 2018; Potvin and Marchand, 2016; Skovbjerg et al., 2017). However, the results in the current study are in line with two other studies using comparable paradigms (Lie et al., 2017; McPhee and Graven-Nielsen, 2018). Compared to the classical paradigm with tonic conditioning, the phasic paradigm seem so show a higher number of CPM-non-responders, which may reflect inter-individual differences in combination with relatively smaller effects . By definition, CPM-responders showed a positive CPM-effect and CPM-non-responders showed negative CPM-effects (i.e. pain facilitation). Most interestingly,

the facilitated pain response in the group of CPM-non-responders was significant during repeated, unconditioned test-stimuli as well as to conditioned test-stimuli with and without Stroop, indicating a stable trait of pain-facilitation. However, compared to sessions without Stroop, pain after Stroop was reduced both in the presence and absence of a conditioning stimulus for both groups, indicating an effect of cognitive load on pain sensitivity, which appear to exist separately from a CPM-effect.

Repeated test-stimuli with and without conditioning has previously been suggested to be a novel method to assess changes in pain sensitivity (Hoegh et al., 2018). Particularly, the net CPM-effect (i.e. the difference between the effect of repeated conditioned and repeated unconditioned test-stimuli) is interesting since it may provide novel insights to the balance between facilitative and inhibitory descending control systems (Arendt-Nielsen et al., 2018; Groves and Thompson, 1970; Hoegh et al., 2018). Accordingly, an exploratory analysis of the changes between the sessions (ΔVAS) was conducted for the 1st and the 2-4th test-stimuli, respectively. The analysis showed that *Stroop-Conditioning-effect* was smaller during the 2-4th test-stimuli compared to *Stroop-effect* (Figure 5b), meaning that the net-effect of Stroop alone was higher than the combined effect of Stroop and conditioning. Unlike Moont et al. (2010) who found that distraction (i.e. attention away from a parallel, painful stimulus) has an additive effect on CPM (Moont et al., 2010), the current study finds that when the attention-task is done before CPM there is no additive effect in CPM-responders. However, the present results support that Stroop is related to analgesia and suggest that Stroop has analgesic effects even in CPM-non-responders and therefore that a lack of CPM response to painful conditioning could be modified by a preceding attention-task. Hamer et al. (2003) found that blood flow in the forearm was significantly increased during Stroop and

they speculated that this could related to descending endogenous effects, however, if such an effect is present during Stroop results from this study suggests that they are insufficient to have an additive effect on CPM after Stroop (Hamer et al., 2003). Together these results support the existing literature speculating that cognitive analgesia and CPM are not the same (Lautenbacher et al., 2007; Moont et al., 2010; 2012) and adds that the timing of the attention-task could be critical for additive effects.

Top-down, bottom-up, or both?

It has been suggested that attention is a *top-down* modulation of pain while sensory stimuli are *bottom-up* modulators (Hauck et al., 2015). The painful conditioning stimulus in this study can be categorised as a bottom-up process since it is stimulus-driven, albeit there is agreement that it involves descending pathways (Yarnitsky et al., 2010). The Stroop task, on the other hand, could be considered a *top-down* process since it is initiated by voluntary and goal-oriented attention (Katsuki and Constantinidis, 2014). Brain imaging show that some participants were more likely to attend to Stroop task (during pain) while others were more likely to attend to the pain-stimulus (during Stroop) (Seminowicz et al., 2004) posing that individual differences could involve differences in brain activity. Furthermore, attention analgesia is likely to involve the same subcortical structures as CPM (Erpelding and Davis, 2013; Kucyi et al., 2013). From a mechanism-based perspective it could seem that top-down modulation is activated by default under cognitive load (Bantick et al., 2002; Fechir et al., 2009; Martinsen et al., 2018; 2014; Oosterman et al., 2010; Wilder-Smith et al., 2013), and that bottom-up mechanisms can be supplemented by

top-down modulation during parallel but not serial application of attention demanding tasks (Lautenbacher et al., 2007; Moont et al., 2010; Nir et al., 2012).

