

Unravelling the effect of experimental pain on the corticomotor system using transcranial magnetic stimulation and electroencephalography

Marylie Martel^{1,2}, Marie-Philippe Harvey^{1,2}, Francis Houde^{1,2}, Frédéric Balg^{1,3}, Philippe Goffaux^{1,3} and Guillaume Léonard^{1,2}

¹ Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, J1H 5N4; ² Research Centre on Aging, CIUSSS de l'Estrie-CHUS, Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, J1H 4C4; ³ Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, J1H 5N4

Abbreviated title: Effect of pain on the corticomotor system

Keywords: experimental pain; transcranial magnetic stimulation; recruitment curves; electroencephalography; corticospinal tract; functional connectivity

Research funding: This work was supported by a grant from Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Corresponding author:

Guillaume Léonard, P.T., Ph.D.
Research Centre on Aging
CIUSSS de l'Estrie-CHUS
1036, rue Belvédère Sud
Sherbrooke (Québec) J1H 4C4
Telephone: 819-780-2220, ext. 45246
Fax: 819-820-6864
Email: guillaume.leonard2@usherbrooke.ca

1 **Abstract**

2 The interaction between pain and the motor system is well-known. For instance, past studies
3 have shown that pain can alter corticomotor excitability and have deleterious effects on motor
4 learning. The aim of this study was to better understand the cortical mechanisms underlying the
5 interaction between pain and the motor system. Experimental pain was induced on 19 young
6 and healthy participants using capsaicin cream, applied on the middle volar part of the left
7 forearm. The effect of pain on brain activity and on the corticomotor system was assessed with
8 electroencephalography (EEG) and transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS), respectively.
9 Compared to baseline, resting state brain activity significantly increased after capsaicin
10 application in the central cuneus (theta frequency), left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (alpha
11 frequency), and left cuneus and right insula (beta frequency). A pain-evoked increase in the right
12 primary motor cortex (M1) activity was also observed (beta frequency), but only among
13 participants who showed a reduction in corticospinal output (as depicted by TMS recruitment
14 curves). These participants further showed greater beta M1-cuneus connectivity than the other
15 participants. These findings indicate that pain-evoked increases in M1 beta power are intimately
16 tied to changes in the corticospinal system, and provide evidence that beta M1-cuneus
17 connectivity is related to the corticomotor alterations induced by pain. The differential pattern
18 of response observed in our participants suggest that the effect of pain on the motor system is
19 variable from on individual to another; an observation that could have important clinical
20 implications for rehabilitation professionals working with pain patients.

21 **Introduction**

22 Pain is a rapidly growing area of research, and the last years have shown huge advancement in
23 our understanding of its neurophysiological process. The development of neuroimaging
24 techniques have led to the discovery that pain perception is intimately linked to the activation of
25 a complex cerebral network comprised, among other things, of the primary somatosensory
26 cortex (S1) and the secondary somatosensory cortex (S2), the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC)
27 and the insula (IC) (Apkarian et al., 2005, Forster and Handwerker, 2014, Nakata et al., 2014).

28

29 A few neuroimaging studies have also reported an increase in the activity of the primary motor
30 cortex (M1) in the presence of experimental pain (Apkarian et al., 2000, Tracey et al., 2000,
31 Burns et al., 2016). A few years ago, Stancák et al. demonstrated, using electroencephalography
32 (EEG), that the application of a short-lasting painful heat stimuli on the hand decreased the β
33 activity of the sensorimotor cortex (Stancák et al., 2007). Given the inhibitory role that β waves
34 have on the motor cortex (Pogosyan et al., 2009), the decrease in M1 β activity noted by Stancák
35 and colleagues suggests that the presence of a brief nociceptive stimulus could prime the motor
36 brain regions (reduction of the inhibition), possibly to facilitate motor withdrawal responses. As
37 pointed out, the results obtained by Stancák and colleagues were obtained following the
38 application of brief/escapable, nociceptive stimuli and it remains uncertain whether the same
39 pattern of results would be obtained with longer/unavoidable nociceptive stimulations.

