

Effect of Types and Anatomic Arrangement of Painful Stimuli on Conditioned Pain Modulation

David M. Klyne,^{*} Annina B. Schmid,^{*,†} G. Lorimer Moseley,^{‡,§} Michele Sterling,[¶] and Paul W. Hodges^{*}

^{*}National Health and Medical Research Council Centre of Clinical Research Excellence in Spinal Pain, Injury and Health, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

[†]Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom.

[‡]The Sansom Institute for Health Research, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia.

[§]Neuroscience Research Australia, Sydney, Australia.

[¶]Centre for National Research on Disability and Rehabilitation Medicine (CONROD), University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

Abstract: Reduced pain perception during painful stimulation to another body region (ie, conditioned pain modulation [CPM]) is considered important for pain modulation and development of pain disorders. The various methods used to study CPM limit comparison of findings. We investigated the influence of key methodologic variations on CPM and the properties of CPM when the back is used for the test stimulus or the conditioning stimulus (CS). Two different test stimuli (pressure pain threshold and pain response to suprathreshold heat [Pain-45, ie, pain rated at 45 on a 0–100 numeric rating scale]) were assessed before and during application of a noxious or non-noxious (sham) CS. Eight blocks of trials varied the anatomic location (back and forearms) and arrangement (body side) of the stimuli. Pressure pain threshold (as the test stimulus) increased during application of noxious, but not non-noxious, CS when stimuli were applied to opposite body sides or heterotopic sites on one body side. Inconsistent with pain-induced CPM, Pain-45 decreased during both noxious and non-noxious CS. These findings indicate that 1) pressure pain threshold can be more confidently interpreted with respect to CPM evoked by a painful stimulus than Pain-45, 2) the back and forearm are equally effective as sites for stimuli, and 3) stimuli arrangement does not influence CPM, except for identical anatomic regions on the same body side.

Perspective: This study indicates that pressure pain threshold as the test stimulus provides a more valid measure of pain-induced CPM than pain response to a suprathreshold heat stimulus. Induction and magnitude of CPM is independent of stimuli arrangement, as long as ipsilateral homotopic sites are avoided. These findings clarify methods to study CPM.

© 2015 by the American Pain Society

Key words: conditioned pain modulation, pain modulation, pain threshold, suprathreshold pain.

The perceived intensity of pain is reduced in the presence of a painful stimulus in another area of the body.²³ This phenomenon is referred to as conditioned pain modulation (CPM).⁴⁷ The mechanisms

that underlie CPM are only beginning to be understood and are likely to involve multiple inhibitory and facilitatory pathways related to pain processing. Exploration of these mechanisms is important because a range of pain disorders and syndromes have been linked to abnormal CPM,^{1,15,30,43,48} and this has been proposed to reflect altered pain inhibitory function.⁴⁶ Although CPM is extensively studied, the use of a large range of methods to explore this phenomenon has created methodologic uncertainty and made it difficult to compare and/or interpret findings.

CPM is quantified as a reduction in pain intensity to a standard stimulus or increased threshold for a stimulus to become painful (test stimulus [TS]) during or after the application of a second noxious stimulus (conditioning

Received April 2, 2014; Revised October 22, 2014; Accepted November 10, 2014.

This research was funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia (project grant: 631369; fellowships: P.W.H., 1002190; A.S., 1053058; G.L.M., 571090; M.S., 1002489).

There are no conflicts of interest related to this work.

Address reprint requests to Paul W. Hodges, PhD, MedDr, BPhy, NHMRC Centre of Clinical Research Excellence in Spinal Pain Injury and Health, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia. E-mail: p.hodges@uq.edu.au
1526-5900/\$36.00

© 2015 by the American Pain Society

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2014.11.005>

stimulus [CS]) to another body region.^{31,47} The TS used to study CPM has involved several pain modalities (ie, thermal, mechanical, electrical, and chemical) and test types (threshold stimulus to evoke pain, eg, pressure pain threshold [PPT], vs pain intensity reported on a visual analog scale in response to a standardized suprathreshold stimulus, eg, pain reported in response to a stimulus sufficient to evoke a pain rated at 45 on a 0–100 visual analog scale [Pain-45]³). CPM has also been induced using different combinations of body regions (ie, opposite/same body side; homotopic/heterotopic anatomic sites). It is unclear whether all procedures provide comparable results. Moreover, it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding the influence of many of these procedural variants on CPM because studies have differed with respect to multiple parameters, which makes direct comparison difficult. Recent data show that CPM responses vary greatly in the same subjects when different TSs are used, and that greater magnitude of CPM is detected using PPT than other TSs, including suprathreshold measures.²⁵ However, these findings are limited to a single stimuli arrangement (left and right arm), and CPM can vary with respect to the spatial configuration of the TS and CS.^{6,27,40} Here we investigated the effect of variation of sites used for the TS and CS and differences between 2 test types used for the TS—with the aim of identifying whether CPM could be elicited with equal confidence with TS based on both pain threshold and intensity measures in response to a painful CS. As our primary interest was optimization of assessment of CPM in people with back pain, we explored combinations of body regions including the forearm and back. Specific objectives were to compare CPM when TS and the CS were applied to 1) heterotopic regions on the same body side, 2) a homotopic region on the same body side, 3) homotopic regions on opposite body sides, and 4) heterotopic regions on opposite body sides (reverse arrangement of stimuli in this condition allowed us to examine whether CPM was influenced by use of the back as a site for the TS or CS). We also studied the effect of a painful and nonpainful (sham) CS on the TS. A priori, we proposed that we could only be confident of the validity of the measure if the TS was modified by a painful, but not by a nonpainful, CS. In addition, we compared 2 typically used TS (PPT and pain reported from a standardized painful heat stimulus [Pain-45]) that differed by sensory mode and test type for each stimuli arrangement.

