



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Corticomotor excitability reduction induced by experimental pain remains unaffected by performing a working memory task as compared to staying at rest

Larsen, Dennis B; Graven-Nielsen, Thomas; Hirata, Rogerio P; Seminowicz, David; Schabrun, Siobhan; Boudreau, Shellie A

Published in:
Experimental Brain Research

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
[10.1007/s00221-019-05587-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-019-05587-y)

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Larsen, D. B., Graven-Nielsen, T., Hirata, R. P., Seminowicz, D., Schabrun, S., & Boudreau, S. A. (2019). Corticomotor excitability reduction induced by experimental pain remains unaffected by performing a working memory task as compared to staying at rest. *Experimental Brain Research*, 237(9), 2205-2215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-019-05587-y>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- ? Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- ? You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- ? You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



[Click here to view linked References](#)

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Corticomotor excitability reduction induced by experimental pain remains unaffected by**
7 **performing a working memory task as compared to staying at rest**
8

9 Dennis B. Larsen¹, Thomas Graven-Nielsen¹, Rogerio P. Hirata²,
10 David Seminowicz³, Siobhan Schabrun⁴, Shellie A. Boudreau^{1*}
11
12
13

14 ¹ Center for Neuroplasticity and Pain (CNAP), SMI, Aalborg University, Aalborg

15 ² SMI, Aalborg University, Aalborg

16 ³ Department of Neural and Pain Sciences, University of Maryland, School of Dentistry,
17 Baltimore, MD, 20201

18 ⁴ Neuroscience Research Australia, Randwick, NSW, Australia
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Original publication for Experimental Brain Research**
26
27

28
29 **Acknowledgments**
30

31 Center for Neuroplasticity and Pain (CNAP) is supported by the Danish National Research
32 Foundation (DNRF121). SMS receives salary support from The National Health and Medical
33 Research Council of Australia (#1105040).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *** Corresponding Author:**
46

47 Shellie A. Boudreau, PhD

48 Center for Neuroplasticity and Pain (CNAP)

49 SMI, Department of Health Science and Technology

50 Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg University

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

52 Phone: +45 9940 9829

53 E-mail: sboudreau@hst.aau.dk
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63

1
2
3
4
5 **ABSTRACT**
6

7 Experimental pain inhibits primary motor cortex (M1) excitability. Attenuating pain-related
8 inhibition of M1 excitability may be useful during rehabilitation in individuals with pain. One
9 strategy to attenuate M1 excitability is to influence prefrontal and premotor cortex activity.
10 Working memory tasks, e.g. the two-back task (TBT), engage prefrontal and premotor cortices
11 and may influence M1 excitability. We hypothesized that performing the TBT during pain would
12 influence pain-related changes in M1 excitability. Participants (n=28) received rigorous training
13 in the TBT before baseline testing. Experimental pain was induced by injecting hypertonic saline
14 into the first dorsal interosseous (FDI) muscle. Participants rated pain intensity on a 0-10
15 numerical rating scale (NRS) every second min until pain-resolved (PR) during the performance
16 of the TBT (n=14) or during REST (n=14). In the TBT, letters were presented pseudo-randomly
17 and accuracy and reaction time to identified letters corresponding to letters shown two times back
18 were recorded. M1 excitability was assessed using transcranial magnetic stimulation. Motor-
19 evoked potentials (MEPs) were recorded at baseline and at PR, PR+10, PR+20, and PR+30
20 minutes. Four minutes after hypertonic saline injection the pain NRS scores were higher in the
21 TBT group than the REST group ($p=0.009$). No Time \times Group interaction was found for MEPs
22 ($p=0.73$), but a main-effect of time ($p<0.0005$) revealed a reduction of MEPs at PR up until
23 PR+30 ($p<0.008$). The TBT accuracy improved at PR+30 in both groups ($p=0.019$). In
24 conclusion, the pain-induced reduction in corticomotor excitability was unaffected by performing
25 a working memory task, despite greater pain in the TBT group.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Keywords:** Pain neuroplasticity, transcranial magnetic stimulation, pain perception, attention,
44 motor evoked potentials
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

INTRODUCTION

Musculoskeletal pain remains in the top ten most debilitating conditions worldwide (Vos et al. 2016). It is well-established that functional alterations occur in the central nervous system in the presence of musculoskeletal pain. For example, functional alterations can involve changes in the size of muscle representations in the primary motor cortex (M1) when the muscle is in pain (Tsao et al. 2011; Schabrun et al. 2015b, 2017a). Furthermore, there is strong evidence that experimental skin pain (Valeriani et al. 1999, 2001; Farina et al. 2001; Svensson et al. 2003) and intramuscular pain (Le Pera et al. 2001; Schabrun et al. 2017b; Larsen et al. 2018) exert a robust reduction in corticomotor excitability, as assessed by transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) motor-evoked potentials (MEPs) (Burns et al. 2016). The reduction in corticomotor excitability continues for up to 25 mins after perception of pain disappears (Le Pera et al. 2001; Schabrun et al. 2015a). The functional impact on e.g. motor function by reversing this reduction in corticomotor excitability during pain is currently unknown.

The experience of pain may persist after an injury to the musculoskeletal system, and be maintained by maladaptive cortical neuroplasticity (Graven-Nielsen and Arendt-Nielsen 2010). Currently, non-invasive approaches to modulate cortical excitability are limited however changes in corticomotor excitability occur during acquisition of novel skills, and re-acquisition of motor skills following injury (Gallasch et al. 2009), or through repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) to the M1 or the premotor cortex (PMC) (Rizzo et al. 2004; Rothkegel et al. 2010). For instance, ballistic motor practice of the hand, induces a rapid increase in flexor pollicis brevis excitability (Muellbacher et al. 2001). However, the interaction between corticomotor excitability reduction induced by pain and learning of discrete motor skills is controversial. Some studies have demonstrated that motor skill acquisition remains unaffected in the presence of pain (Bouffard et al. 2014; Lamothe et al. 2014), albeit different motor strategies may be involved (Mavromatis et al. 2017), while others show a reduction in the gains in corticomotor excitability that would otherwise occur during motor skill acquisition (Boudreau et al. 2007). Simple repetitive movements performed after experimental muscle pain did not attenuate the pain-induced reduction in corticomotor excitability (Schabrun et al. 2017b). This is surprising given that prior studies report that repeated volitional movements increase corticomotor excitability (Muellbacher et al. 2001; Carroll et al. 2008; Gallasch et al. 2009).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

This study explores an alternative approach to modulate pain-induced corticomotor excitability reduction through PMC activation. The presence of a neuroanatomical pathway linking the PMC to the M1 provides a means to influence corticomotor excitability through reciprocal connections (Tokuno and Tanji 1993; Takada et al. 1998). In humans, corticomotor excitability can be modulated by PMC stimulation, by applying TMS conditioning stimuli anterior to the M1 (Civardi et al. 2001). Further, inhibiting the PMC with low-frequency rTMS or continuous theta burst stimulation suppresses first dorsal interosseous (FDI) muscle MEPs (Gerschlager et al. 2001; Münchau et al. 2002; Huang et al. 2009). In addition, functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies show strong bilateral activity of the PMC when performing working memory tasks, such as the N-back task (Owen et al. 2005).