Stroop task measures *inhibition* of cognition but other test, such as *n*-back test for working memory (*updating*), may have different effects on pain inhibition and could be relevant to test in a similar paradigm. Expectation is another big top-down modulator of pain (Bjørkedal and Flaten, 2012; Colloca et al., 2018), however, Stroop-pain and Stroop-pain-conditioning sessions were only different with regards to the conditioning stimulus, so expectations are unlikely to explain the results in this study (Bjørkedal and Flaten, 2012; Nir et al., 2012).

In summary, attention (*top-down*) was key to reducing pain sensitivity in healthy men and responses to painful conditioning (*bottom-up*) may be more dependent on individual variability. In this context, results from this study could be considered exploratory evidence of a spectrum of *bottom-up* and *top-down* triggers working on associated mechanisms in healthy volunteers. Future studies could explore if individual differences in top-down and bottom-up modulation of pain could direct more efficient treatment to clinical populations.

Limitations

The results in this study are exploratory in their nature and serve mainly as proof-of-concept for studying the role of attention on pain in an experimental setting. The age-span among the participants was very large but it is unlikely that this could have affected the results. Although not compared directly, the paradigms used to test for CPM-effects at baseline and during the experimental sessions were not identical and might have imposed a difference in perception of pressure pain in the two paradigms. Phasic cuff-pressure test-stimuli may associate with smaller CPM-effects

than tonic or ramping test-stimuli (Lie et al., 2017) but it was the only feasible paradigm available for testing deep tissue pain sensitivity in the breaks between the Stroop-trials. However, since no accumulating effect of Stroop (e.g. cognitive exhaustion) was measured, future studies could consider using longer lasting test-stimuli and possibly reach more pronounced CPM-effects. This study included a baseline test with a 'normal' CPM-paradigm as well as the test-retest reliability of the peak-stimulus paradigm, which also serves as a methodological strength. It allowed test-retest reliability calculations on the same group of participants, as well as direct comparison between conditioned test-stimuli with and without Stroop task. The sample size for this study was sufficient to study changes in CPM-effects at group level, not subgroup level, which must be considered when interpreting these results. Also, future studies might consider to use k-means clustering to determine subgroups.

Conclusion

This study is the first to measure the delayed effects of Stroop on pain sensitivity in healthy men and to show that Stroop can induce analgesia in participants who show facilitation during CPM. Stroop-induced analgesia does not seem to have an additive effect on CPM. This study concludes that attention-driven analgesia utilises different or only partially overlapping mechanisms as those of pain-driven analgesia (CPM). Clinically, this could be suggest that that attention-driven analgesia is relevant independently of pain-induced analgesia.

Author contributions

All authors contributed in the study design and planning. MH and TGN analysed data from the cuff and DAS analysed data from the Stroop task. All authors contributed to interpretation of the data and to the finalising of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Aniskin, D.B., Fink, E., Prosser, J., Cohen, L.J., Boda, N., Steinfeld, M., Galynker, I.I. (2011). The Effect of Pain on Stroop Performance in Patients With Opiate Dependence in Sustained Remission. *Journal of Addiction Medicine* 5, 50–56.

Arendt-Nielsen, L., Morlion, B., Perrot, S., Dahan, A., Dickenson, A., Kress, H.G., Wells, C., Bouhassira, D., Mohr Drewes, A. (2018). Assessment and manifestation of central sensitisation across different chronic pain conditions. *Eur J Pain* 22, 216–241.

Bantick, S.J., Wise, R.G., Ploghaus, A., Clare, S., Smith, S.M., Tracey, I. (2002). Imaging how attention modulates pain in humans using functional MRI. *Brain* 125, 310–319.

Bjørkedal, E., Flaten, M.A. (2012). Expectations of increased and decreased pain explain the effect of conditioned pain modulation in females. *Jpr* 5, 289–300.

Bush, G., Whalen, P.J., Rosen, B.R., Jenike, M.A., McInerney, S.C., Rauch, S.L. (1998). The counting Stroop: an interference task specialized for functional neuroimaging--validation study with functional MRI. *Hum Brain Mapp* 6, 270–282.

Bushnell, M.C., Ceko, M., Low, L.A. (2013). Cognitive and emotional control of pain and its disruption in chronic pain. 1–10.

Colloca, L., Corsi, N., Fiorio, M. (2018). The interplay of exercise, placebo and nocebo effects on experimental pain. *Sci Rep* 8, 14758.