Methods

Participants

Thirty-one participants (14 males and 17 females) aged 25 ± 6 (mean \pm standard deviation) years volunteered for the study. Participants were included if they had no arm or back pain in the last 3 months, no history of chronic pain, no known medical conditions, no medication use on a regular basis (except oral contraceptives), and no pain-relieving medications in the last 7 days. They were also required to communicate in English and understand

the study purpose and instructions. Participants were recruited by local advertisement around the university campus. Ethical clearance for the study was obtained from the university medical research ethics committee, and participants provided written informed consent.

CS

The CS involved contact heat pain produced by a computerized Peltier-based contact stimulation device (Pathway Pain and Sensory Evaluation System, Medoc Ltd, Ramat Yishai, Israel) with a 30×30 mm probe. Unlike limb immersion techniques (eg, hand immersion in painfully hot or cold water), this form of stimulation enabled application of a CS to the back. CS intensity was determined at the start of the session for each test site using a heat pain threshold (HPT) paradigm. Beginning at a temperature of 32°C , 8 ascending heat stimuli were applied with a rate of temperature change of $.7^\circ\text{C/s}$ and an interstimulus interval of 10 seconds. Participants signaled the onset of pain by pressing a button, and the temperature immediately returned to baseline. HPT was identified as the mean of the final 5 trials.³⁰ The CS was set at 1°C above the HPT. Some participants were unable to tolerate this CS during CPM trials, and the CS was reduced at $.5^\circ\text{C}$ increments until reported pain scores were lower than 80 on a 0 to 100 numeric rating scale (NRS) anchored with “no pain” at 0 and “worst pain imaginable” at 100. If the CS intensity was less than 45 on the NRS, the temperature was increased until pain was reported greater than 45 on the NRS. This “revised” temperature was then used for all remaining CPM trials that involved the same CS test site unless further modifications were required (ie, increased or decreased temperature). This procedure ensured that the CS was safe and sufficiently intense to induce CPM over a short application time.

During CPM testing, the CS was applied at an initial temperature of 32°C before rising at a rate of $.7^\circ\text{C/s}$ to the predetermined intensity. Temperature was returned to baseline at 7°C/s immediately following the completion of both TS measurements (~ 90 seconds). During exposure to the CS, participants reported the pain intensity caused by the CS on the NRS 3 times: at 0 seconds, at 30 seconds, and just before cessation of the CS (ie, after the last TS recording). In the event that a participant's pain response to the CS could not be maintained at or above 35/100 (NRS) for 30 seconds, the trial was excluded on the basis that a CS of at least moderate intensity ($\sim 35/100$ NRS) is considered necessary to induce CPM.²⁶

TS: PPT

A pressure algometer (Somedic A/B, Stockholm, Sweden) with a 1-cm disc-shaped probe head¹ was used to assess the PPT. Pressure was delivered perpendicular to the skin and increased at a rate of 30 kPa/s to the pressure at which the participant reported that the stimulus changed from one of pressure to one of pain. Three trials were performed at each site, separated by less than 10 seconds, and a mean score in kilopascals was calculated.

TS: Pain-45

Heat at a suprathreshold pain intensity was applied using contact heat generated by a separate device (Thermal Sensory Analyzer 2001 system with a 30 × 30 mm Peltier contact probe; Medoc Ltd). The temperature required for the participant to report a pain rated at 45 on the 0 to 100 NRS was identified.¹¹ Participants were exposed to a series of heat stimuli of ~10-second duration. The first stimulus was set at 1°C below the HPT, followed by stimuli of increasing intensity (1°C increments) separated by a 60-second interstimulus interval to minimize skin sensitization. After each stimulus, participants verbally rated their pain on the NRS. When a stimulus induced pain of at least 45/100, the test was discontinued, and the temperature was selected as the TS.

The protocol used for application of the TS involved an increase in temperature at a rate of 4°C/s up to the Pain-45 temperature and maintained for ~10 seconds before returning to a baseline temperature of 28°C to facilitate the reduction of skin temperature and avoid changes in skin sensitivity. Three trials were performed at each site, separated by less than 10 seconds, with the pain intensity rated after each TS and a mean score out of 100 was calculated.