Therefore, this study aimed to investigate if performing a working memory task during experimental pain influences the magnitude and duration of corticomotor excitability reduction. It was hypothesized that performing the two-back task during pain would (1) attenuate corticomotor excitability reduction immediately after perceived pain disappeared, and (2) reduce the duration of the corticomotor excitability reduction.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Participants

Twenty-eight right-handed, pain-free participants (mean age \pm SD: 22.1 \pm 2.1 years; 15 women) with no history of musculoskeletal or neurological conditions were included. Participants were excluded based on the following criteria: pregnancy; regular use of analgesics; analgesics or alcohol consumption within the last 24 h; drug use/abuse; use of antidepressants, neuroleptics and anticonvulsants; any recent history of pain (acute or chronic) affecting the upper limbs or torso. Prior to participation, all participants were screened using the TMS screening questionnaire (Rossi et al. 2009, 2011) to avoid contraindicative delivery of magnetic pulses. All participants were right-handed as assessed by the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory (Mean laterality quotient \pm SD: 0.76 \pm 0.21) (Oldfield 1971). Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study. The study was approved by the local ethics committee (VN-20170006) and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Experimental design

Each participant participated in one session and was randomized into either a two-back task (TBT) group or a rest (REST) group (Fig. 1). Initially, participants were asked to fill out questionnaires including the pain catastrophizing scale (PCS) (Sullivan et al. 1995) and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI/S-T) (Spielbeger 1983). They were then seated comfortably in a chair with their right arm resting on a pillow. Elbow flexion was kept at approximately 45° angle flexion. A computer screen was placed immediately in front of them (mid-point of screen at 90 cm distance away from nasion of the participant). All participants underwent a familiarization round consisting of 40 trials (one letter presented = one trial, duration: 3 mins) to reach ~80% accuracy in all trials. This was done to ensure that the participants focused on the online monitoring and updating of working memory (Owen et al. 2005) while performing the TBT. After the familiarization round, a baseline assessment was performed of the TBT, in which three rounds of 30 trials (6 min) were performed. Subsequently, baseline measures of TMS MEPs were recorded. Experimental pain was induced in the right FDI muscle by injection of hypertonic saline. Pain intensity ratings were recorded every two mins from 30 s to 10 mins after injection, then every minute until pain-resolve (i.e. first pain rating of 0; PR). The TBT group performed the TBT for 10 mins (five rounds of 30 trials) starting immediately after the first pain rating and then one round until next pain rating etc. Conversely, the REST group remained at rest between pain ratings for 10 mins. After hypertonic saline injection, pain intensity was recorded every other minute (every minute after the first 10 mins of rating). At PR, TMS MEPs were recorded again. The mind-wandering scale and effort ratings were recorded immediately after recording MEPs at PR. In both groups, a 10 mins break was kept after PR and MEPs were recorded again. This was repeated at 20 and 30 min after PR after which the TBT was re-assessed in both groups (3 rounds of 30 trials). McGill's Pain Questionnaire was completed at the end of the experiment.

Two-back task

During the TBT participants were presented with 30 English letters (equal 1 round) including all consonants. The letters were presented on the screen for 3 s, with interstimulus intervals of 500 ms (Vermeij et al. 2012). The participants used their left hand to press a key (i.e. using the numeric keypad 1) whenever the presented letter corresponded to the letter shown two times back

1
2
3
4
5 (target), or (numeric keypad 2) when it did not match (non-target). Therefore, each letter
6 presented would be accompanied by a button pressed and reaction time and accuracy (i.e. correct
7 or incorrect keypad pressing) were recorded. For each round, 20 non-targets and 10 targets were
8 presented in a random order. Reaction time reflects the time from letter presentation on the
9 screen, to the key press, whereas accuracy is whether the correct button was pressed. The left
10 hand was chosen to avoid on-going ipsilateral motor activity (associated with keypad pressing) of
11 the left M1 affected by pain, which could potentially interfere with the reduction of corticomotor
12 excitability.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Questionnaires*

23 To ensure that the pain reporting was not influenced by cognitive factors such as pain
24 catastrophizing (Turner and Aaron 2001), state and trait anxiety (Tang and Gibson 2005), and
25 mind-wandering (Kucyi et al. 2013), the PCS, STAI, and mind-wandering scale were recorded
26 for each participant. The 13 items of the PCS are categorized into “Rumination” (sum of items 8-
27 11), “Magnification” (sum of items 6, 7, and 13), and “Helplessness” (sum of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,
28 and 12) (Sullivan et al. 1995). For each statement, the participants reported the degree to which
29 the sentence corresponded to their own thoughts and feelings when experiencing pain (*not at all,*
30 *to a slight degree, to a moderate degree, to a great degree, and to a large degree*). The anxiety
31 score was determined by the STAI (Spielbegeer 1983) consisting of 40 questions, half of which
32 are related to state anxiety, and the other half to trait anxiety. Each statement was rated on a 0-3
33 scale with anchors ‘*Almost never*’ to ‘*Almost always*’. The mind-wandering scale was adopted
34 from Kucyi et al. (Kucyi et al. 2013), and consisted of four questions designed to determine the
35 level of mind-wandering occurring during the TBT performance or during rest. Participants were
36 asked “*How confident are you that you can accurately assess whether your attention was focused*
37 *on the task/staying at rest, or on something other than the task/staying at rest; To what degree*
38 *was your attention on one of the following when not on the task/staying at rest, (1)*
39 *external/sensory distractions, (2) task-related interferences, and (3) mind-wandering*”. Each
40 question was rated on a 0-7 Likert scale ranging from 1 (not confident at all/never) to 7
41 (extremely confident/always). In addition, the participants were asked for the level of effort they
42 had to put into the task (TBT) or to staying at rest (REST) during pain (1, no effort; 7, maximum
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 effort). To characterize the experimental pain condition, the short-form McGill Pain
6 Questionnaire-2 (MPQ) was completed at the end of the experiment (Dworkin et al. 2009). The
7 most commonly used words to describe the experimental pain were extracted.
8
9

