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Abstract

Chronic postoperative pain following total knee replacement (TKR) in knee osteoarthritis (KOA) implies clinical challenges. Widespread hyperalgesia, facilitated temporal summation of pain (TSP), and impaired conditioning pain modulation (CPM) have been found in painful KOA. This exploratory study investigated postoperative pain relief 12 months after TKR in 4 sub-groups of patients preoperatively profiled by mechanistic quantitative sensory testing. In 103 KOA patients pressure detection and tolerance thresholds (PDT, PTT) were assessed at the lower leg using cuff algometry. TSP was measured as an increase in pain intensity scores during 10 repeated (2 seconds intervals) painful cuff stimuli. CPM was calculated as the relative increase in PDT during painful conditioning stimulation. The grand averages of TSP and CPM were calculated and values below or above were used for sub-grouping. Facilitated TSP/impaired CPM (Group-A, N=16), facilitated TSP/normal CPM (Group-B, N=15), normal TSP/impaired CPM (Group-C, N=44), and normal TSP/normal CPM (Group-D, N=28). Clinical VAS pain intensity score were collected before and 12 months after TKR-surgery and the pain relief calculated. Less pain relief was found in Group A (52.0±14.0% pain relief) compared with Group B (81.1±3.5%, P=0.023) and Group C (79.6±4.4%, P=0.007), but not Group D (69.4±7.9%, P=0.087). Low preoperative PDT was associated with a less postoperative pain relief (R=-0.222, P=0.034) whereas TSP or CPM alone showed no associations with postoperative pain relief.

This exploratory study indicated that OA patients with facilitated TSP together with impaired CPM are more vulnerable to experience less pain relief after TKR.
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1. Introduction

Patients with osteoarthritis (OA) may eventually suffer from chronic pain leading to disabilities of the individual and associated costs for public health care systems [20]. OA is the most frequent painful musculoskeletal condition in the elderly population [26]. The end-stage treatment of knee OA (KOA) is total knee replacement (TKR) of which approximately 500,000 are performed in the US every year, and this number is estimated to increase sevenfold by 2030 [41]. Evidence suggests that around 20% of KOA patients will develop chronic postoperative pain after TKR [7,29].

Quantitative sensory testing (QST) is widely used to characterise the underlying mechanisms of KOA pain [3,4,13,30]. KOA patients have decreased pressure pain thresholds (PPTs) around the knee and at extra-segmental sites compared with healthy controls [3,4,13] known as local and widespread hyperalgesia [14]. Patients with chronic e.g. OA [3,4,13], fibromyalgia [15], or low back pain [19] show facilitated pain responses to repeated painful stimulation (temporal summation of pain: TSP) compared with controls. This indicates that the central integrative mechanisms are facilitated potentially due to sensitization processes. A measure for the status of the descending pain control system is conditioned pain modulation (CPM) [5] which is impaired in patients with, e.g. KOA [3,4,13], fibromyalgia [21,23], chronic tension-type headache [36], or chronic pancreatitis [27].

Cuff algometry is widely used for assessment of the deep somatic tissue pain sensitivity [26] in addition to single-point algometry which stimulates more localized superficial somatic structures [12]. Computer controlled cuff algometry has previously been used to assess PPT, TSP, and CPM [4,13,33,40] and offers the advantage of being user independent [33] and has a good test-retest reliability [16].
Accumulated findings suggest that preoperative pain and sensitization play a role in the development of chronic postoperative pain. Impaired CPM before thoracotomy [49] and abdominal [47] surgery has shown to be predictive for the risk of developing chronic postoperative pain. Recently, it was demonstrated that patients who developed severe chronic postoperative pain after TKR had a fourfold increase in preoperative TSP compared with patients who did not develop chronic pain [30]. Another study showed that the degree of widespread hyperalgesia predicted postoperative pain in patients after total hip replacement [48]. Subgrouping KOA patients based on radiographic characterization and pain reveals different sub-groups [10] emphasizing that subgrouping of patients may play a major role in understanding the involvement of different pain mechanisms in KOA and hence possible how vulnerable they are to develop chronic pain after surgery. No studies have investigated the possible value of combined preoperative mechanistic QST parameters (e.g. TSP and CPM) in KOA patients before TKR and the associations to chronic postoperative pain outcomes.