Procedure

Four body regions were selected for testing: (1) right forearm, (2) left forearm, (3) right side of the lower back, and (4) left side of the lower back (Fig 1). Anatomic landmarks used for the assessment of PPT were the proximal region of the muscle belly of extensor carpi radialis longus for the forearm, and 2 cm lateral to the spinous process of the L3 vertebrae for the lower back. The locations used for the Pain-45 test were at the proximal volar aspect of the forearms and 2 cm lateral to the spinous process of L1 in the lower back. The CS was delivered 10 cm from each TS site. This is the minimal distance between 2 concurrent stimuli that has been shown to induce CPM.³³

Trials were conducted in 8 test blocks (Table 1) performed in random order in a single session with the TS and CS applied to homotopic regions on opposite sides of the body (back or forearms), homotopic regions on the same side of the body (back or forearms), heterotopic regions on opposite sides of the body (back and forearm), and heterotopic regions on the same side of the body (back and forearm).

The CPM paradigm commenced 15 minutes after determination of the Pain-45 and CS temperatures. Each block of trials involved 3 repetitions of the 2 TSs (ie, PPT and Pain-45 test), in random order (allocated a priori), after which the CS commenced, and the 2 TSs were reapplied 30 seconds after onset of the CS, again in random order. The CS was maintained until all TS measurements had been completed (~90 seconds). The sham procedure to test the validity of the CPM measures was undertaken in an additional block with the CS intensity below the HPT (thermode set at 32°C) applied to the right forearm and the TS applied to the left forearm.




Figure 1. Locations used for the test and conditioning stimuli.

The sham block was randomized among the other blocks in the experiment. A 15-minute rest was enforced between blocks to eliminate any unresolved CPM effects (Fig 2).⁴⁴

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed in 2 ways. First, the TS values before and during the CS were compared to determine whether the TS changed. Second, absolute change scores (difference between TS scores obtained before and during the CS⁴⁸) were calculated to compare the magnitude of CPM between conditions. A decrease in pain evoked in the Pain-45 test or an increase in the PPT during exposure to the CS is consistent with CPM, and were both expressed as positive values. We controlled for potential gender differences in pain thresholds and perception (eg, females have lower

Table 1. Locations of the TS and CS for Each Experimental Block

CONDITION	ARRANGEMENT	
	TEST STIMULI	CONDITIONING STIMULUS
Homotopic regions on opposite body sides	L forearm L back	R forearm R back
Homotopic regions on the same side	L forearm L back	L forearm L back
Heterotopic regions on opposite body sides	L forearm R back	R back L forearm
Heterotopic regions on the same side	L forearm	L back
Sham	L forearm	R forearm (skin temperature)

Abbreviations: L, left; R, right.




Figure 2. Schematic representation of the experimental protocol for the induction and assessment of CPM over 8 testing blocks (only 4 blocks are shown).

PPTs and are less tolerant to thermal and pressure pain for a specific stimulus intensity³⁴) by virtue of our repeated measures design and individualization of the stimulus intensities used for the TS and CS; hence, data for males and females could be pooled for analysis. Although there may be minor differences in the magnitude of CPM between genders, we did not power the study to investigate this, as our primary aim was to compare the relative efficacy of different stimulus combinations to evoke CPM.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analyses were conducted using Statistica (version 10; StatSoft, Inc, Tulsa, OK) with significance set at $\alpha = .05$. An initial analysis was conducted to test whether a CPM response could be induced using our protocol (Table 1, “sham” condition). We assumed that our data would be consistent with a CPM response if PPT increased and/or Pain-45 decreased during the noxious CS but not the non-noxious (sham) CS. This was evaluated with a separate repeated measures analysis of variance for each TS. Using data from the left forearm (TS) and right forearm (CS) arrangement, we compared TS measures before and during the CS (Conditioning) and between trials with a painful and nonpainful (sham) CS (Condition type).

To compare the effect of CPM according to anatomic location, repeated measures analyses of variance were undertaken on TS scores (PPT and Pain-45 test ratings), with the factors Conditioning (2 levels: before vs during the CS) and Arrangement (8 levels: 8 different stimuli arrangements; see Fig 1 and Table 1). If there was a significant Conditioning \times Arrangement interaction, Duncan’s multiple range test was used for post hoc analysis. This test was chosen over more conservative post hoc tests (which are less protective against false negatives) to confirm, with greater certainty, whether the sham CS had an effect on the TS and thus verify the legitimacy of a CPM effect according to our definition.

To address specific questions posed in this study, change scores were compared in 3 separate repeated measures analyses of variance (Table 2). As the validity of the Pain-45 measure was not confirmed (there was no difference between trials with a painful and nonpainful CS; see the Results section), this analysis was only undertaken on data using PPT as the TS. These analyses investigate whether CPM differed between stimulus configurations based on 1) side of the body (Side: 2 levels—same vs opposite body sides arrangement) and anatomic site (Anatomy: 2 levels—forearm vs back) used for the TS and CS, 2) matched or unmatched regions on opposite sides of the body (Region: 2 levels—homotopic vs heterotopic anatomic sites) and TS location (TS-Location: 2 levels—forearm vs back), and 3) matched or unmatched regions on the same side of the body (Region: 2 levels—homotopic vs heterotopic anatomic sites) and TS location (TS-Location: 2 levels—forearm vs back).