10 11 12 *Recording motor-evoked potentials*

13
14 All TMS methods will be described in accordance with guidelines on reporting TMS
15 methodology (Chipchase et al. 2012). A focal figure-of-eight coil (D70², Magstim Company,
16 UK) was used to deliver monophasic TMS pulses supplied by a magnetic stimulator (Magstim
17 BiStim², Magstim Company, UK). The coil handle was pointing backwards, laterally and at a 45°
18 angle to the sagittal plane, inducing a posterior-anterior directed current, to elicit TMS MEPs
19 from the FDI muscle. An inter-stimulus interval of 6 s was used for all stimulations. The
20 participants were fitted with a swimming cap and the optimal scalp position was marked on a pre-
21 defined grid (1 × 1 cm squares orientated to vertex) to standardize orientation and location. The
22 optimal scalp position (hotspot) for the FDI muscle was determined using 50% maximum
23 stimulator output and defined as the site yielding consistent and highest peak-to-peak amplitude
24 MEPs in three trials. The intensity needed to evoke MEPs of ~1 mV was tested by increasing and
25 decreasing stimulus intensity until ~1 mV was consistently evoked in the FDI muscle (in 10
26 trials). This stimulation intensity was employed for the remaining of the experiment. For each
27 assessment, fifteen MEPs were recorded from the right FDI muscle.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Surface electromyography (EMG) was recorded from the muscle belly of the FDI muscle
41 using bipolar Ag/AgCl electrodes (Neuroline 720, Ambu® A/S, DK). Electrodes were placed
42 with an approximate 20 mm interelectrode distance with the reference electrode located at the
43 styloid process. The EMG data were pre-amplified (1000x gain), analogue band-pass filtered (5
44 Hz-1 kHz) and sampled at 4 kHz by a 16-bit data-acquisition card (National Instruments,
45 NI6122). Peak-to-peak MEPs were shown on-line by custom-made LabView software (Mr. Kick
46 III, Aalborg University). Peak-to-peak amplitude was extracted for each MEP and averaged
47 across the 15 recorded MEPs at each time point for further analysis.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 *Experimental muscle pain*

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 The sites of injections were determined by palpation of the contracted FDI muscle, and the skin
6 was cleaned with alcohol. A bolus injection of sterile hypertonic saline (0.2 mL, 5.8% NaCl) was
7 administered into the FDI muscle using a 1 mL syringe with a disposable needle (27G) (Le Pera
8 et al. 2001; Larsen et al. 2018). The right FDI was chosen due to the body of evidence already
9 available on the effect of pain on FDI M1 excitability (Le Pera et al. 2001; Schabrun et al. 2013;
10 Larsen et al. 2018, 2019). Hypertonic saline excites group III/IV muscle afferents (Cairns et al.
11 2006) and an earlier study demonstrated that hypertonic saline injection temporally reduces
12 primary somatosensory cortex (S1) excitability before M1 excitability (Schabrun et al. 2013). To
13 assess the intensity of saline-induced pain, participants were asked verbally to rate the pain
14 intensity on a 0-10 numerical rating scale (NRS), with '0' representing 'no pain' and '10'
15 representing 'worst imaginable pain'.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Statistical analysis*

28
29 Data are presented as mean \pm standard error of the mean (SEM) unless otherwise stated. Normal
30 distribution was tested using Shapiro-Wilk's test for normality. Participant demographics were
31 compared between groups using independent samples *t*-tests (age, handedness, and threshold_{1mV})
32 and chi-square test (gender ratio). The PCS, STAI-S/T, MPQ, and mind-wandering scale data
33 were analyzed using Mann-Whitney *U* tests. The MEPs were tested in a two-way mixed-model
34 analysis of variance (ANOVA) with group (TBT or REST) as between-groups factor and time
35 (baseline, PR, PR+10 min, PR+20 min, and PR+30 min) as within-subjects factor. NRS scores
36 were analyzed with a two-way mixed-model ANOVA with group (TBT or REST) as between-
37 groups factor and time (30 s after injection and 2-17 mins) as within-subjects factor. The TBT
38 performance data were analyzed by two separate repeated measures multivariate ANOVAs (one
39 for targets and one for non-targets; MANOVA), with two dependent variables (accuracy and
40 reaction time), one within-group factor (baseline versus PR+30), and one between-group factor
41 (TBT versus REST). The MANOVAs for target and non-target were corrected by familywise
42 error rate correction (0.05/2=0.025). Note that the TBT performance data obtained during pain is
43 not included in these analyses, since the REST group did not perform the TBT during pain.
44 Spearman ranked correlation analyses were performed to test whether there were associations
45 between the pain intensity NRS rating and percentage MEP reduction at peak-pain for both the
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 REST and the TBT group. Sidak correction was applied where appropriate. All analyses were
6 carried out in Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS; version 25, IBM). A p -value < 0.05
7 was considered significant.
8
9

10 11 12 **RESULTS**

13 *Participants and TMS parameters*

14
15 The two groups did not differ in age (22.7 ± 0.6 years vs. 22.9 ± 0.6 years, $t(26) = -0.18$, $p =$
16 0.86), handedness (laterality quotient, TBT group: 0.76 ± 0.06 vs. REST group: 0.75 ± 0.05 , $t(26)$
17 $= 0.09$, $p = 0.93$), or gender ratio (9/14 women in TBT group vs. 6/14 in REST group, $\chi^2(1) =$
18 1.29 , $p = 0.26$). The stimulator output intensity needed to produce MEPs of ~ 1 mV amplitude
19 was $55.3 \pm 14.3\%$ in the TBT group which was not statistically different from the $57.5 \pm 11.7\%$
20 in the REST group ($t(26) = -0.43$, $p = 0.67$).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Pain catastrophizing and anxiety questionnaires*

29
30 The median PCS score for the TBT group was 16.5 (interquartile range (IQR) = 22.75) and 13.5
31 (IQR = 8.5) for the REST group, which did not differ significantly, $U = 92.5$, $n_1 = n_2 = 14$, $z = -$
32 0.25 , $p = 0.8$. Similarly, there were no differences between groups for ‘*Rumination*’ scores (TBT
33 versus REST: 6 (IQR = 9.75) vs. 5 (IQR = 4.5), $U = 91$, $n_1 = n_2 = 14$, $z = -0.32$, $p = 0.75$),
34 ‘*Magnification*’ (3 (IQR = 6) vs. 3.5 (IQR = 4.5), $U = 92$, $n_1 = n_2 = 14$, $z = -0.28$, $p = 0.78$), or
35 ‘*Helplessness*’ (4.5 (IQR = 8.5) vs. 6 (IQR = 5.25), $U = 89.5$, $n_1 = n_2 = 14$, $z = -0.39$, $p = 0.69$).
36 Similarly, no significant differences between groups were found for the STAI-S (TBT versus
37 REST: 31.5 (IQR = 10.5) vs. 36 (IQR = 9); $U = 71.5$, $n_1 = n_2 = 14$, $z = -1.2$, $p = 0.22$) or STAI-T
38 (40.5 (IQR = 16.25) vs. 35 (IQR = 16.5); $U = 86$, $n_1 = n_2 = 14$, $z = -0.6$, $p = 0.6$).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Mind-wandering scale*

