

FUNCTIONAL MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING  
STUDIES OF THE PRIMARY SOMATOSENSORY  
CORTEX IN RELATION TO COMPLEX REGIONAL  
PAIN SYNDROME

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE UNIVERSITY OF EXETER  
IN THE SUBJECT OF PHYSICS  
FOR THE DEGREE  
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

By  
Sarah Carr  
July 2009

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

(signature) .....

# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction . . . . .	1
1.2 Perceptual Neuroscience . . . . .	3
1.2.1 Previous Studies of Tactile Perception . . . . .	4
1.3 Chronic Pain Conditions . . . . .	10
1.3.1 Complex Regional Pain Syndrome . . . . .	11
1.4 Overview of the Project . . . . .	14
<b>2 The Nervous System</b>	<b>16</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	16
2.2 Neuron Structure and Generation of Nerve Impulses . . . . .	16
2.3 Detecting Touch Sensations . . . . .	18
2.3.1 Pacinian Corpuscles . . . . .	18
2.3.2 Ruffini Corpuscles . . . . .	19
2.3.3 Meissner Corpuscles . . . . .	20
2.3.4 Merkel Discs . . . . .	20
2.3.5 Free Nerve Endings . . . . .	21
2.4 Touch Nerve Pathways . . . . .	21
2.5 Primary Somatosensory Cortex . . . . .	23

2.6	Brodmann Areas . . . . .	25
2.7	Coordinate Systems of the Brain . . . . .	27
<b>3</b>	<b>Complex Regional Pain Syndrome</b>	<b>31</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	31
3.2	Onset of the Disease . . . . .	31
3.3	Symptoms . . . . .	32
3.4	Diagnosis . . . . .	34
3.5	Changes Associated with CRPS . . . . .	36
3.5.1	Peripheral Changes . . . . .	36
3.5.2	Cortical Changes . . . . .	38
3.6	Summary . . . . .	42
<b>4</b>	<b>Magnetic Resonance Imaging</b>	<b>43</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	43
4.2	The Physics of MRI . . . . .	44
4.2.1	Image Encoding . . . . .	46
4.2.2	Image Sequence . . . . .	48
4.2.3	Single Shot Echo Planar Imaging . . . . .	50
4.2.4	Functional MRI and the BOLD Effect . . . . .	52
4.3	Artifacts and Noise . . . . .	56
4.3.1	Physiological Fluctuations . . . . .	56
4.3.2	Thermal Noise . . . . .	57
4.3.3	Image Artifacts . . . . .	58
4.4	MRI Instrumentation . . . . .	59
<b>5</b>	<b>Data Processing</b>	<b>62</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	62
5.2	Raw Imaging Data . . . . .	62
5.3	Preprocessing . . . . .	63
5.3.1	Slice Timing . . . . .	64

5.3.2	Realignment . . . . .	65
5.3.3	Normalisation . . . . .	66
5.3.4	Smoothing . . . . .	66
5.4	Modelling of fMRI Data . . . . .	67
5.4.1	Fixed Effects Analysis . . . . .	67
5.4.2	Random Effects Analysis . . . . .	70
<b>6</b>	<b>Vibrotactile Stimulator</b>	<b>71</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	71
6.2	Stimulator Design . . . . .	72
6.3	Control of Stimulus Timing . . . . .	74
6.4	Electronic Drive Circuitry . . . . .	74
<b>7</b>	<b>Studies 1 - 5: Experimental Procedure</b>	<b>78</b>
7.1	Studies 1 to 4 . . . . .	78
7.2	Protocol . . . . .	79
7.2.1	Study 1 . . . . .	82
7.2.2	Study 2 . . . . .	83
7.2.3	Study 3 . . . . .	84
7.2.4	Study 4 . . . . .	85
7.3	Study 5: CRPS Patients . . . . .	86
7.3.1	Protocol . . . . .	86
7.4	Data Processing . . . . .	92
7.5	Calculation of Cortical Digit Separations . . . . .	94
<b>8</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>97</b>
8.1	Introduction . . . . .	97
8.2	Study 1 . . . . .	97
8.2.1	Individual Analysis . . . . .	98
8.2.2	Group Analysis . . . . .	101
8.2.3	Summary of Study 1 . . . . .	103