The aims of this exploratory study were (1) preoperative profiling of KOA patients based on spreading hyperalgesia, TSP, and CPM characteristics, (2) to investigate 4 sub-groups of patients preoperatively profiled by mechanistic quantitative sensory testing (TSP, and CPM) and the relation to chronic postoperative pain relief 12 months after TKR, and (3) to investigate the associations between preoperative widespread hyperalgesia and the development of the chronic postoperative pain relief.
2. Methods

2.1 Patients

KOA patients (N=135) scheduled for unilateral TKR from the outpatient clinic at Hospital Vendsyssel, Frederikshavn, Denmark, were invited to join the study. Radiological KOA progression was evaluated using the Kellgren & Lawrence (KL) score [22]. Patients with other diagnosed pain problems (e.g., hip OA, rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia, neuropathic pain), sensory dysfunction, or mental impairment were excluded from the study. The study was approved by The North Denmark Region Committee on Health Research Ethics (N-20120015) and conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration. All patients read and signed an informed consent. This cohort of patients has not previous been included in any other scientific publications.

2.2 Protocol

The peak pain intensity within the last 24 hours (visual analogue scale, VAS), body mass index (BMI), and QST recordings (pressure pain sensitivity, TSP and CPM) were collected before surgery by handheld pressure algomery and cuff algometry. The patients were asked not to take any analgesic medication 24 hours prior to the examination. Moreover, the patients were contacted 12 months after surgery to collect the VAS score of the peak pain intensity within the last 24 hours (VAS). Pain relief was calculated as the percentage difference between pre- and postoperative VAS and used as the main outcome measure.

2.3 Cuff Algometry

Deep-tissue pain sensitivity was evaluated by cuff pressure stimuli using a computer-controlled cuff algometer (NociTech and Aalborg University, Denmark) including a 13-cm wide tourniquet cuff (VBM, Sulz, Germany) and an electronic VAS (Aalborg University, Denmark) for recording of
the pain intensity. The cuff was placed at the level of the head of the gastrocnemius muscle of the leg most affected by KOA. The electronic continuous VAS (sliding resistor) was 10 cm long and sampled at 10 Hz; 0 cm indicated “no pain” and 10 cm indicated “maximum pain”.

**Pressure Detection and Tolerance Threshold**

The pressure was increased by 1 kPa/s and the patient was instructed to rate the pain intensity continuously on the electronic VAS until the tolerance level was reached and, further, the patient was instructed to press a stop button after which the pressure was released immediately. The pressure pain detection threshold (PDT) was defined as the pressure where the VAS score exceeded 2 cm[43] and the pain tolerance threshold (PTT) was defined when the patient pressed the stop button. The measures were repeated three times and the average was used for further analysis.

**Temporal Summation of Pain**

The concept of temporal summation is an increase in the pain ratings during a series of e.g. 10 identical painful stimuli delivered at a rate of e.g. 0.5 Hz. The automatic cuff algometer was used to elicit temporal summation [16].

A total of 10 repeated mechanical pressure stimuli at the average of the PDT and PTT levels were delivered at 0.5 Hz (1 s stimulus duration and 1 s interval between stimuli) to the lower leg. A constant pressure between the individual pressure stimuli of 1 kPa was applied to avoid movement of the cuff. During the 10 repeated stimuli, the patients rated continuously the pain intensity on a 10 cm continuous VAS (sliding resistor) (“0” represented “no pain”, and “10” represented “maximal pain”).
For analysis of TSP, the mean VAS score was calculated in the interval from the first to the end of
the 4\textsuperscript{th} stimulus (VAS-I) and in the interval from the 8\textsuperscript{th} to the end of the 10\textsuperscript{th} stimulus (VAS-II). TSP
was defined as the difference between VAS-I and VAS-II (i.e. VAS-II minus VAS-I) [44].

\textit{Conditioned Pain Modulation}

The concept of CPM is that a tonic painful stimulus (conditioning stimulus) will inhibit pain evoked
simultaneously from another site (test stimulus).