49
50 One participant from the REST group had missing data from the mind-wandering scale, and was
51 excluded from the analysis. The groups did not differ in their confidence in assessing their level
52 of attention towards the task/staying at rest (TBT median: 6 versus REST median: 6, $U = 64$, n_1
53 $= 14$, $n_2 = 13$, $z = -1.36$, $p = 0.17$), and did not rate sensory or mind-wandering interference with
54 their attention to either task differently (TBT median: 4 and 3 versus REST median: 4 and 4, both
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

$U > 74$, $n_1 = 14$, $n_2 = 13$, $z > -0.27$, $p > 0.4$). Conversely, the TBT group rated the task-related interferences with their attention to the task higher than the REST group did (TBT median: 2 versus REST median: 0, $U = 0.0$, $n_1 = 14$, $n_2 = 13$, $z = -4.72$, $p < 0.005$). Further, the TBT group rated their effort higher than the REST group, when performing their respective task (i.e. performing the TBT as opposed to staying at rest for the REST group) (TBT median: 5 versus REST median: 2, $U = 26.5$, $n_1 = 14$, $n_2 = 13$, $z = -3.17$, $p = 0.001$).

Pain intensity ratings and profile

A significant two-way interaction was found for the pain intensity NRS scores ($F_{12,338} = 2.3$, $p = 0.008$, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.08$). The REST group gave NRS scores lower than the TBT group at 4 mins post-injection ($p = 0.009$; Fig. 2). Pain reduced significantly for both groups at 8 and 10 mins compared to immediately after (I.A.) injection, for the group performing the TBT and the REST group, respectively ($p < 0.05$, Fig. 2). For all pairwise comparisons, refer to Figure 2.

The most common words to describe the hypertonic saline-induced pain sensation in both groups were Sharp (82%), Cramping (85.7%), Aching (75%), Heavy (67%), and Numbness (67%).

Corticomotor excitability

The two-way mixed-model ANOVA of MEPs did not yield a significant group \times time interaction ($F_{4,104} = 0.51$, $p = 0.73$, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.19$) or between-group difference ($F_{1,26} = 0.7$, $p = 0.4$, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.03$), but a strong main effect of time ($F_{4,104} = 8.3$, $p < 0.0005$, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.24$). *Post hoc* tests showed that corticomotor excitability of the FDI muscle was reduced at PR ($p = 0.002$) as well as PR+10 min ($p = 0.002$), PR+20 min ($p = 0.008$), and PR+30 min ($p = 0.002$) as compared to baseline (Fig. 3).

Two-back task performance

One and two participants in the TBT and REST group respectively, had missing data during the performance of the TBT. Therefore, their data were omitted during the analysis of the TBT performance (TBT group, $n = 13$; REST group, $n = 12$).

The repeated measures MANOVA did not yield any time \times group interactions for non-target accuracy ($F_{1,20} = 0.21$, $p = 0.65$, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.01$; Fig. 4A) or reaction time ($F_{1,20} = 0.2$, $p =$

1
2
3
4
5 0.66, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.01$; Fig. 4B). Similarly, target accuracy ($F_{1,20} = 0.01$, $p = 0.94$, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} < 0.001$;
6 Fig. 4C) and target reaction time ($F_{1,20} = 0.03$, $p = 0.86$, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.002$; Fig. 4D) did not show
7 any time \times group interactions. A main effect of time was found for target accuracy ($F_{1,20} = 6.55$, p
8 $= 0.019$, $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.25$), indicating an increase in accuracy between baseline and PR+30 (Fig.
9 4C).

16 *Correlation analyses*

17
18 No significant correlations were found for the percentage change in MEP amplitude and peak
19 NRS scores of pain intensity for the REST group ($\rho = -0.15$, $p = 0.6$) or the TBT group ($\rho = -$
20 0.4 , $p = 0.89$).

25 **DISCUSSION**

26
27 There is growing interest to find approaches capable of attenuating the pain-induced reduction in
28 corticomotor excitability, since it may prove useful during musculoskeletal pain rehabilitation
29 (Pelletier et al. 2015). The present findings confirm earlier findings of a robust reduction in FDI
30 corticomotor excitability following experimental muscle pain. The pain-induced reduction in
31 MEPs was unaffected by the TBT performance. The TBT group rated higher pain during the
32 performance of the TBT as compared to the group that remained at rest.

39 *Corticomotor excitability reduction was unaffected by performance of the two-back task*

40
41
42 Contrary to our hypotheses, the pain-induced reduction in corticomotor excitability and the
43 duration of this reduction were unaffected by performing a working memory task during acute
44 experimental pain. As previously reported (Le Pera et al. 2001; Schabrun and Hodges 2012;
45 Larsen et al. 2018), hypertonic saline-induced pain reduced FDI corticomotor excitability, as
46 reflected by MEP amplitudes, even after pain resolve. This reduction in corticomotor excitability
47 is considered to be mediated through an increase in gamma-aminobutyric acid inhibitory and
48 decreased glutamate-mediated facilitatory (N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor acting on
49 glutamatergic interneurons) intracortical mechanisms (Schabrun and Hodges 2012), and may
50 serve as a protective mechanism for avoiding further injury by splinting the affected limb
51 (Hodges and Tucker 2011; Burns et al. 2016). The current study aimed at targeting the link
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 between PMC and M1, since the TBT is known to engage prefrontal and premotor cortices
7 during performance (Owen et al. 2005). However, our findings suggest that more research is
8 needed to establish if engaging the PMC by performing the TBT affects M1 excitability, given
9 the lack of a pain-free TBT group. Several factors influence the corticomotor excitability
10 response to pain, such as (1) prefrontal and subcortical brain areas (Mink 1996; Owen et al. 2005;
11 Seminowicz and Moayed 2017); (2) right PMC-to-contralateral M1 inhibition (Mochizuki et al.
12 2004); or (3) transcallosal M1-M1 inhibition (Ferber et al. 1992). It is therefore not possible to
13 rule out if performing the task with the left hand, may have induced either right PMC-to-M1 or
14 M1-M1 inhibition, thereby counteracting any potential facilitation of M1 excitability. However,
15 considerable bilateral PMC activation has been demonstrated by fMRI across several n-back task
16 paradigms (Owen et al. 2005), and PMC-to-M1 inhibition is therefore unlikely to be the sole
17 responsible factor for the lack of MEP facilitation. Instead, the human PMC-M1 relationship
18 remains somewhat elusive, and the notion that PMC may drive M1 excitability is based on
19 empirical evidence suggesting that rTMS to PMC alters M1 excitability (Gerschlagler et al. 2001;
20 Mochizuki et al. 2004; Rizzo et al. 2004). Additionally, since M1 receives multiple inputs from
21 e.g. the S1 (Hatsopoulos and Suminski 2011), it is possible that MEPs are not only reflecting
22 changes at the level of M1. This notion is supported by the finding that S1 excitability changes
23 occur before that of M1 excitability (Schabrun et al. 2013).