Coppieters, I., Ickmans, K., Cagnie, B., Nijs, J., De Pauw, R., Noten, S., Meeus, M. (2015). Cognitive Performance Is Related to Central Sensitization and Health-related Quality of Life in Patients with Chronic Whiplash-Associated Disorders and Fibromyalgia. *Pain Physician* 18, E389–E401.

Damien, J., Colloca, L., Bellei-Rodriguez, C.-É., Marchand, S. (2018). Pain Modulation: From Conditioned Pain Modulation to Placebo and Nocebo Effects in Experimental and Clinical Pain. In *Neurobiology of the Placebo Effect Part II*, (Elsevier), pp. 255–296.

Erpelding, N., Davis, K.D. (2013). Neural underpinnings of behavioural strategies that prioritize either cognitive task performance or pain. *Pain* 154, 2060–2071.

Fechir, M., Schlereth, T., Kritzmann, S., Balon, S., Pfeifer, N., Geber, C., Breimhorst, M., Eberle, T., Gamer, M., Birklein, F. (2009). Stress and thermoregulation: different sympathetic responses and different effects on experimental pain. *Eur J Pain* 13, 935–941.

Geva, N., Pruessner, J., Defrin, R. (2014). Acute psychosocial stress reduces pain modulation capabilities in healthy men. *Pain* 155, 2418–2425.

Graven-Nielsen, T., Izumi, M., Petersen, K.K., Arendt-Nielsen, L. (2017). User-independent assessment of conditioning pain modulation by cuff pressure algometry. *Eur J Pain* 21, 552–561.

Groves, P.M., Thompson, R.F. (1970). Habituation: a dual-process theory. *Psychol Rev* 77, 419–450.

Hamer, M., Boutcher, Y.N., Boutcher, S.H. (2003). The role of cardiopulmonary baroreceptors during the forearm vasodilatation response to mental stress. *Psychophysiology* 40, 249–253.

Hauck, M., Lorenz, J., Domnick, C., Gerloff, C., Engel, A.K. (2015). Top-Down and Bottom-Up Modulation of Pain-Induced Oscillations. *Front Hum Neurosci* 9.

Hoegh, M., Petersen, K.K., Graven-Nielsen, T. (2018). Effects of repeated conditioning pain modulation in healthy volunteers. *Eur J Pain* 22, 1833–1843.

Imai, Y., Petersen, K.K., Mørch, C.D., Arendt-Nielsen, L. (2016). Comparing test–retest reliability and magnitude of conditioned pain modulation using different combinations of test and conditioning stimuli. *Somatosens Mot Res* 1–9.

Ivanec, D., Pavin, T., Kotzmuth, A. (2007). Possibilities of attentional control of pain: Influence of distractive Stroop task on pain threshold and pain tolerance. *Review of Psychology* 13, 87–94.

Jaeschke, R., Singer, J., Guyatt, G.H. (1989). Measurement of health status. Ascertaining the minimal clinically important difference. *Control Clin Trials* 10, 407–415.

Katsuki, F., Constantinidis, C. (2014). Bottom-up and top-down attention: different processes and overlapping neural systems. *Neuroscientist* 20, 509–521.

Kennedy, D.L., Kemp, H.I., Ridout, D., Yarnitsky, D., Rice, A.S.C. (2016). Reliability of conditioned pain modulation: a systematic review. *Pain* 157, 2410–2419.

Kjøgx, H., Zachariae, R., Pfeiffer-Jensen, M., Kasch, H., Svensson, P., Jensen, T.S., Vase, L. (2014). Pain frequency moderates the relationship between pain catastrophizing and pain. *Front Psychol* 5.

Klyne, D.M., Moseley, G.L., Sterling, M., Barbe, M.F., Hodges, P.W. (2018). Individual Variation in Pain Sensitivity and Conditioned Pain Modulation in Acute Low Back Pain: Effect of Stimulus Type, Sleep, and Psychological and Lifestyle Factors. *J Pain* 19.

Klyne, D.M., Schmid, A.B., Moseley, G.L., Sterling, M., Hodges, P.W. (2015). Effect of types and anatomic arrangement of painful stimuli on conditioned pain modulation. *J Pain* 16, 176–185.

Koo, T.K., Li, M.Y. (2016). A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. *J Chiropr Med* 15, 155–163.