8.3	Study 2 . . . . .	114
8.3.1	Individual Analysis . . . . .	114
8.3.2	Group Analysis . . . . .	117
8.3.3	Summary of Study 2 . . . . .	119
8.4	Study 3 . . . . .	131
8.4.1	Individual Analysis . . . . .	131
8.4.2	Summary of Study 3 . . . . .	136
8.5	Study 4 . . . . .	147
8.5.1	Individual Analysis . . . . .	147
8.5.2	Summary of Study 4 . . . . .	149
8.6	Study 5 . . . . .	157
8.6.1	Individual Analysis . . . . .	157
8.6.2	Group Analysis . . . . .	167
8.6.3	Summary of Study 5 . . . . .	169
<b>9</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>191</b>
9.1	Introduction . . . . .	191
9.2	Study 1 . . . . .	192
9.3	Study 2 . . . . .	193
9.4	Study 3 . . . . .	197
9.5	Study 4 . . . . .	199
9.6	Study 5 . . . . .	200
9.7	Conclusions . . . . .	203
9.8	Future work . . . . .	204
<b>A</b>	<b>Experimental Procedure</b>	<b>219</b>
A.1	Healthy Participant Information . . . . .	219
A.1.1	MRI Information Sheet . . . . .	219
A.1.2	Study Protocol . . . . .	222
A.1.3	Consent Form . . . . .	224
A.1.4	MRI Safety Checklist . . . . .	225

A.2	Patient Information . . . . .	228
A.2.1	Study Protocol and Information Sheet . . . . .	228
A.2.2	Sample GP Letter . . . . .	234
<b>B</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>236</b>
B.1	Study 1 . . . . .	236
B.2	Study 2 . . . . .	245
B.3	Study 3 . . . . .	251
B.3.1	12 minutes . . . . .	251
B.3.2	20 minutes . . . . .	257
B.4	Study 4 . . . . .	263
B.5	Study 5 . . . . .	269
B.5.1	CRPS Patients . . . . .	269
B.5.2	Patient Controls . . . . .	283

# List of Figures

1	Cortical somatosensory activity . . . . .	5
2	Cortical reorganisation in CRPS . . . . .	13
3	Neuron . . . . .	17
4	Mechanoreceptors . . . . .	19
5	Somatosensory pathway . . . . .	22
6	Human brain . . . . .	24
7	Homonculus . . . . .	24
8	Brodmann areas 1, 2, 3a and 3b . . . . .	26
9	Talairach coordinate system . . . . .	28
10	Patient with CRPS . . . . .	33
11	Mirror therapy and CRPS . . . . .	39
12	Mirror therapy and phantom limbs . . . . .	42
13	Free induction decay . . . . .	47
14	$k$ -space . . . . .	49
15	Spin echo imaging sequence . . . . .	50
16	Echo planar imaging . . . . .	51
17	$k$ -space trajectory in EPI . . . . .	51
18	Cerebral blood flow and volume . . . . .	53
19	BOLD effect . . . . .	53
20	Aliasing . . . . .	57
21	Example artifacts found in MR images . . . . .	58



22	MRI instrumentation . . . . .	59
23	Magnetic resonance imager . . . . .	61
24	MRicro . . . . .	63
25	SPM . . . . .	64
26	SPM design matrix . . . . .	68
27	Tactile stimulators . . . . .	73
28	Schematic of the systems and electronics involved in generating the vibrotactile stimulation. . . . .	75
29	Input signals and the resultant output. . . . .	77
30	SPM for subject 5, study 1 . . . . .	104
31	BA1 graphs: subject 1, study 1 . . . . .	105
32	BA1 graphs: subject 2, study 1 . . . . .	106
33	BA1 graphs: subject 3, study 1 . . . . .	107
34	BA1 graphs: subject 4, study 1 . . . . .	108
35	BA1 graphs: subject 5, study 1 . . . . .	109
36	BA1 graphs: subject 6, study 1 . . . . .	110
37	Study 1, group results . . . . .	111
38	BA1 graphs: group data, study 1 . . . . .	112
39	BA1 graphs: all subject data, study 1 . . . . .	113
40	SPM for subject 3, study 2 . . . . .	120
41	BA1 graphs: subject 1, study 2 . . . . .	121
42	BA1 graphs: subject 2, study 2 . . . . .	122
43	BA1 graphs: subject 3, study 2 . . . . .	123
44	BA1 graphs: subject 4, study 2 . . . . .	124
45	BA1 graphs: subject 5, study 2 . . . . .	125
46	BA1 graphs: subject 6, study 2 . . . . .	126
47	BA1 graphs: subject 7, study 2 . . . . .	127
48	Study 2, group results . . . . .	128