The painful conditioned stimulus was initially set to the level of 60 kPa as this value was found
equivalent to a general pain perception of 5 cm on the VAS in a preliminary assessment. If not
tolerated, the conditioned stimulus was reduced to 30 kPa. Simultaneously, assessment of PDT
was performed using a single chamber cuff on the ipsilateral lower leg (test stimulus). The
conditioned stimulus was terminated right after the PDT was assessed. CPM was defined as the
difference between PDT during and before conditioned pain (i.e. “during” minus “before”).

2.4 Handheld Algometry

A handheld algometer (Somedic AB, Sweden) was used for measuring PPT. A 1-cm\textsuperscript{2} probe was
used and placed perpendicularly to the skin. The pressure was applied at 30 kPa/s until the patient
identified the pressure as pain and pressed a button. The algometry was performed on 7 sites at
the most affected knee with two distant sites at the tibialis anterior muscle (TA, 5 cm distal to the
tibial tuberosity) and at the extensor carpi radialis longus muscle (arm, 5 cm distal to the lateral
epicondyle of humerus). The sites in the peripatellar regions were: 2 cm distal to the inferior
medial edge of patella (Site 1); 2 cm distal to the inferior lateral edge of patella (Site 2): 3 cm
lateral to the midpoint of the lateral edge of patella (Site 3); 2 cm proximal to the superior lateral
edge of patella (Site 4): 2 cm proximal to the superior edge of patella (Site 5); 2 cm proximal to the
superior medial edge of patella (Site 6); 3 cm medial to the midpoint of the medial edge of patella (Site 7). An average of the seven peripatellar PPTs was used for further analysis [3].

2.5 Statistics

To phenotype patients with a high degree of central sensitization, i.e., facilitated TSP and impaired CPM, the patients were arbitrarily divided into four groups based on a mean cut-off splits of preoperative TSP and CPM defined by facilitated TSP and impaired CPM (Group A), facilitated TSP and normal (defined as the average of the group) CPM (Group B), normal TSP and impaired CPM (Group C), and normal TSP and normal CPM (Group D). Later studies should be designed to optimize these cut-off splits. The data are presented as mean and standard error of the mean (SEM) if not otherwise stated. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to compare preoperative parameters and the postoperative pain relief for the four groups. The Fisher post-hoc test was used in case of significant differences. Pearson’s correlation was used for correlation analysis. Linear regression, including significant correlating parameters from the Pearson’s correlations, was used to categorize independent parameters. A previous study showed that cuff measurement in KOA patients is age-dependent, for which reason all analyses were adjusted for age [11]. P<0.05 was considered significant.

3. Results

3.1 Demographics

Of the 135 patients recruited, 32 patients (24%) were lost at the 12 month follow-up where three patients could not be reached, two patients had undergone major surgery within the last month, one patient had developed Alzheimer, and 26 patients did not attend the follow-up despite
several phone calls. In total 103 patients were included in the current analysis. All patients had technically successful TKRs at follow-up.

Four groups were initially suggested based on the arbitrary QST cut-off levels below or above the grand average of TSP (1.55 ± 0.17 cm) and CPM (5.40 ± 1.05 kPa), respectively.

Group A: facilitated TSP and impaired CPM (N=16).

Group B: facilitated TSP and normal CPM (N=15).

Group C: normal TSP and impaired CPM (N=44).

Group D: normal TSP and normal CPM (N=28).

Group B showed higher BMI compared with Group D (ANOVA: F=4.772, P<0.002, Fisher: P=0.020) (Table 1). Otherwise the groups were identical.

3.2 Postoperative Pain Relief

No difference between preoperative VAS scores was found among the four groups (Table 1; ANOVA: F=1.86, P=0.13). Group A had significantly (Table 1; ANOVA: F=2.55, P<0.045) less postoperative pain relief as compared with Group B (Fisher: P=0.023) and C (Fisher: P=0.007) but not with Group D (Fisher: P=0.087).