Table 2. Repeated Measures ANOVA Models Used to Compare Change Scores (CPM) With Different Stimuli Configurations

	TS	CS	TS	CS
Anatomy vs side				
	<i>Anatomy</i>			
<i>Side</i>	<i>Arm</i>		<i>Back</i>	
Same	L forearm	L forearm	L back	L back
Opposite	L forearm	R forearm	R back	L back
Region (opposite body sides) vs TS location				
	<i>Region</i>			
<i>TS-Location</i>	<i>Homotopic</i>		<i>Heterotopic</i>	
Arm	L forearm	R forearm	L forearm	R back
Back	R back	L back	R back	L forearm
Region (same body side) vs TS location				
	<i>Region</i>			
<i>TS-Location</i>	<i>Homotopic</i>		<i>Heterotopic</i>	
Arm	L forearm	L forearm	L forearm	L back

Abbreviations: ANOVA, analysis of variance; L, left; R, right.

Results

All 31 participants completed the 8-block experimental CPM paradigm. Despite efforts to maintain the CS intensity above 45/100 (NRS), pain ratings fell below 35/100 (NRS) in 12 TS trials (out of a total of 217 noxious CS trials) across 8 different participants. These data were removed given that the intensity of pain was considered insufficient to induce CPM.⁹

Effects of CS on PPT

Fig 3 presents PPT values before and during the CS. Analysis of the validity of PPT to detect CPM shows that a change in baseline PPT during application of the CS (main effect: Conditioning, $F[1, 28] = .1, P = .815$) depended on whether a noxious or non-noxious sham CS was used (interaction: Conditioning \times Condition type, $F[1, 28] = 8.1, P = .008$). That is, although the PPT for the left forearm was greater during application of the noxious CS to the right forearm than prior to the CS (post hoc $P < .001$), there was no difference in PPT with the identical stimuli arrangement but with a non-noxious sham CS (post hoc $P = .390$). This suggests that the increase in PPT in the presence of a painful CS is consistent with pain-induced CPM.

Change in PPT in the presence of the CS depended on the location of stimuli (main effect: Arrangement, $F[7, 161] = 69.8, P < .001$; interaction: Conditioning \times Arrangement, $F[7, 161] = 2.6, P = .015$). Post hoc tests showed that PPT was higher than baseline during a noxious CS when the TS and CS were applied to heterotopic anatomic sites on the same side of the body (TS–left forearm, CS–left back; $P = .006$) or opposite sides of the body, regardless of anatomic site (TS–right back, CS–left back, $P = .014$; TS–right back, CS–left forearm, $P < .001$; TS–left forearm, CS–right forearm, $P = .003$), with exception of the left forearm (TS) and right back (CS) combination. No CPM effect was found when the TS and CS were applied to homotopic anatomic sites on the same side of the body (TS–left back, CS–left back, $P = .857$; TS–left forearm, CS–left forearm, $P = .918$).

Effects of CS on the Heat Pain-45 Test

Unlike PPT, pain reported during the Pain-45 test (left forearm) was reduced when the right forearm was exposed to either the noxious CS (main effect: Conditioning, $F[1, 28] = 19.0, P < .001$; post hoc $P = .008$) or non-noxious CS ($P < .001$), and the reductions in pain scores were of similar magnitude (main effect: Condition type, $F[1, 28] = .4, P = .532$). Pain reported during the Pain-45 test was reduced during the noxious CS with all stimuli arrangements (main effect: Conditioning, $F[1, 28] = 38.9, P < .001$; post hoc, all $P < .026$) (Fig 4). The magnitude of the reduction in pain (change scores) did not differ between arrangements (main effect: Arrangement, $F[7, 154] = .4, P = .914$). As our data questioned the validity of the Pain-45 test to study a CPM effect, we undertook no further analysis.

Effect of Side of the Body and Anatomic Site (Back vs Forearm) on CPM

The magnitude of CPM, measured using PPT as the TS, was greater when the TS and CS were applied to homotopic sites on opposite sides of the body than on the same side of the body (main effect: Side, $F[1, 25] = 7.1, P = .013$) regardless of whether the back or forearms were used (Fig 5). No difference in the magnitude of CPM was found between the back and forearms regardless of body side arrangement (main effect: Anatomy, $F[1, 25] < .1, P = .991$).

Effect of Homotopic and Heterotopic Anatomic Sites on Opposite Sides of the Body on CPM

No difference in the magnitude of CPM was found between stimuli combinations that involved homotopic sites on opposite sides of the body (eg, TS–back, CS–back) and heterotopic sites on opposite sides of the body (eg, TS–back, CS–forearm) (Region, $F[1, 26] = .4, P = .509$), irrespective of whether the TS was applied to the back or forearm (TS–Location, $F[1, 26] = .8, P = .366$).




Figure 3. PPT scores (mean + standard deviation) before (baseline) and during the CS for all 8 stimuli arrangements. Abbreviations: R Back, right side of back; L Back, left side of back; R Arm, right forearm; L Arm, left forearm. * $P < .05$.




Figure 4. Pain ratings (NRS [mean + standard deviation]) from the Pain-45 test before (baseline) and during the CS for all 8 stimuli arrangements. Abbreviations: R Back, right side of back; L Back, left side of back; R Arm, right forearm; L Arm, left forearm. * $P < .05$.

(Fig 6). Post hoc analyses show that the amplitude of CPM was not affected by reversal of the TS and CS ($P = .192$).

