



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](mailto: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. Larsen<sup>1</sup>, Thomas Graven-Nielsen<sup>1</sup>, Rogerio P. Hirata<sup>2</sup>,  
10 David Seminowicz<sup>3</sup>, Siobhan Schabrun<sup>4</sup>, Shellie A. Boudreau<sup>1\*</sup>  
11  
12  
13

14 <sup>1</sup> Center for Neuroplasticity and Pain (CNAP), SMI, Aalborg University, Aalborg

15 <sup>2</sup> SMI, Aalborg University, Aalborg

16  
17 <sup>3</sup> Department of Neural and Pain Sciences, University of Maryland, School of Dentistry,  
18 Baltimore, MD, 20201  
19

20  
21 <sup>4</sup> Neuroscience Research Australia, Randwick, NSW, Australia  
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

49 Center for Neuroplasticity and Pain (CNAP)  
50

51 SMI, Department of Health Science and Technology  
52

53 Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg University  
54

55 Fredrik Bajers Vej 7 D3, DK-9220 Aalborg, Denmark  
56

57 Phone: +45 9940 9829  
58

59 E-mail: sboudreau@hst.aau.dk  
60  
61  
62

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **ABSTRACT**

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 (Spielbege 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  
8 most commonly used words to describe the experimental pain were extracted.  
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 (D70<sup>2</sup>, Magstim Company,  
16 UK) was used to deliver monophasic TMS pulses supplied by a magnetic stimulator (Magstim  
17 BiStim<sup>2</sup>, 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<sub>1mV</sub>)  
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 ( $22.7 \pm 0.6$  years vs.  $22.9 \pm 0.6$  years,  $t(26) = -0.18$ ,  $p =$   
16  $0.86$ ), handedness (laterality quotient, TBT group:  $0.76 \pm 0.06$  vs. REST group:  $0.75 \pm 0.05$ ,  $t(26)$   
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  $\sim 1$  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  
20 The performance increase in target accuracy was similar for the TBT and REST group. This  
21 verifies that no additional learning occurred at PR+30 for the TBT group compared to the REST  
22 group, despite having performed the task for an additional 10 mins. This supports the notion that  
23 the TBT during pain can be considered a working memory task. The similar increase in target  
24 accuracy is plausibly due to the familiarization performance, where the two groups achieved a  
25 similar level of target accuracy during the 40 trials. The aim of the current study was to employ  
26 the TBT to influence M1 excitability indirectly by engaging the PMC and DLPFC (Owen et al.  
27 2005) and not induce learning per se. Since earlier research showed performance gains in N-back  
28 tasks (accuracy and reaction time) in response to facilitated DLPFC excitability by high-  
29 frequency rTMS (for review, see Brunoni and Vanderhasselt (2014)), the present findings support  
30 that a working memory task that engages the DLPFC, improves accuracy on targets, but  
31 corticomotor excitability remains unchanged. The increased accuracy from baseline to PR+30 is  
32 in agreement with earlier lines of evidence on motor learning, which demonstrated that  
33 performance still increases when motor practice is performed during pain (Boudreau et al. 2007;  
34 Lamothe et al. 2014; Bouffard et al. 2016; Mavromatis et al. 2017).  
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  
55  
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 2457(09)00519-7 [pii]  
8  
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 Schabrun SM, Burns E, Hodges PW (2015a) New Insight into the Time-Course of Motor and  
17 Sensory System Changes in Pain. *PLoS One* 10:e0142857. doi:  
18 10.1371/journal.pone.0142857  
19  
20 Schabrun SM, Elgueta-Cancino EL, Hodges PW (2017a) Smudging of the Motor Cortex Is  
21 Related to the Severity of Low Back Pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 42:1172–1178. doi:  
22 10.1097/BRS.0000000000000938  
23  
24 Schabrun SM, Hodges PW (2012) Muscle pain differentially modulates short interval  
25 intracortical inhibition and intracortical facilitation in primary motor cortex. *J Pain* 13:187–  
26 194. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2011.10.013  
27  
28 Schabrun SM, Hodges PW, Vicenzino B, et al (2015b) Novel adaptations in motor cortical maps:  
29 The relation to persistent elbow pain  
30  
31 Schabrun SM, Jones E, Kloster J, Hodges PW (2013) Temporal association between changes in  
32 primary sensory cortex and corticomotor output during muscle pain. *Neuroscience* 235:159–  
33 64. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2012.12.072  
34  
35 Schabrun SM, Palsson TS, Thapa T, Graven-Nielsen T (2017b) Movement Does Not Promote  
36 Recovery of Motor Output Following Acute Experimental Muscle Pain. *Pain Med* 1–7. doi:  
37 10.1093/pm/pnx099  
38  
39 Seminowicz DA, Davis KD (2007a) A re-examination of pain-cognition interactions:  
40 Implications for neuroimaging. *Pain* 130:8–13. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2007.03.036  
41  
42 Seminowicz DA, Davis KD (2007b) Interactions of pain intensity and cognitive load: The brain  
43 stays on task. *Cereb Cortex* 17:1412–1422. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhl052  
44  
45 Seminowicz DA, Mikulis DJ, Davis KD (2004) Cognitive modulation of pain-related brain  
46 responses depends on behavioral strategy. *Pain* 112:48–58. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2004.07.027  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 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 Takada M, Tokuno H, Nambu A, Inase M (1998) Corticostriatal projections from the somatic  
31 motor areas of the frontal cortex in the macaque monkey: Segregation versus overlap of  
32 input zones from the primary motor cortex, the supplementary motor area, and the premotor  
33 cortex. *Exp Brain Res* 120:114–128. doi: 10.1007/s002210050384  
34  
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 Tokuno H, Tanji J (1993) Input organization of the distal and proximal forelimb areas in the  
44 monkey primary motor cortex: a retrograde labeling study. *JCompNeurol* 333:199–209  
45  
46  
47 Tsao H, Danneels LA, Hodges PW (2011) ISSLS Prize Winner: smudging the motor brain in  
48 young adults with recurrent low back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 36:1721–1727. doi:  
49 10.1097/BRS.0b013e31821c4267  
50  
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