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Another possibility is, that the PMC activation observed during performance of a two-back task is mainly related to attention (Owen et al. 2005). Yet, given the strong motor preparation component of the TBT, prefrontal areas such as the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) the PMC, and M1 are likely involved (Carlson et al. 1998; Neige et al. 2018), and being purely attention-related activation is unlikely to be the main factor in the lack of M1 excitability change during pain.

Based on the current findings, we are unable to infer whether performance of the working memory task influences corticomotor excitability. It is possible that the familiarization and baseline testing on the TBT had already increased MEPs during baseline TMS testing. However, the numerical value of the MEPs were similar to those reported in earlier research utilizing 120% RMT (Schabrun and Hodges 2012; Larsen et al. 2018). Furthermore, the pain-induced reduction in MEPs was similar to those earlier reported (Le Pera et al. 2001; Schabrun and Hodges 2012;

1
2
3
4
5 Burns et al. 2016; Larsen et al. 2018). Therefore, the familiarization and baseline TBT testing are
6 unlikely to have had any major impact on the MEPs.
7
8

9 Modulating corticomotor excitability through the PMC is an interesting approach, as shown
10 in other areas of research on action observation (Fadiga et al. 1995; Strafella and Paus 2000) and
11 motor imagery (Stinear and Byblow 2003). Perhaps these approaches may be more effective for
12 normalizing pain-induced corticomotor excitability reduction.
13
14
15
16
17

18 *Pain intensity ratings differed between groups*

19 In this study, those performing the working memory task rated their perceived pain intensity
20 higher than the resting group during pain. In contrast, pain intensities are rated lower during
21 performance of an attention task (Bushnell et al. 1985; Miron et al. 1989), a Stroop task (Bantick
22 et al. 2002; Seminowicz and Davis 2007a), and a three-back task (Buhle and Wager 2010) in
23 previous studies. A reduction in pain intensity during task performance is considered to be
24 mediated through attenuation of activation of pain-related brain regions such as the S1, S2 and
25 the posterior insula, and the ipsilateral (to the pain) anterior insula (Petrovic et al. 2000; Bantick
26 et al. 2002; Seminowicz et al. 2004; Wiech et al. 2005; Bingel et al. 2007). The discrepancy
27 between the current and previous studies in pain ratings may depend on the choice of
28 experimental pain model. Phasic short-lasting (0.8-7 s application) heat pain models applied to
29 the face, the hand, and the left forearm (Bushnell et al. 1985; Bantick et al. 2002; Buhle and
30 Wager 2010) yield moderate pain intensities (4-7) scored on a visual analogue scale, whereas
31 hypertonic saline-induced pain in the hand is rated at ~6 NRS in this study and earlier work
32 (Larsen et al. 2018). It is therefore unlikely that pain intensity alone can explain the discrepancy.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Alternatively, performing the task during pain may have shifted the attention towards pain.
46 However, we find this unlikely since (1) the two groups did not rate external/sensory distractions
47 differently with respect to task execution and (2) earlier evidence suggests that task performance
48 remain unaffected when performed during pain (Seminowicz and Davis 2007b). Instead, the
49 difference in quality of the painful sensation, i.e. tonic muscle pain versus phasic skin pain, may
50 impact pain perception during the working memory task performance. Indeed, capsaicin
51 application to the skin before painful heat stimulation (heat allodynia) enhances forebrain
52 responses related to areas such as the anterior insula and dorsolateral prefrontal areas, when
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 compared to similar pain intensity heat stimulation alone (Lorenz et al. 2002). It could be argued
6 that the two groups were different because of interindividual susceptibility to pain perception,
7 given the sizeable heterogeneity in pain ratings amongst healthy volunteers to standardized
8 nociceptive input (Coghill 2010). Although we cannot rule out the possibility of group
9 differences in pain susceptibility, the groups did not differ in age, gender, PCS, or STAI-S/T
10 scores.
11
12
13
14
15

16
17
18 *Accuracy in the two-back task increased at PR+30 as compared to baseline*

19 The performance increase in target accuracy was similar for the TBT and REST group. This
20 verifies that no additional learning occurred at PR+30 for the TBT group compared to the REST
21 group, despite having performed the task for an additional 10 mins. This supports the notion that
22 the TBT during pain can be considered a working memory task. The similar increase in target
23 accuracy is plausibly due to the familiarization performance, where the two groups achieved a
24 similar level of target accuracy during the 40 trials. The aim of the current study was to employ
25 the TBT to influence M1 excitability indirectly by engaging the PMC and DLPFC (Owen et al.
26 2005) and not induce learning per se. Since earlier research showed performance gains in N-back
27 tasks (accuracy and reaction time) in response to facilitated DLPFC excitability by high-
28 frequency rTMS (for review, see Brunoni and Vanderhasselt (2014)), the present findings support
29 that a working memory task that engages the DLPFC, improves accuracy on targets, but
30 corticomotor excitability remains unchanged. The increased accuracy from baseline to PR+30 is
31 in agreement with earlier lines of evidence on motor learning, which demonstrated that
32 performance still increases when motor practice is performed during pain (Boudreau et al. 2007;
33 Lamothe et al. 2014; Bouffard et al. 2016; Mavromatis et al. 2017).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The lack of facilitation of M1 could be explained by the effort needed to perform the
48 working memory task during pain. It is known that for instance motor tasks need to be at a
49 certain level of difficulty for learning to be optimal and engage M1 (Boudreau et al. 2010).
50 Participants in the TBT group consistently rated the effort to complete the TBT higher during
51 pain, but effort is not a direct measure of task difficulty. It therefore remains unclear if the task
52 was able to modulate corticomotor excitability since a TBT group without pain was not included.
53 Nonetheless, it is known that increased task difficulty enhances corticomotor excitability to a
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 greater extent during performance of e.g. motor imagery (Roosink and Zijdwind 2010), and task
6 difficulty in the current study should therefore be considered.
7
8
9