Kucyi, A., Salomons, T.V., Davis, K.D. (2013). Mind wandering away from pain dynamically engages antinociceptive and default mode brain networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 110, 18692–18697.

Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Front Psychol* 4, 863.

Lautenbacher, S., Prager, M., Rollman, G.B. (2007). Pain additivity, diffuse noxious inhibitory controls, and attention: a functional measurement analysis. *Somatosens Mot Res* 24, 189–201.

Legrain, V., Mancini, F., Sambo, C.F., Torta, D.M., Ronga, I., Valentini, E. (2012). Cognitive aspects of nociception and pain. Bridging neurophysiology with cognitive psychology. *Neurophysiologie Clinique / Clinical Neurophysiology* 42, 325–336.

Lie, M.U., Matre, D., Hansson, P., Stubhaug, A., Zwart, J.-A., Nilsen, K.B. (2017). A tonic heat test stimulus yields a larger and more reliable conditioned pain modulation effect compared to a phasic heat test stimulus. *PAIN Reports* 2, e626.

MacLeod, C.M. (1992). The Stroop task: The "gold standard" of attentional measures. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 121, 12–14.

Marouf, R., Caron, S., Lussier, M., Bherer, L., Piché, M., Rainville, P. (2014). Reduced pain inhibition is associated with reduced cognitive inhibition in healthy aging. 155, 494–502.

Martinsen, S., Flodin, P., Berrebi, J., Löfgren, M., Bileviciute-Ljungar, I., Ingvar, M., Fransson, P., Kosek, E. (2014). Fibromyalgia patients had normal distraction related pain inhibition but cognitive impairment reflected in caudate nucleus and hippocampus during the Stroop Color Word Test. *PLoS ONE* 9, e108637.

Martinsen, S., Flodin, P., Berrebi, J., Löfgren, M., Bileviciute-Ljungar, I., Mannerkorpi, K., Ingvar, M., Fransson, P., Kosek, E. (2018). The role of long-term physical exercise on performance and brain activation during the Stroop colour word task in fibromyalgia patients. *Clin Physiol Funct Imaging* 38, 508–516.

Maurer, T.J., Pierce, H.R. (1998). A comparison of Likert scale and traditional measures of self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83, 324–329.

McPhee, M., Graven-Nielsen, T. (2018). Alterations in Temporal Summation of Pain and Conditioned Pain Modulation Across an Episode of Experimental Exercise-Induced Low Back Pain. *J Pain*.

Meeus, M., Van Oosterwijck, J., Ickmans, K., Baert, I., Coppieters, I., Roussel, N., Struyf, F., Pattyn, N., Nijs, J. (2015). Interrelationships between pain processing,

cortisol and cognitive performance in chronic whiplash-associated disorders. *Clin Rheumatol* 34, 545–553.

Moont, R., Crispel, Y., Lev, R., Pud, D., Yarnitsky, D. (2012). Temporal changes in cortical activation during distraction from pain: A comparative LORETA study with conditioned pain modulation. *Brain Research* 1435, 105–117.

Moont, R., Pud, D., Sprecher, E., Sharvit, G., Yarnitsky, D. (2010). "Pain inhibits pain" mechanisms: Is pain modulation simply due to distraction? *Pain* 150, 113–120.

Moore, D.J., Keogh, E., Eccleston, C. (2012). The interruptive effect of pain on attention. *Q J Exp Psychol (Hove)* 65, 565–586.

Nir, R.-R., Yarnitsky, D., Honigman, L., Granot, M. (2012). Cognitive manipulation targeted at decreasing the conditioning pain perception reduces the efficacy of conditioned pain modulation. *Pain* 153, 170–176.

Oosterman, J.M., Dijkerman, H.C., Kessels, R.P.C., Scherder, E.J.A. (2010). A unique association between cognitive inhibition and pain sensitivity in healthy participants. *Eur J Pain* 14, 1046–1050.

Petersen, K.K., Vaegter, H.B., Arendt-Nielsen, L. (2017). An updated view on the reliability of different protocols for the assessment of conditioned pain modulation. *Pain* 158, 988.

Pincus, T., Fraser, L., Pearce, S. (1998). Do chronic pain patients 'Stroop' on pain stimuli? *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 37, 49–58.

Potvin, S., Marchand, S. (2016). Pain facilitation and pain inhibition during conditioned pain modulation in fibromyalgia and in healthy controls. *Pain* 157, 1704–1710.