3.3 Cuff Algometry

**Pressure Pain Detection and Tolerance Thresholds**

Group D showed significantly higher PDT values compared with Group A and Group B (Figure 1; ANOVA: F=3.62, P<0.005, Fisher: P<0.016) and higher PTT values compared with Group A (ANOVA: F=2.86, P<0.028, Fisher: P<0.027).
Temporal Summation of Pain

A significant interaction was found between groups and TSP (ANOVA: F=52.53, P<0.001) showing less TSP in Group B (Fishers, P=0.002), Group C (Fishers, P<0.001) and Group D (Fishers, P<0.001) compared with Group A, and less TSP in Group C (Fishers, P<0.001) and Group D (Fishers, P<0.001) compared with Group B (Figure 1). TSP alone did not predict postoperative pain relief.

Conditioned Pain Modulation

Group A and Group C showed significantly impaired CPM compared with Group B and Group D (ANOVA: F=25.6, P<0.001, Fisher: P<0.001), but no significant difference was found between the groups with facilitated and normal TSP (i.e., Group A and Group C or Group B and Group D) (Figure 1). CPM alone did not predict postoperative pain relief.

3.4 Handheld Pressure Algometry

No significant difference in PPTs was found between the groups in the peripatellar area (Figure 2; ANOVA: F=0.59, P=0.67), TA (ANOVA: F=1.41, P=0.24), or on the arm (ANOVA: F=0.49, P=0.75). PPTs alone did not predict postoperative pain relief.

3.5 Correlations

A positive correlation was found between postoperative pain relief and preoperative pain (R=0.241, P=0.009). A significant negative correlation was found between postoperative pain relief and preoperative PDT (R=-0.216, P=0.021). A linear stepwise regression analysis, including preoperative VAS and PDT (Table 2), was performed to investigate the possible prediction of postoperative pain relief. The analysis showed that PDT was an independent parameter (R=-0.222, P=0.034) and a trend towards an independent parameter was found for preoperative pain.
(R=0.263, P=0.080). As such PDT, independently of preoperative pain, could predict postoperative pain relief.

No significant correlations between the postoperative pain relief and the preoperative TSP, CPM, or handheld algometry, respectively, were found.

4. Discussion
This preliminary study showed that preoperative subgrouping of KOA patients based on TSP and CPM can identify vulnerable groups experiencing less postoperative pain relief 12 months after TKR. Reduced preoperative pressure pain detection thresholds at the lower leg were as a single parameter associated with pain relief 12 months after TKR.

4.1 Preoperative Pain Biomarkers and associations for Postoperative Pain Relief
Sensitization in OA is often characterized by widespread hyperalgesia, impaired descending pain control, and increased facilitation of temporal summation [6,25,42]. As in the present study preoperative widespread hyperalgesia has been shown to predict postoperative pain outcome after total hip replacement [48]. Yarnitsky et al. [49] suggested that impaired CPM was associated with a higher risk of chronic pain after thoracotomy and Wilder-Smith et al. [47] showed similar results in patients after abdominal surgery. Preoperatively facilitated TSP has been shown to predict chronic postoperative pain after abdominal surgery [46] and, recently also after TKR [30].

An increasing number of studies suggest that subgrouping of KOA patients based on clinical and experimental pain assessment parameters can reveal groups of specifically sensitized patients [2,3,10] which could be the patients more vulnerable to experience less pain relief after TKR. The present study confirmed this suggestion and found that subgrouping KOA patients based on preoperatively facilitated TSP and impaired CPM revealed a sub-group of KOA patients with the
least pain relief after TKR. This group had less postoperative pain relief as compared with patients showing either showing 1) facilitated TSP but normal CPM or 2) impaired CPM but normal TSP.

This indicates that a preoperative multimodal pain mechanistic QST approach is important for predicting the chronic postoperative pain outcome. Drugs designed to block the N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptors have shown to reduce TSP [34,45], and drugs promoting the re-uptake of serotonin and norepinephrine have shown to strengthen CPM [32] suggesting that such drugs in combination may be used for selected vulnerable KOA patients before TKR, but future randomized control trials are needed to confirm the hypothesis of such a targeted individualized treatment regime.