10 *Limitations*

11 The lack of a TBT group with no pain during performance makes it difficult to assess if the TBT
12 influences corticomotor excitability when performed during pain. Earlier studies where pain-free
13 participants were tested, have consistently demonstrated that isotonic saline and no pain
14 perception do not interfere with the magnitude of MEPs (Le Pera et al. 2001; Svensson et al.
15 2003; Schabrun et al. 2015a), but there is no equivalent data on the TBT alone. The lack of a pre-
16 familiarization TMS baseline does not allow for the relative impact of the familiarization/baseline
17 n-back task performance on MEPs to be assessed.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 This is the first study to explore if performing a working memory task modulates the pain-
28 induced reduction in corticomotor excitability. Pain-induced reduction in FDI corticomotor
29 excitability was unaffected by engaging in a working memory task during pain, despite an
30 enhanced pain perception.
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Declarations of interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest
37
38
39

40 **Author contributions:** TGN, RPH, DAS, SS, SAB, and DBL contributed to the conceptual
41 development of the study. Data collection, analysis and the preliminary draft were performed by
42 DBL. All authors interpreted and discussed the results. The manuscript draft was critically
43 revised by RPH, TGN and SAB and edited by all authors. All authors approved the final
44 manuscript.
45
46
47
48
49

50 **REFERENCES**

51 Bantick SJ, Wise RG, Ploghaus A, et al (2002) Imaging how attention modulates pain in humans
52 using functional MRI. *Brain* 125:310–319. doi: 10.1093/brain/awf022
53
54 Bingel U, Rose M, Gläscher J, Büchel C (2007) fMRI Reveals How Pain Modulates Visual
55 Object Processing in the Ventral Visual Stream. *Neuron* 55:157–167. doi:
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 10.1016/j.neuron.2007.05.032
6

7 Boudreau S, Romaniello A, Wang K, et al (2007) The effects of intra-oral pain on motor cortex
8 neuroplasticity associated with short-term novel tongue-protrusion training in humans. *Pain*
9 132:169–178. doi: S0304-3959(07)00413-7 [pii]10.1016/j.pain.2007.07.019
10

11 Boudreau SA, Farina D, Falla D (2010) The role of motor learning and neuroplasticity in
12 designing rehabilitation approaches for musculoskeletal pain disorders. *Man Ther* 15:410–
13 414. doi: 10.1016/j.math.2010.05.008S1356-689X(10)00083-4 [pii]
14

15 Bouffard J, Bouyer LJ, Roy JS, Mercier C (2014) Tonic pain experienced during locomotor
16 training impairs retention despite normal performance during acquisition. *J Neurosci*
17 34:9190–9195. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5303-13.201434/28/9190 [pii]
18

19 Bouffard J, Bouyer LJ, Roy JS, Mercier C (2016) Pain Induced during Both the Acquisition and
20 Retention Phases of Locomotor Adaptation Does Not Interfere with Improvements in Motor
21 Performance. *Neural Plast* 2016:. doi: 10.1155/2016/8539096
22

23 Brunoni AR, Vanderhasselt MA (2014) Working memory improvement with non-invasive brain
24 stimulation of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
25 *Brain Cogn* 86:1–9. doi: 10.1016/j.bandc.2014.01.008
26

27 Buhle J, Wager TD (2010) Performance-dependent inhibition of pain by an executive working
28 memory task. *Pain* 149:19–26. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2009.10.027
29

30 Burns E, Chipchase LS, Schabrun SM (2016) Primary sensory and motor cortex function in
31 response to acute muscle pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Pain* 20:1203–
32 1213. doi: 10.1002/ejp.859
33

34 Bushnell MC, Duncan GH, Dubner R, et al (1985) Attentional influences on noxious and
35 innocuous cutaneous heat detection in humans and monkeys. *J Neurosci* 5:1103–1110. doi:
36 10.1016/0304-3959(86)90138-7
37

38 Cairns BE, Svensson P, Wang K, et al (2006) Activation of Peripheral NMDA Receptors
39 Contributes to Human Pain and Rat Afferent Discharges Evoked by Injection of Glutamate
40 into the Masseter Muscle. *J Neurophysiol* 90:2098–2105. doi: 10.1152/jn.00353.2003
41

42 Carlson S, Martinkauppi S, Rämä P, et al (1998) Distribution of cortical activation during
43 visuospatial n-back tasks as revealed by functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Cereb*
44 *Cortex* 8:743–752. doi: 10.1093/cercor/8.8.743
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Carroll TJ, Lee M, Hsu M, Sayde J (2008) Unilateral practice of a ballistic movement causes bilateral increases in performance and corticospinal excitability. *J Appl Physiol* 104:1656–1664. doi: 10.1152/jappphysiol.01351.2007
- Chipchase L, Schabrun S, Cohen L, et al (2012) A checklist for assessing the methodological quality of studies using transcranial magnetic stimulation to study the motor system: An international consensus study. *Clin Neurophysiol* 123:1698–1704. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2012.05.003
- Civardi C, Cantello R, Asselman P, Rothwell JC (2001) Transcranial magnetic stimulation can be used to test connections to primary motor areas from frontal and medial cortex in humans. *Neuroimage* 14:1444–1453. doi: 10.1006/nimg.2001.0918
- Coghill RC (2010) Individual Differences in the Subjective Experience of Pain: New Insights Into Mechanisms and Models. *Headache J Head Face Pain* 50:1531–1535. doi: 10.1111/j.1526-4610.2010.01763.x
- Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Revicki DA, et al (2009) Development and initial validation of an expanded and revised version of the Short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire (SF-MPQ-2). *Pain* 144:35–42. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2009.02.007
- Fadiga L, Fogassi L, Pavesi G, Rizzolatti G (1995) Motor facilitation during action observation: a magnetic stimulation study. *J Neurophysiol* 73:2608–2611. doi: 10.1.1.299.4524
- Farina S, Valeriani M, Rosso T, et al (2001) Transient inhibition of the human motor cortex by capsaicin-induced pain. A study with transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Neurosci Lett* 314:97–101. doi: S0304394001022972 [pii]
- Ferbert A, Priori A, Rothwell JC, et al (1992) Interhemispheric inhibition of the human motor cortex. *J Physiol* 453:525–546. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.1992.sp019243
- Gallasch E, Christova M, Krenn M, et al (2009) Changes in motor cortex excitability following training of a novel goal-directed motor task. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 105:47–54. doi: 10.1007/s00421-008-0871-y
- Gerschlager W, Siebner HR, Rothwell JC (2001) Decreased corticospinal excitability after subthreshold 1 Hz rTMS over lateral premotor cortex. *Neurology* 57:449–455. doi: 10.1212/WNL.57.3.449
- Graven-Nielsen T, Arendt-Nielsen L (2010) Assessment of mechanisms in localized and