49	BA1 graphs: group data, study 2 . . . . .	129
50	BA1 graphs: all subject data, study 2 . . . . .	130
51	SPM for subject 1, study 3 . . . . .	137
52	BA1 graphs: subject 1, study 3 . . . . .	138
53	BA1 graphs: subject 2, study 3 . . . . .	139
54	BA1 graphs: subject 3, study 3 . . . . .	140
55	BA1 graphs: subject 4, study 3 . . . . .	141
56	BA1 graphs: subject 5, study 3 . . . . .	142
57	BA1 graphs: subject 6, study 3 . . . . .	143
58	BA1 graphs: subject 7, study 3 . . . . .	144
59	BA1 graphs: subject 8, study 3 . . . . .	145
60	BA1 graphs: all subject data, study 3 . . . . .	146
61	SPM for subject 1, study 4 . . . . .	151
62	BA1 graphs: subjects 1 and 2, study 4 . . . . .	152
63	BA1 graphs: subjects 3 and 4, study 4 . . . . .	153
64	BA1 graphs: subjects 5 and 6, study 4 . . . . .	154
65	BA1 graphs: subjects 7 and 8, study 4 . . . . .	155
66	BA1 graphs: all subject data, study 4 . . . . .	156
67	SPM for patient 3, study 5 . . . . .	170
68	SPM for patient 3, study 5 . . . . .	171
69	BA1 graphs: patient 1, study 5 . . . . .	172
70	BA1 graphs: patient 1, study 5 . . . . .	173
71	BA1 graphs: patient 2, study 5 . . . . .	174
72	BA1 graphs: patient 2, study 5 . . . . .	175
73	BA1 graphs: patient 3, study 5 . . . . .	176
74	BA1 graphs: patient 3, study 5 . . . . .	177
75	BA1 graphs: patient 4, study 5 . . . . .	178
76	BA1 graphs: patient 4, study 5 . . . . .	179
77	BA1 graphs: control 1, study 5 . . . . .	180
78	BA1 graphs: control 2, study 5 . . . . .	181

79	BA1 graphs: control 3, study 5 . . . . .	182
80	BA1 graphs: control 4, study 5 . . . . .	183
81	Study 5, patient group results . . . . .	184
82	Study 5, patient group results . . . . .	185
83	BA1 graphs: patient group data, study 5 . . . . .	186
84	BA1 graphs: patient group data, study 5 . . . . .	187
85	Study 5, control group results . . . . .	188
86	BA1 graphs: control group data, study 5 . . . . .	189
87	BA1 graphs: all subject data, study 5 . . . . .	190
88	BA1 graphs: other somatosensory studies . . . . .	194
89	BA1 graph: all non-patient data . . . . .	196
90	Five finger stimulator . . . . .	205

# List of Tables

1	Coordinates of SI . . . . .	8
2	Coordinates of SII . . . . .	9
3	CRPS disease symptoms . . . . .	34
4	Patient details for vibrotactile test . . . . .	80
5	FMRI parameters used in studies 1 - 5 . . . . .	81
6	Volunteers from studies 1 and 2 . . . . .	82
7	Volunteers from studies 3 and 4 . . . . .	85
8	Patient volunteers for study 5 . . . . .	91
9	Patient control volunteers for study 5 . . . . .	92
10	Summary of procedures for studies 1 to 5 . . . . .	96
11	Highest T-scores for SI and SII activations in study 1 . . . . .	99
12	Euclidean separations from study 1 . . . . .	101
13	Group SI activations from study 1 . . . . .	102
14	Highest T-scores for SI and SII activations in study 2 . . . . .	115
15	Euclidean separations from study 2 . . . . .	117
16	Group SI activations from study 2 . . . . .	118
17	Highest T-scores for SI and SII activations in study 3, 12 minutes . . . . .	132
18	Euclidean separations from study 3 . . . . .	134
19	Highest T-scores for SI and SII activations in study 3, 20 minutes . . . . .	135
20	Highest T-scores for SI and SII activations in study 4 . . . . .	148
21	Euclidean separations from study 4 . . . . .	150