Effect of Homotopic and Heterotopic Anatomic Sites on the Same Side of the Body on CPM

Fig 7 displays the comparison between homotopic and heterotopic stimuli combinations on the same side of the body on CPM. Although CPM effects were induced when stimuli were positioned on heterotopic regions (TS–left forearm, CS–left back), this was not apparent for stimuli applied to a homotopic region (TS–left forearm, CS–left forearm) on the same side of the body (Main effect: Region, $F[1, 26] = 7.8, P = .01$; post hoc $P = .010$).

Discussion

This study has 3 main findings. First, we show that changes in PPT (as the TS) provide a valid measure of




Figure 5. CPM (mean + standard deviation) assessed with stimuli configured using 2 back conditions and 2 forearm conditions: Conditions from left to right: 1, PPT and CS applied to the left back; 2, PPT applied to the left back and CS applied to the right back; 3, PPT and CS applied to the left forearm; and 4, PPT applied to the left forearm and CS applied to the right forearm. * $P < .05$.

CPM, but this could not be confirmed for when the TS is the pain intensity to a suprathreshold heat stimulus (Pain-45 test). Although heat Pain-45 scores reduced during the painful CS, inconsistent with pain-induced CPM, they also reduced during the nonpainful (sham) CS. Second, CPM was best evoked when the TS and CS were applied on opposite body sides (for the same [homotopic] and different [heterotopic] anatomic sites), and heterotopic, but not homotopic, anatomic sites on the same side of the body. Third, CPM magnitude was similar whether the TS or CS was applied to back or forearm sites. These data have implications for future investigations of CPM.

Effect of TS Type on CPM

These data provide evidence of validity of PPT as the TS for measurement of CPM but not suprathreshold pain measures. Although a recent study that compared different TS supported this finding,²⁵ our conclusion




Figure 6. CPM (mean + standard deviation) assessed using homotopic and heterotopic anatomic sites on opposite body sides. Measures of PPT (TS) are recorded from either the back or forearm. Conditions from left to right: 1, TS–right side of the back, CS–left side of the back; 2, TS–right side of the back, CS–left forearm; 3, TS–left forearm, CS–right forearm; 4, TS–left forearm, CS–right side of the back.




Figure 7. CPM (mean + standard deviation) assessed using homotopic and heterotopic anatomic sites on the same body side. Conditions from left to right: 1, TS–left forearm, CS–left forearm; 2, TS–left forearm, CS–left side of the back. * $P = .01$.

differs from that of Pud et al,³¹ who after review of the literature argued that suprathreshold measures were preferable to threshold measures. Pud and colleagues³¹ argument was based on greater variability of threshold measures (pain threshold increased by 3 to 100%) than suprathreshold measures (pain intensity decreased by 10 to 55%). We propose that variation in percentage TS change is not an optimal criterion to judge relative merits of TS types, as the scoring methods of the TS measures differ in terms of the variance structure. Suprathreshold pain measures use a scale bounded by 0 to 10 or 100, whereas threshold measures are recorded with variable boundaries guided by the tolerance of the participant and could yield higher percentage change scores. Thus, justification of preference for one method based on magnitude of variation is not ideal, and we argue that evaluation of the validity of detection of CPM provides a better means to compare methods. Consistent with our observations, Pud et al³¹ noted that suprathreshold pain measures, but not threshold measures, had failed to detect CPM in healthy controls in at least 1 study.³⁹ Other work supports our view that threshold-based TS provides a more valid test of CPM^{21,42} (eg, CPM measured using both TS methods more consistently showed age-related decline in CPM when assessed using a threshold measure¹⁷).

The 2 TSs used in the current study differed in modality, intensity, and nature of the response (threshold vs intensity). Others concur that CPM varies with different TSs.²⁵ This raises the question whether differences in psychophysical properties of each method contributed to disparity in their validity as a CPM measure. This has been implied in earlier studies. CPM increases when attention is directed to the TS and CS,^{6,39} and distraction away from the stimuli has a small but significant effect on CPM.¹⁹ Distraction might differ between stimuli. As suprathreshold pain intensity measures are strongly correlated with psychological factors such as fear of pain and anxiety³⁶ and can be substantially modulated by simple cues (eg, visual cues²⁴), it is reasonable to speculate that a suprathreshold painful stimulus could be more threatening and have a greater effect on attention. Large changes in Pain-45 test values in the current study, even with the non-noxious CS, support this notion.

Differences in CPM might also be partially explained by variability of the TS. Although assessment of pain threshold and pain reported for a standard stimulus involve similar somatosensory pathways (eg, spinothalamic),¹³ the process involved in interpretation of each is distinct; one involves decision regarding a change from non-noxious to noxious, whereas the other requires interpretation relative to an abstract scale, and variability is inherent in both. Numerous studies have reported variability in PPT in people with^{22,38} and without^{4,5,28} clinical pain conditions. Perception of pain to a standard painful stimulus also has inherent variability; pain intensity varies between repeat assessments^{2,4,7,14} and with demographic and psychological variables.^{36,37} In summary, both measures have some inherent variation; however, in our study, only the threshold measure (PPT) yielded a change consistent with pain-induced CPM, which we argue is a better comparison to determine preference for TS measure.