- 1
2
3
4
5 widespread musculoskeletal pain. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 6:599–606. doi:
6 10.1038/nrrheum.2010.107
7
8
9 Hatsopoulos NG, Suminski AJ (2011) Sensing with the Motor Cortex. *Neuron* 72:477–487. doi:
10 10.1016/j.neuron.2011.10.020
11
12 Hodges PW, Tucker K (2011) Moving differently in pain: A new theory to explain the adaptation
13 to pain. *Pain* 152:S90–S98. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2010.10.020
14
15 Huang YZ, Rothwell JC, Lu CS, et al (2009) The effect of continuous theta burst stimulation
16 over premotor cortex on circuits in primary motor cortex and spinal cord. *Clin Neurophysiol*
17 120:796–801. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2009.01.003
18
19 Kucyi A, Salomons T V, Davis KD (2013) Mind wandering away from pain dynamically
20 engages antinociceptive and default mode brain networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 110:18692 LP
21 – 18697
22
23 Lamothe M, Roy J-SS, Bouffard J, et al (2014) Effect of tonic pain on motor acquisition and
24 retention while learning to reach in a force field. *PLoS One* 9:e99159. doi:
25 10.1371/journal.pone.0099159
26
27 Larsen DB, Graven-Nielsen T, Boudreau SA (2019) Pain-Induced Reduction in Corticomotor
28 Excitability Is Counteracted by Combined Action-Observation and Motor Imagery. *J Pain*.
29 doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2019.05.001
30
31 Larsen DB, Graven-nielsen T, Hirata RP, Boudreau SA (2018) Differential Corticomotor
32 Excitability Responses to Hypertonic Saline-Induced Muscle Pain in Forearm and Hand
33 Muscles. *Neural Plast* 2018:1–9. doi: 10.1155/2018/7589601
34
35 Le Pera D, Graven-Nielsen T, Valeriani M, et al (2001) Inhibition of motor system excitability at
36 cortical and spinal level by tonic muscle pain. *Clin Neurophysiol* 112:1633–1641. doi:
37 10.1016/S1388-2457(01)00631-9
38
39 Lorenz J, Cross DJ, Minoshima S, et al (2002) A unique representation of heat allodynia in the
40 human brain. *Neuron* 35:383–393. doi: 10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00767-5
41
42 Mavromatis N, Neige C, Gagné M, et al (2017) Effect of Experimental Hand Pain on Training-
43 Induced Changes in Motor Performance and Corticospinal Excitability. *Brain Sci* 7:15. doi:
44 10.3390/brainsci7020015
45
46 Mink JW (1996) The basal ganglia: Focused selection and inhibition of competing motor
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5 programs. *Prog Neurobiol* 50:381–425. doi: 10.1016/S0301-0082(96)00042-1
6
7 Miron D, Duncan GH, Bushnell MC (1989) Effects of attention on the unpleasantness and
8 intensity of thermal pain. *Pain* 39:345–352
9
10 Mochizuki H, Huang Y-Z, Rothwell JC (2004) Interhemispheric interaction between human
11 dorsal premotor and contralateral primary motor cortex. *J Physiol* 561:331–338. doi:
12 10.1113/jphysiol.2004.072843
13
14 Muellbacher W, Ziemann U, Boroojerdi B, et al (2001) Role of the human motor cortex in rapid
15 motor learning. *Exp Brain Res* 136:431–438. doi: 10.1007/s002210000614
16
17 Münchau A, Bloem BR, Irlbacher K, et al (2002) Functional connectivity of human premotor and
18 motor cortex explored with repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. *J Neurosci* 22:554–
19 561. doi: 22/2/554 [pii]
20
21 Neige C, Massé-Alarie H, Mercier C (2018) Stimulating the Healthy Brain to Investigate Neural
22 Correlates of Motor Preparation: A Systematic Review. *Neural Plast* 2018:1–14. doi:
23 10.1155/2018/5846096
24
25 Oldfield RC (1971) The assessment and analysis of handedness: the Edinburgh inventory.
26 *Neuropsychologia* 9:97–113
27
28 Owen AM, McMillan KM, Laird AR, Bullmore E (2005) N-back working memory paradigm: A
29 meta-analysis of normative functional neuroimaging studies. *Hum Brain Mapp* 25:46–59.
30 doi: 10.1002/hbm.20131
31
32 Pelletier R, Higgins J, Bourbonnais D (2015) Is neuroplasticity in the central nervous system the
33 missing link to our understanding of chronic musculoskeletal disorders? *BMC*
34 *Musculoskelet Disord* 16:25. doi: 10.1186/s12891-015-0480-y
35
36 Petrovic P, Petersson KM, Ghatan PH, et al (2000) Pain-related cerebral activation is altered by a
37 distracting cognitive task. *Pain* 85:19–30. doi: 10.1016/S0304-3959(99)00232-8
38
39 Rizzo V, Siebner HR, Modugno N, et al (2004) Shaping the excitability of human motor cortex
40 with premotor rTMS. *J Physiol* 554:483–495. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2003.048777
41
42 Roosink M, Zijdwind I (2010) Corticospinal excitability during observation and imagery of
43 simple and complex hand tasks: Implications for motor rehabilitation. *Behav Brain Res*
44 213:35–41. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2010.04.027
45
46 Rossi S, Hallett M, Rossini PM, Pascual-Leone A (2009) Safety, ethical considerations, and
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 application guidelines for the use of transcranial magnetic stimulation in clinical practice
6 and research. *Clin Neurophysiol* 120:2008–2039. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2009.08.016S1388-
7
8 2457(09)00519-7 [pii]
9

10 Rossi S, Hallett M, Rossini PM, Pascual-Leone A (2011) Screening questionnaire before TMS:
11 an update. *Clin Neurophysiol* 122:1686. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2010.12.037
12

13 Rothkegel H, Sommer M, Paulus W (2010) Breaks during 5 Hz rTMS are essential for
14 facilitatory after effects. *Clin Neurophysiol* 121:426–430. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2009.11.016
15
16

17 Schabrun SM, Burns E, Hodges PW (2015a) New Insight into the Time-Course of Motor and
18 Sensory System Changes in Pain. *PLoS One* 10:e0142857. doi:
19 10.1371/journal.pone.0142857
20
21
22

23 Schabrun SM, Elgueta-Cancino EL, Hodges PW (2017a) Smudging of the Motor Cortex Is
24 Related to the Severity of Low Back Pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 42:1172–1178. doi:
25 10.1097/BRS.0000000000000938
26
27
28

29 Schabrun SM, Hodges PW (2012) Muscle pain differentially modulates short interval
30 intracortical inhibition and intracortical facilitation in primary motor cortex. *J Pain* 13:187–
31 194. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2011.10.013
32
33