22	Highest T-scores for SI and SII activations in study 5 . . . . .	159
23	Highest T-scores for SI and SII activations in study 5 . . . . .	160
24	Highest T-scores for SI and SII activations in study 5 . . . . .	161
25	Largest cluster sizes from study 5 . . . . .	164
26	Euclidean separations from study 5 . . . . .	166
27	Group SI activations from study 5 . . . . .	168
28	Surface Euclidean separations from study 5 . . . . .	202
29	Statistics of the SI activations for study 1 . . . . .	237
30	Cont. . . . .	238
31	Cont. . . . .	239
32	Cont. . . . .	240
33	Cont. . . . .	241
34	Cont. . . . .	242
35	Cont. . . . .	243
36	Cont. . . . .	244
37	Statistics of the SI activations for study 2 . . . . .	246
38	Cont. . . . .	247
39	Cont. . . . .	248
40	Cont. . . . .	249
41	Cont. . . . .	250
42	Statistics of the SI activations for study 3, 12 minutes . . . . .	252
43	Cont. . . . .	253
44	Cont. . . . .	254
45	Cont. . . . .	255
46	Cont. . . . .	256
47	Statistics of the SI activations for study 3, 20 minutes . . . . .	258
48	Cont. . . . .	259
49	Cont. . . . .	260
50	Cont. . . . .	261

51	Cont. . . . .	262
52	Statistics of the SI activations for study 4 . . . . .	264
53	Cont. . . . .	265
54	Cont. . . . .	266
55	Cont. . . . .	267
56	Cont. . . . .	268
57	Statistics of the SI activations for study 5 . . . . .	270
58	Cont. . . . .	271
59	Cont. . . . .	272
60	Cont. . . . .	273
61	Cont. . . . .	274
62	Cont. . . . .	275
63	Cont. . . . .	277
64	Cont. . . . .	278
65	Cont. . . . .	279
66	Cont. . . . .	280
67	Cont. . . . .	281
68	Cont. . . . .	282
69	Cont. . . . .	284
70	Cont. . . . .	285
71	Cont. . . . .	286
72	Cont. . . . .	287
73	Cont. . . . .	288

# Abstract

Functional MRI was used to detect brain activations in the primary somatosensory cortex (SI) in response to a vibrotactile stimulus applied to the thumb (D1) and little finger (D5) of the right (R) and left (L) hands. Four studies were carried out with healthy subjects in order to determine the scanning and stimulation protocols that resulted in consistent and robust SI activity. It was found that a strong stimulus, compared to a weak stimulus, led to the SI activity being detected more frequently and at a more statistically significant level. Also, extending the scanning duration per digit further increased the T-scores.

The SI activations for each digit showed multiple foci and were distributed throughout the SI area. However, a clustering occurred in separate centres for stimulation to RD1 and RD5 near the Brodmann area 1/Brodmann area 3 boundary. The Euclidean separations of the cortical digit representations for LD1-D5 and RD1-D5 were calculated on the basis of the ‘centre of mass’ of the multiple activations. Observed separations ranged between 1.2 mm to 22.8 mm.

A further vibrotactile fMRI study was carried out involving patients with complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS). It has been suggested an altered central processing mechanism is involved in the disease, possibly due to cortical reorganisation in the sensory/motor cortices. The most efficient experimental protocols from the healthy subject studies were used to determine if these cortical differences were present in four patients. Data were acquired over two scanning sessions, approximately four months apart. The study revealed multiple SI foci and overlapping between the digits in both the healthy and CRPS hands, similar to those observed in the first studies. Larger SI activations were detected in one patient,

smaller SI activations were detected in another patient and two patients demonstrated cluster sizes in the normal range. The cluster sizes and the changes in size between the two scans suggest a correlation with the amount of pain experienced by the patients.

A general lack of consistency in the results from all the studies may be attributed to the difficulty of reliably detecting SI activity at a field strength of 1.5 T.



# Acknowledgements

Without the assistance of all the study participants this project would not have been possible and I'd like to say a big thank you to everyone, particularly the patients, who kindly gave up their time to take part.

I would also like to thank my supervisor in the department of Physics, Dr Summers for all his help and support over the past three years and, also, my supervisors in the department of Psychology, Dr Williams and Professor Hodgson, for all their assistance and support as well. Thank you to our collaborators Dr Haigh and Mr Peters at the Royal Devon and Exeter Hospital and Dr McCabe at Bath Royal National Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases for all their help, support and input to the project. I would also like to thank DAART for the financial support which allowed this project to be carried out.

Finally, a big thank you to my friends and family, particularly my Mum and Dad, for supporting me through the ups and downs of my PhD and being the understanding and wonderful people they are.