Effect of Anatomic Test Site on CPM

With the exception of homotopic sites on the same side of the body, the combination of anatomic regions selected for the TS and CS had no effect on CPM. This suggests that an application site in the lower back region for the TS and/or CS is equally effective as a forearm region for induction of CPM. Although various body regions have been explored (eg, legs, arms, neck and head; see Pud et al³¹), direct comparison between different sites is limited to a few studies, and the results are inconsistent. Although some report no difference between arm and leg sites,⁴⁰ others reported greater CPM for leg sites.²⁷ The present study is the first to validate the back, against a commonly used region (forearm), as a site for TS or CS application.

Confirmation that stimulation of the back can generate CPM in healthy controls provides an opportunity to explore whether patients with and without back pain yield different results. This is important for 2 reasons: first, it is not known whether back pain involves altered CPM, as has been shown in fibromyalgia¹⁷ and some people with thorax pain post-thoracotomy⁴⁸; and second, sensory disturbances have been reported in back pain (eg, hyperalgesia¹⁰ and allodynia⁸) that implicate disturbed nociceptive processes. The only study of CPM in back pain tested whether patient's clinical pain (interpreted as a CS) was associated with higher pain threshold for a TS in another body region.²⁹ Although that study found no difference in pain thresholds when compared to pain-free controls, it is unclear how this relates to CPM because the TS was not measured in patients before having back pain, and this comparison is critical for interpretation of CPM. Further, this would be contrary to the common observation of reduced pain thresholds, consistent with sensitization.¹³ Studies that investigate TS before and during a CS are required.

Effect of the Arrangement of the TS and CS on CPM

Consistent with Pud et al,³¹ CPM magnitude was similar when the TS and CS were applied to opposite

body sides regardless of whether homotopic or heterotopic anatomic sites were used. CPM magnitude was also similar when heterotopic, but not homotopic, anatomic sites were used on the same body side. Larger CPM magnitudes have, however, been reported for heterotopic sites (arm and leg) on opposite body sides than the same side.⁴⁰ The effects may differ whether a limb or the trunk is used. Although we showed no CPM when stimuli were placed 10 cm apart on the forearm or back, one study induced CPM with stimuli separated by 10 cm on the legs,³³ and another showed increasing CPM magnitude as the distance between stimuli increased from 30 cm, regardless of the body side or region.⁷ Taken together with evidence that spatial summation of thermal noxious stimuli (an effect opposite to CPM) occurs with a separation of 5 cm or less,⁷ separation of the TS and CS by 10 cm is on the borderline of that required to induce CPM. Interestingly, recent work from our group using transcutaneous electrical stimulation delivered to the forearm shows that spatial summation can occur for distances up to 20 cm.³⁵

Effect of CS on CPM

There is disagreement whether the CS must be painful to induce CPM. Our data show that CPM using PPT was elicited when the CS was painful but not in the nonpainful sham condition. Although Lautenbacher et al^{18,20} demonstrated that a strong but nonpainful CS (hand immersion in 42°C water) reduced the pain provoked by thermal stimulus, Granot et al¹¹ did not; pain only reduced (ie, CPM) when the CS was painfully hot (46.5°C) or painfully cold (12°C), and not after nonpainful stimuli (15°C, 18°C, and 44°C). Further, some studies have shown increased magnitude of CPM with CS intensity (temperature) within an individual,^{41,45} whereas others report no difference in CPM magnitude between moderate and intense CS intensities²⁶ and that the pain induced by the CS is unrelated to CPM magnitude, once the CS becomes painful.^{11,32} Although our data showed reduced Pain-45 test ratings during a

nonpainful CS, we contend that TS involving reports of pain to a suprathreshold stimulus provides a less sensitive measure of CPM in response to a painful CS.

Study Limitations

It is important to note that a sham CS was only studied for the left and right forearm arrangement. A priori, we decided that a measure of CPM could only be considered to be valid if the TS reduced during painful, but not sham, CS. Although it could be argued that evaluation of the validity of the interpretation of presence of CPM would be more thorough if we studied a sham in all configurations, we considered it necessary to limit the number of conditions to avoid any adverse effects of repeated exposure to tests. We chose the left (TS) and right (CS) forearm combination for the sham condition because it is consistent with the paradigm studied in most of the existing literature. Finally, we accept that comparison of 2 psychophysically different TSs (test type: threshold vs intensity; and sensory mode: thermal vs pressure) precludes any direct conclusions regarding whether the “test type” or “sensory mode” was responsible for the reduced confidence in detection of CPM using the heat pain-45 method than PPT as the TS.

Conclusion

Differences in the experimental methods employed to evoke CPM in separate studies complicate interpretation of experimental findings. The present findings suggest that pain-induced CPM is more confidently interpreted when using PPT as the TS than pain reported for a suprathreshold heat stimulus for the configurations and setup tested here. Further, the back and forearm are equally effective as sites for application of the TS and CS. Our data also suggest that arrangement of the TS and CS does not influence CPM, as long as identical anatomic regions on the same side of the body are avoided. These findings further clarify the methods by which CPM is effectively activated.