Ries, A.L. (2005). Minimally clinically important difference for the UCSD Shortness of Breath Questionnaire, Borg Scale, and Visual Analog Scale. *Copd* 2, 105–110.

Seminowicz, D.A., Davis, K.D. (2007a). Interactions of Pain Intensity and Cognitive Load: The Brain Stays on Task. *Cereb Cortex* 17, 1412–1422.

Seminowicz, D.A., Davis, K.D. (2007b). A re-examination of pain-cognition interactions: implications for neuroimaging. *Pain* 130, 8–13.

Seminowicz, D.A., Mikulis, D.J., Davis, K.D. (2004). Cognitive modulation of pain-related brain responses depends on behavioral strategy. *Pain* 112, 48–58.

Shrout, P.E., Fleiss, J.L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychol Bull* 86, 420–428.

Silvestrini, N., Rainville, P. (2013). After-effects of cognitive control on pain. *Eur J Pain* 17, 1225–1233.

Skovbjerg, S., Jørgensen, T., Arendt-Nielsen, L., Ebstrup, J.F., Carstensen, T., Graven-Nielsen, T. (2017). Conditioned Pain Modulation and Pressure Pain

Sensitivity in the Adult Danish General Population: The DanFunD Study. *J Pain* 18, 274–284.

Smith, A., Pedler, A. (2017). Conditioned pain modulation is affected by occlusion cuff conditioning stimulus intensity, but not duration. *Eur J Pain* 22, 816–819.

Stroop, J.R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 18, 643–662.

Sullivan, M.J.L., Bishop, S.R., Pivik, J. (1995). The Pain Catastrophizing Scale: Development and validation. *Psychological Assessment* 7, 524–532.

Tashjian, R.Z., Deloach, J., Porucznik, C.A., Powell, A.P. (2009). Minimal clinically important differences (MCID) and patient acceptable symptomatic state (PASS) for visual analog scales (VAS) measuring pain in patients treated for rotator cuff disease. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 18, 927–932.

Traxler, J., Hanssen, M.M., Lautenbacher, S., Ottawa, F., Peters, M.L. (2019). General versus pain-specific cognitions: Pain catastrophizing but not optimism influences conditioned pain modulation. *Eur J Pain* 23, 150–159.

Usui, H., Nishida, Y. (2017). The very low-frequency band of heart rate variability represents the slow recovery component after a mental stress task. *PLoS ONE* 12, e0182611.

Vaegter, H.B., Graven-Nielsen, T. (2016). Pain modulatory phenotypes differentiate subgroups with different clinical and experimental pain sensitivity. *Pain* 157, 1480–1488.

Vaegter, H.B., Petersen, K.K., Mørch, C.D., Imai, Y., Arendt-Nielsen, L. (2018). Assessment of CPM reliability: quantification of the within-subject reliability of 10 different protocols. *Scandinavian Journal of Pain* 0, 663.

Wiech, K. (2016). Deconstructing the sensation of pain: The influence of cognitive processes on pain perception. *Science* 354, 584–587.

Wilder-Smith, C.H., Li, X., Shen, L., Cao, Y., Ho, K.Y., Wong, R.K. (2013). Dysfunctional endogenous pain modulation in patients with functional dyspepsia. *Neurogastroenterol Motil* 26, 489–498.

Yarnitsky, D., Arendt-Nielsen, L., Bouhassira, D., Edwards, R.R., Fillingim, R.B., Granot, M., Hansson, P., Lautenbacher, S., Marchand, S., Wilder-Smith, O. (2010). Recommendations on terminology and practice of psychophysical DNIC testing. *Eur J Pain* 14, 339–339.

Yarnitsky, D., Bouhassira, D., Drewes, A.M., Fillingim, R.B., Granot, M., Hansson, P., Landau, R., Marchand, S., Matre, D., Nilsen, K.B., Stubhaug, A., Treede, R.D., Wilder-Smith, O.H.G. (2015). Recommendations on practice of conditioned pain modulation (CPM) testing. *Eur J Pain* 19, 805–806.