34 Schabrun SM, Hodges PW, Vicenzino B, et al (2015b) Novel adaptations in motor cortical maps:
35 The relation to persistent elbow pain
36
37

38 Schabrun SM, Jones E, Kloster J, Hodges PW (2013) Temporal association between changes in
39 primary sensory cortex and corticomotor output during muscle pain. *Neuroscience* 235:159–
40 64. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2012.12.072
41
42
43

44 Schabrun SM, Palsson TS, Thapa T, Graven-Nielsen T (2017b) Movement Does Not Promote
45 Recovery of Motor Output Following Acute Experimental Muscle Pain. *Pain Med* 1–7. doi:
46 10.1093/pm/pnx099
47
48

49 Seminowicz DA, Davis KD (2007a) A re-examination of pain-cognition interactions:
50 Implications for neuroimaging. *Pain* 130:8–13. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2007.03.036
51
52

53 Seminowicz DA, Davis KD (2007b) Interactions of pain intensity and cognitive load: The brain
54 stays on task. *Cereb Cortex* 17:1412–1422. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhl052
55
56

57 Seminowicz DA, Mikulis DJ, Davis KD (2004) Cognitive modulation of pain-related brain
58 responses depends on behavioral strategy. *Pain* 112:48–58. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2004.07.027
59
60
61

- 1
2
3
4
5 Seminowicz DA, Moayed M (2017) The Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex in Acute and Chronic
6 Pain. *J Pain* 18:1027–1035. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2017.03.008
7
8
9 Spielberger C (1983) *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. rev. ed. Consult Psychol Press
10
11 Stinear CM, Byblow WD (2003) Motor imagery of phasic thumb abduction temporally and
12 spatially modulates corticospinal excitability. *Clin Neurophysiol* 114:909–914. doi:
13 10.1016/S1388-2457(02)00373-5
14
15
16 Strafella AP, Paus T (2000) Modulation of cortical excitability during action observation: a
17 transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *Neuroreport* 11:2289–2292. doi:
18 10.1097/00001756-200007140-00044
19
20
21 Sullivan MJL, Bishop SR, Pivik J (1995) The Pain Catastrophizing Scale: Development and
22 Validation. *Psychol Assess* 7:524–532. doi: 10.1037/1040-3590.7.4.524
23
24
25 Svensson P, Miles TS, McKay D, Ridding MC (2003) Suppression of motor evoked potentials in
26 a hand muscle following prolonged painful stimulation. *Eur J Pain* 7:55–62. doi:
27 10.1016/S1090-3801(02)00050-2
28
29
30
31 Takada M, Tokuno H, Nambu A, Inase M (1998) Corticostriatal projections from the somatic
32 motor areas of the frontal cortex in the macaque monkey: Segregation versus overlap of
33 input zones from the primary motor cortex, the supplementary motor area, and the premotor
34 cortex. *Exp Brain Res* 120:114–128. doi: 10.1007/s002210050384
35
36
37
38 Tang J, Gibson SJ (2005) A psychophysical evaluation of the relationship between trait anxiety,
39 pain perception, and induced state anxiety. *J Pain* 6:612–619. doi:
40 10.1016/j.jpain.2005.03.009
41
42
43
44 Tokuno H, Tanji J (1993) Input organization of the distal and proximal forelimb areas in the
45 monkey primary motor cortex: a retrograde labeling study. *JCompNeurol* 333:199–209
46
47
48 Tsao H, Danneels LA, Hodges PW (2011) ISSLS Prize Winner: smudging the motor brain in
49 young adults with recurrent low back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 36:1721–1727. doi:
50 10.1097/BRS.0b013e31821c4267
51
52
53 Turner JA, Aaron LA (2001) Pain-related catastrophizing: What is it? *Clin J Pain* 17:65–71. doi:
54 10.1097/00002508-200103000-00009
55
56
57 Valeriani M, Restuccia D, Di Lazzaro V, et al (2001) Inhibition of biceps brachii muscle motor
58 area by painful heat stimulation of the skin. *Exp Brain Res* 139:168–172
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5 Valeriani M, Restuccia D, Di V L, et al (1999) Inhibition of the human primary motor area by
6 painful heat stimulation of the skin 135. *ClinNeurophysiol* 110:1475–1480
7
8 Vermeij A, van Beek AHEA, Olde Rikkert MGM, et al (2012) Effects of Aging on Cerebral
9 Oxygenation during Working-Memory Performance: A Functional Near-Infrared
10 Spectroscopy Study. *PLoS One* 7:e46210. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0046210
11
12 Vos T, Allen C, Arora M, et al (2016) Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and
13 years lived with disability for 310 diseases and injuries, 1990–2015: a systematic analysis
14 for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *Lancet* 388:1545–1602. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
15 6736(16)31678-6
16
17 Wiech K, Seymour B, Kalisch R, et al (2005) Modulation of pain processing in hyperalgesia by
18 cognitive demand. *Neuroimage* 27:59–69. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.03.044
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

33 **Fig. 1** Participants were randomized into a two-back task (TBT) group or a rest (REST) group.
34 Both groups were extensively familiarized with the TBT, and baseline TBT performance and
35 transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) motor-evoked potentials (MEPs) were recorded.
36 Hypertonic saline was injected into the first dorsal interosseous (FDI) muscle. Pain intensity
37 ratings were obtained throughout the experiment. The TBT group performed the TBT throughout
38 the pain period, whereas the REST group remained seated quietly. Follow-up MEPs were
39 recorded at pain-resolve (PR), PR+10 mins, PR + 20 mins, and PR + 30 mins. At PR + 30 mins,
40 both groups performed the TBT again
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Fig. 2** Mean (+ SEM) numerical rating scale (NRS) scores following injection of hypertonic
51 saline in the two-back-task (TBT) and resting (REST) groups. NRS scores were significantly
52 reduced in both groups from 8-17 or 10-17 mins (TBT and REST, respectively) compared to I.A.
53 ($p<0.05$). All significant NRS rating reductions as compared to 2-8 mins are indicated in the
54 figure. A between-group difference in NRS was found at four mins (#, $p<0.05$). PR: Pain-resolve
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fig. 3 Mean (+ SEM) motor evoked potentials (MEPs). No significant differences in MEP reduction between the two groups were found. At PR up until PR+30 mins, MEPs were reduced for both groups (*, $p < 0.008$). *PR*: Pain-resolve

Fig. 4 Mean (+ SEM) target and non-target accuracy and reaction time for the two-back-task (TBT) and resting (REST) groups. A main effect of time (Baseline versus PR+30 mins) was found for target accuracy (*, $p = 0.019$), suggesting that both groups had a similar increase in accuracy on targets