It is well known that pain in KOA varies throughout the day (e.g. during walking, while climbing stairs, or when the patient is at rest)[4,29]. To avoid misinterpretation of an e.g. lower current pain while the patients were examined in the laboratory, the peak pain intensity within the last 24 hours is, as in the present study, often applied to assess the knee OA pain [2-4,30,31,35,37,38]. Pain ratings during rest, during the last 24 hours, or during the last 8 days are strongly correlated in patients with hip and knee OA [28].

The present was not designed to predict if patients developed chronic postoperative pain or not and hence the sub-grouping of patients were not optimized for this purpose. However the combination of mechanistic QST parameters for assessing central pain processing may be indicative of possibly biologically important contributions for the postoperative outcome. In case of specific sensitive patients (group A) red flags should be raised prior to surgery to indicate that a given patient could be more vulnerable for developing less postoperative pain relief.
4.2 Temporal Summation of Pain and Conditioned Pain Modulation

Previous studies have shown that patients with KOA have enhanced temporal summation compared with healthy controls [4] and that patients with pain after revision TKR have continued enhanced temporal summation as compared with patients without pain [39]. Preoperative temporal summation has been associated with postoperative chronic pain after TKR [30]. The current study defined two groups with facilitated preoperative TSP, and the group with the most facilitated TSP showed the least pain relief after TKR surgery. Patients with KOA have shown a less efficient CPM system compared with healthy controls [4] but the CPM normalises after pain free recovery after TKR surgery [13]. Dysfunctional preoperative CPM has been suggested to have a predictive value for which patients may develop chronic postoperative pain [47,49], for which reason the current study focused on combining these two apparently important pain mechanisms.

It should be stated that neither TSP nor CPM individually as parameters could be associated with postoperative outcomes. The present preliminary study arbitrarily selected cut-off levels of the different QST parameters used for sub-grouping patients and further studies should investigate if these cut-off levels could be further optimised and hence increase the ability to predict postoperative outcomes.

Cuff algometry has previously been widely used to study pain mechanisms in KOA, such as pressure pain thresholds, TSP, and CPM [13,39,40], and offers the advantage of being user-independent [33]. Pain sensitivity has been shown to be related with age for which reason the analysis in the present study was adjusted for age [11]. In addition, studies have shown that increased BMI is associated with increased inflammation [24] and increased inflammation is associated sensitization of the peripheral nociceptors [1], why BMI is important to adjust for in the statistical analysis as done in the present study.
4.3 Widespread Hyperalgesia

Cuff assessment performed on the lower part of the leg in KOA is suggested a proxy for widespread hyperalgesia. The current study showed that KOA patients with preoperatively facilitated TSP and impaired CPM and patients with facilitated TSP had a decreased pressure detection threshold measured by cuff algometry compared with the other groups. Patients with normal CPM combined with normal TSP (normal defined as the grand average in the present population) did not show widespread hyperalgesia compared with the other groups which may suggest that facilitated TSP and widespread hyperalgesia somehow reflect the same pain mechanisms.

Preoperative widespread hyperalgesia measured by handheld pressure algometry has been shown in KOA patients compared with healthy controls [4,8,9,13,17,18,30]. A recent study found that preoperative widespread hyperalgesia measured by pressure algometry did not, as a single parameter, predict postoperative pain after total knee replacement [48]. The present study did confirm that preoperative widespread hyperalgesia as assessed by handheld algometry is not capable of predicting the postoperative pain relief after TKR.

In addition, this study illustrated that widespread hyperalgesia measured by cuff and handheld algometry yielded different sensory profiles which had different predictive values for postoperative KOA patients and hence argue for the value of multi-modal, mechanism based sensory testing.

4.4 Limitations

This study presented a 24% dropout at follow-up limiting the study results by the low sample size of the groups, but these patients are most likely the patients with no pain. This lowers the
sensitivity of the current study, and the findings should be replicated in large studies before the clinical implications can be concluded. The study was designed as an explorative study and as such no firm statistical plan was formulated *à priori* which further highlight the preliminary nature at the study. The findings should therefore be replicated in future studies before the findings can be suggested as indicative for diagnosis and treatment of patients before TKR.