References

1. Arendt-Nielsen L, Nie H, Laursen MB, Laursen BS, Madeleine P, Simonsen OH, Graven-Nielsen T: Sensitization in patients with painful knee osteoarthritis. *Pain* 149: 573-581, 2010
2. Brennum J, Kjeldsen M, Jensen K, Jensen TS: Measurements of human pressure-pain thresholds on fingers and toes. *Pain* 38:211-217, 1989
3. Campbell CM, France CR, Robinson ME, Logan HL, Geffken GR, Fillingim RB: Ethnic differences in diffuse noxious inhibitory controls. *J Pain* 9:759-766, 2008
4. Cathcart S, Pritchard D: Reliability of pain threshold measurement in young adults. *J Headache Pain* 7:21-26, 2006
5. Chesterton LS, Sim J, Wright CC, Foster NE: Interrater reliability of algometry in measuring pressure pain thresholds in healthy humans, using multiple raters. *Clin J Pain* 23: 760-766, 2007
6. Defrin R, Tsedek I, Lugasi I, Moriles I, Urca G: The interactions between spatial summation and DNIC: Effect of the distance between two painful stimuli and attentional factors on pain perception. *Pain* 151:489-495, 2010
7. DeLoach LJ, Higgins MS, Caplan AB, Stiff JL: The visual analog scale in the immediate postoperative period: Intra-subject variability and correlation with a numeric scale. *Anesth Analg* 86:102-106, 1998
8. Freynhagen R, Baron R: The evaluation of neuropathic components in low back pain. *Curr Pain Headache Rep* 13: 185-190, 2009
9. Fujii K, Motohashi K, Umino M: Heterotopic ischemic pain attenuates somatosensory evoked potentials induced by electrical tooth stimulation: Diffuse noxious inhibitory controls in the trigeminal nerve territory. *Eur J Pain* 10:495-504, 2006

10. Giesecke T, Gracely RH, Grant MA, Nachemson A, Petzke F, Williams DA, Clauw DJ: Evidence of augmented central pain processing in idiopathic chronic low back pain. *Arthritis Rheum* 50:613-623, 2004
11. Granot M, Weissman-Fogel I, Crispel Y, Pud D, Granovsky Y, Sprecher E, Yarnitsky D: Determinants of endogenous analgesia magnitude in a diffuse noxious inhibitory control (DNIC) paradigm: Do conditioning stimulus painfulness, gender and personality variables matter? *Pain* 136:142-149, 2008
12. Hansson P, Backonja M, Bouhassira D: Usefulness and limitations of quantitative sensory testing: Clinical and research application in neuropathic pain states. *Pain* 129:256-259, 2007
13. Hubscher M, Moloney N, Leaver A, Rebbeck T, McAuley JH, Refshauge KM: Relationship between quantitative sensory testing and pain or disability in people with spinal pain—A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pain* 154:1497-1504, 2013
14. Jaeschke R, Singer J, Guyatt GH: A comparison of seven-point and visual analogue scales. Data from a randomized trial. *Control Clin Trials* 11:43-51, 1990
15. Julien N, Goffaux P, Arsenault P, Marchand S: Wide-spread pain in fibromyalgia is related to a deficit of endogenous pain inhibition. *Pain* 114:295-302, 2005
16. Kosek E, Hansson P: Modulatory influence on somatosensory perception from vibration and heterotopic noxious conditioning stimulation (HNCS) in fibromyalgia patients and healthy subjects. *Pain* 70:41-51, 1997
17. Lariviere M, Goffaux P, Marchand S, Julien N: Changes in pain perception and descending inhibitory controls start at middle age in healthy adults. *Clin J Pain* 23:506-510, 2007
18. Lautenbacher S, Kunz M, Burkhardt S: The effects of DNIC-type inhibition on temporal summation compared to single pulse processing: Does sex matter? *Pain* 140:429-435, 2008
19. Lautenbacher S, Prager M, Rollman GB: Pain additivity, diffuse noxious inhibitory controls, and attention: A functional measurement analysis. *Somatosens Mot Res* 24:189-201, 2007
20. Lautenbacher S, Roscher S, Strian F: Inhibitory effects do not depend on the subjective experience of pain during heterotopic noxious conditioning stimulation (HNCS): A contribution to the psychophysics of pain inhibition. *Eur J Pain* 6:365-374, 2002
21. Leffler AS, Hansson P, Kosek E: Somatosensory perception in a remote pain-free area and function of diffuse noxious inhibitory controls (DNIC) in patients suffering from long-term trapezius myalgia. *Eur J Pain* 6:149-159, 2002
22. Maquet D, Croisier JL, Demoulin C, Crielaard JM: Pressure pain thresholds of tender point sites in patients with fibromyalgia and in healthy controls. *Eur J Pain* 8:111-117, 2004
23. Melzack R: *FolkMedicine and the Sensory Modulation of Pain*, 3rd ed. Edinburgh, Churchill Livingstone, 1994
24. Moseley GL, Arntz A: The context of a noxious stimulus affects the pain it evokes. *Pain* 133:64-71, 2007
25. Nahman-Averbuch H, Yarnitsky D, Granovsky Y, Gerbera E, Dagulc P, Granota M: The role of stimulation parameters on the conditioned pain modulation response. *Scand J Pain* 4:10-14, 2013
26. Nir RR, Granovsky Y, Yarnitsky D, Sprecher E, Granot M: A psychophysical study of endogenous analgesia: The role of the conditioning pain in the induction and magnitude of conditioned pain modulation. *Eur J Pain* 15:491-497, 2011
27. Oono Y, Nie H, Matos LD, Wang K, Arendt-Nielsen L: The inter and intra-individual variance in descending pain modulation evoked by different conditioning stimuli in healthy men. *Scand J Pain* 2:162-169, 2011
28. Persson AL, Brogardh C, Sjolund BH: Tender or not tender: Test-retest repeatability of pressure pain thresholds in the trapezius and deltoid muscles of healthy women. *J Rehabil Med* 36:17-27, 2004
29. Peters ML, Schmidt AJ, Van den Hout MA, Koopmans R, Sluifjter ME: Chronic back pain, acute postoperative pain and the activation of diffuse noxious inhibitory controls (DNIC). *Pain* 50:177-187, 1992
30. Pielsticker A, Haag G, Zaudig M, Lautenbacher S: Impairment of pain inhibition in chronic tension-type headache. *Pain* 118:215-223, 2005
31. Pud D, Granovsky Y, Yarnitsky D: The methodology of experimentally induced diffuse noxious inhibitory control (DNIC)-like effect in humans. *Pain* 144:16-19, 2009
32. Pud D, Sprecher E, Yarnitsky D: Homotopic and heterotopic effects of endogenous analgesia in healthy volunteers. *Neurosci Lett* 380:209-213, 2005
33. Quevedo AS, Coghill RC: Attentional modulation of spatial integration of pain: Evidence for dynamic spatial tuning. *J Neurosci* 27:11635-11640, 2007
34. Racine M, Tousignant-Laflamme Y, Kloda LA, Dion D, Dupuis G, Choinière M: A systematic literature review of 10 years of research on sex/gender and experimental pain perception, part 1: Are there really differences between women and men? *Pain* 153:602-618, 2012
35. Reid E, Harvie D, Miegel R, Spence C, Moseley GL: Spatial summation of pain in humans investigated using transcutaneous electrical stimulation. *J Pain* 16:11-18, 2014
36. Robinson ME, Bialosky JE, Bishop MD, Price DD, George SZ: Supra-threshold scaling, temporal summation, and after-sensation: Relationships to each other and anxiety/fear. *J Pain Res* 3:25-32, 2010
37. Rolke R, Baron R, Maier C, Tölle TR, Treede RD, Beyer A, Binder A, Birbaumer N, Birklein F, Bötefür IC, Braune S, Flor H, Hüge V, Klug R, Landwehrmeyer GB, Magerl W, Maihöfner C, Rolko C, Schaub C, Scherens A, Sprenger T, Valet M, Wasserka B: Quantitative sensory testing in the German Research Network on Neuropathic Pain (DFNS): Standardized protocol and reference values. *Pain* 123:231-243, 2006
38. Smidt N, van der Windt DA, Assendelft WJ, Mourits AJ, Devillé WL, de Winter AF, Bouter LM: Interobserver reproducibility of the assessment of severity of complaints, grip strength, and pressure pain threshold in patients with lateral epicondylitis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 83:1145-1150, 2002
39. Staud R, Robinson ME, Vierck CJ Jr, Price DD: Diffuse noxious inhibitory controls (DNIC) attenuate temporal summation of second pain in normal males but not in normal females or fibromyalgia patients. *Pain* 101:167-174, 2003
40. Svensson P, Hashikawa CH, Casey KL: Site- and modality-specific modulation of experimental muscle pain in humans. *Brain Res* 851:32-38, 1999