TABLES

Table 1: VAS-scores in all sessions

	Stimulus	Mean	SEM
Pain-I	1	6.16	0.34
	2	6.26	0.33
	3	6.33	0.33
	4	6.57	0.31
Pain-II	1	5.59	0.37
	2	6.20	0.33
	3	6.43	0.38
	4	6.41	0.37
Stroop-no-pain	1	0.40	0.19
	2	0.50	0.20
	3	0.54	0.23
	4	0.61	0.21
Stroop-pain	1	5.04	0.39
	2	5.29	0.41
	3	5.50	0.43
	4	5.25	0.47
Stroop-pain-conditioning	1	5.16	0.36
	2	5.50	0.44
	3	5.62	0.40
	4	5.46	0.52

Average and SEM (N=25) of visual analogue scale (VAS) scores of cuff test-stimuli in the five sessions.

Table 2: Test-retest reliability of repeated test-stimuli in the first two sessions (Pain-I, Pain-II)

	ICC Single measures	95% Confidence Intervals Lower bound	Upper bound	ICC Average measures	95% Confidence Intervals Lower bound	Upper bound
1st test-stimulus	0.705	0.436	0.858	0.827	0.607	0.924
2nd test-stimulus	0.672	0.384	0.841	0.804	0.554	0.913
3rd test-stimulus	0.864	0.715	0.938	0.927	0.834	0.968
4th test-stimulus	0.873	0.728	0.943	0.932	0.843	0.971
Average of 2-4th	0.852	0.693	0.932	0.920	0.818	0.965

Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICC) and 95% confidence intervals of the four stimuli (1-4th) as well as for the average of the three conditioned (2-4th) stimuli in the two Pain-only sessions (Pain-I, Pain-II).

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Overview over the study and protocol. At baseline CPM, self-perceived stress and Pain Catastrophizing Scale was measured (first column). The sessions without Stroop (Pain-I and Pain-II) were identical and included four phasic (5 s) test-stimuli on the dominant leg. The last three test-stimuli were conditioned with a tonic (210 s) pressure. Before the test-stimuli a break of 1 min was applied. The three Stroop-sessions started with a Stroop test (59 s) followed by one of the following: Mild, non-painful pressure (Stroop-no-pain), painful pressure (Stroop-pain) or painful pressure and a parallel, tonic, stimulus on the non-dominant leg during the last three Stroop and pressure stimuli (Stroop-pain-conditioning). After all sessions self-perceived stress was assessed and after all Stroop-sessions self-perceived attention was assessed.

Figure 2. Mean (± SEM, n = 25) reaction time (**A**) and correct answers (**B**) for congruent numbers (circles) and incongruent numbers (squares) in each of the three experimental sessions (Stroop-no-pain, Stroop-pain, Stroop-pain-conditioning). Significant differences between incongruent numbers and congruent numbers are illustrated (*, p < 0.0005).

Figure 3. Scatter-plot of VAS-scores of test-stimuli in the Pain-I and Pain-II sessions.

Figure 4. Mean (+SEM) pain VAS scores for the 1st and 2-4th test-stimuli, respectively are shown for each of the three sessions ($Pain_{avg}$, Stroop-pain and Stroop-pain-conditioning) and for CPM-non-responders and CPM-responders. VAS scores were higher during $Pain_{avg}$ compared to the Stroop-pain-sessions (*, Bon: P ≤ 0.05) and during the 2-4th test-stimuli compared with the 1st test stimulus for CPM-non-responders (#, Bon: p < 0.0005).

Figure 5. Mean (±SEM) difference in VAS-scores (ΔVAS) between the three sessions for CPM-non-responders and CPM-responders during the 1st test-stimulus (A) and the 2-4th test-stimuli (B). The 'Stroop-Conditioning-effect' was lower than 'Stroop effect' (*, Bon: p = 0.02).

Fig 1

	Baseline CPM	Pain-I / Pain-II	Stroop-no-pain	Stroop-pain	Stroop-pain conditioning
Stimulus timing and duration		5.0 s / 210 s	59 s		
Stimulus intensity	1 kPa/s / 70% PTT	100% PTT / 70% PTT	90% PDT	100% PTT	100% PTT / 70% PTT
Questionnaires	Stress (NRS) / Pain Catastrophizing	Stress (NRS)	Stress (NRS) / Attention (NRS)	Stress (NRS) / Attention (NRS)	Stress (NRS) / Attention (NRS)

Fig 2

Fig 3

Fig 4

Fig 5