The groups were initially established based on arbitrary selected cut-off limits of the mechanistic QST parameters which should be optimised to enhance the sensitivity of the sub-grouping. The current study did not include a healthy control group, and therefore, the terms “normal” TSP and “normal” CPM is used in contrast to “facilitated” TSP and “impaired” CPM.

The present preliminary study can be indicative of how possibly biologically important sensitization processes may contribute to the continued postoperative pain problems in KOA patients and hence provide clinically important pre-operative indications for specifically vulnerable patients.

The clinical outcome parameter in the present study was based on the peak pain intensity in the last 24 hours as this has been shown as a reliable clinical parameter in characterizing KOA pain. If this is the most sensitive parameter to be associated with mechanistic QST parameters is not known and should be further investigated.

This study was conducted in a single hospital and a multi-centre study should confirm the findings of this study. In addition, the patients were end-stage KOA patients and the criteria for eligibility for surgery may vary from country to country.
5. Conclusions

KOA patients with preoperatively facilitated TSP and impaired CPM constitute a group of vulnerable patients who experience less postoperative pain relief 12 months after TKR as compared with patients with either only facilitated TSP or impaired CPM alone. Widespread hyperalgesia assessed by cuff algometry may be a predictive preoperative mechanistic QST parameter for the postoperative pain relief after TKR.
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Figure Legends

Figure 1. A: Mean (±SEM) preoperative pressure detection thresholds (PDTs, red bars, [kPa]), pressure pain tolerance thresholds (PTTs, yellow bars, [kPa]), conditioned pain modulation (CPM, green bars, [kPa]) and temporal summation of pain (TSP, blue bars, [VAS]) were measured using cuff algometry at the lower leg. Groups are defined by: facilitated TSP and impaired CPM (Group A, N=16), facilitated TSP and normal CPM (Group B, N=15), normal TSP and impaired CPM (Group C, N=44), and normal TSP and normal CPM (Group D, N=28). B: Mean (±SEM) pain relief from the four groups after total knee replacement. * indicates significant difference (P<0.05) compared with group A, and # indicates significant difference (P<0.05) compared with group B.

Figure 2. Mean (±SEM) preoperative pressure pain thresholds (PPTs) measured using handheld pressure algometry at the peripatellar area (knee), the tibialis anterior muscle (TA), and the extensor carpi radialis longus muscle (Arm). No significant differences were found between groups.
Summary
Knee osteoarthritis patients with low conditioned pain modulation and high temporal summation have more pain 12 months after total knee replacement surgery.
Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the subgrouped KOA patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N) of patients</td>
<td>N=16</td>
<td>N=15</td>
<td>N=44</td>
<td>N=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoperative pain VAS scores (cm, mean ± SEM)</td>
<td>6.6 ± 0.5</td>
<td>6.8 ± 0.5</td>
<td>6.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td>5.9 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m², mean ± SEM)</td>
<td>28.5 ± 1.2</td>
<td>32.2 ± 1.7</td>
<td>30.4 ± 0.8</td>
<td>28.6 ± 1.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years, mean ± SEM)</td>
<td>73.2 ± 2.1</td>
<td>69.6 ± 2.2</td>
<td>66.8 ± 1.7</td>
<td>67.0 ± 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (% female)</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL (mean (range))</td>
<td>3.7 (2-4)</td>
<td>3.9 (1-4)</td>
<td>3.7 (3-4)</td>
<td>3.8 (3-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain relief (% VAS reduction, mean ± SEM)</td>
<td>52.0 ± 14.0</td>
<td>81.1 ± 3.5*</td>
<td>79.6 ± 4.4*</td>
<td>69.4 ± 7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMI: Body Mass Index. KL: Kellgren & Lawrence radiological scores. Significant difference compared with Group B (*, ANOVA: P = 0.020) or Group A (#; ANOVA: P < 0.023).
**Table 2.** The crude coefficient shows the result from the univariate logistic regression analysis between the postoperative pain relief and the preoperative pain and pressure detection threshold (PDT) measured by cuff algometry. The adjusted coefficient shows the results from the multivariate stepwise logistic regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crude coefficient</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Adjusted coefficient</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preoperative pain</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>