41. Tousignant-Laflamme Y, Page S, Goffaux P, Marchand S: An experimental model to measure excitatory and inhibitory pain mechanisms in humans. *Brain Res* 1230:73-79, 2008
42. Tuveson B, Leffler AS, Hansson P: Time dependent differences in pain sensitivity during unilateral ischemic pain provocation in healthy volunteers. *Eur J Pain* 10:225-232, 2006
43. van Wijk G, Veldhuijzen DS: Perspective on diffuse noxious inhibitory controls as a model of endogenous pain modulation in clinical pain syndromes. *J Pain* 11:408-419, 2010
44. Willer JC, De Broucker T, Le Bars D: Encoding of nociceptive thermal stimuli by diffuse noxious inhibitory controls in humans. *J Neurophysiol* 62:1028-1038, 1989
45. Willer JC, Roby A, Le Bars D: Psychophysical and electrophysiological approaches to the pain-relieving effects of heterotopic nociceptive stimuli. *Brain* 107:1095-1112, 1984
46. Yarnitsky D: Conditioned pain modulation (the diffuse noxious inhibitory control-like effect): Its relevance for acute and chronic pain states. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol* 23: 611-615, 2010
47. Yarnitsky D, Arendt-Nielsen L, Bouhassira D, Edwards RR, Fillingim RB, Granot M, Hansson P, Lautenbacher S, Marchand S, Wilder-Smith O: Recommendations on terminology and practice of psychophysical DNIC testing. *Eur J Pain* 14:339, 2010
48. Yarnitsky D, Crispel Y, Eisenberg E, Granovsky Y, Ben-Nun A, Sprecher E, Best LA, Granot M: Prediction of chronic post-operative pain: Pre-operative DNIC testing identifies patients at risk. *Pain* 138:22-28, 2008