40

41 The observations made with neuroimaging techniques are consistent with the results of studies
42 performed with transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS). TMS studies have shown that
43 experimental pain stimulation can alter the excitability of the corticomotor system (Farina et al.,
44 2001, Valeriani et al., 2001). However, contrary to the study by Stancák et al. (that suggest a

45 priming of the motor cortex in the presence of pain), TMS studies generally report reduced
46 corticospinal excitability following nociceptive stimuli (Boudreau et al., 2007, Mercier and
47 Leonard, 2011, Schabrun and Hodges, 2012, Schabrun et al., 2013, Rittig-Rasmussen et al.,
48 2014). Some researchers have suggested that these corticomotor effects could explain the
49 negative impact that pain can have on motor learning (Boudreau et al., 2007, Rittig-Rasmussen
50 et al., 2014). Supporting this are the results of Rittig-Rasmussen et al. (Rittig-Rasmussen et al.,
51 2014) who have observed that the change in corticospinal excitability (increased motor-evoked
52 potential [MEP] amplitudes) noted following upper trapezius training was completely blocked by
53 a hypertonic muscle saline injection, with the effect being apparent up to 7 days post-training.

54

55 Interestingly, several neuroimaging and neurostimulation studies have shown that patients
56 suffering from clinical pain conditions show changes in cortical representation at the M1 level.
57 For example, in patients suffering from complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS) and from
58 phantom limb pain, researchers have reported reduced cortical representation of the affected
59 limb (Karl et al., 2001, Krause et al., 2006). Although compelling, these studies remain
60 correlational and it is impossible to know if the neuroplastic changes in M1 are *directly* caused
61 by pain. The use of an experimental pain paradigm, in which the researchers can manipulate the
62 presence of pain, would make it possible to address this question and determine whether pain is
63 causally linked to corticomotor changes.

64

65 In this study, TMS and EEG were used concomitantly to better understand the effect of pain on
66 the motor system. More specifically, the objectives were to evaluate the effect of a
67 prolonged/inescapable nociceptive stimulation on TMS recruitment curves (a measure believed
68 to reflect the strength of the corticospinal projections (Devanne et al., 1997, Abbruzzese and

69 Trompetto, 2002)) and on the pattern of EEG activity of the motor brain regions. A second
70 objective was to determine if these potential changes in the TMS recruitment curve and EEG
71 activity could be related to changes in functional connectivity between M1 and other brain
72 regions implicated in the perception of pain.

73

74

75 **Materials and Methods**

76 *Participants*

77 Nineteen healthy, right handed adults (12 women and 7 men; mean age: 29 ± 7 years old)
78 participated in the study. To be included in the study, participants had to be aged over 18 years
79 and be pain-free (absence of painful health condition and no pain upon testing). For security
80 reasons, individuals with neurological disorders, metal implants in the skull, a pacemaker or
81 neurostimulator, epilepsy or pregnant were excluded from the study. Participants were asked to
82 refrain from consuming caffeine for six hours before testing, and tobacco products for two hours
83 before testing. The research protocol was approved by the ethics committee of the Research
84 Centre on Aging (Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada) and each participant provided informed written
85 consent before participating in the study.

86

87 *Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)*

88 Magnetic stimuli were delivered by a 70 mm figure-eight coil connected to a Magstim 200
89 (Magstim Co., Dyfed, UK). Participants sat in a comfortable chair and two Ag/AgCl surface
90 recording electrodes (1 cm² recording area) were positioned over their left first dorsal
91 interosseous (FDI) muscle to record motor-evoked potentials (MEP). Electromyographic signals,
92 elicited by the magnetic stimuli, were amplified and filtered (bandwidth, 200 Hz to 2 kHz) with a

93 CED 1902 amplifier (Cambridge Electronic Design Limited, Cambridge, UK), and digitized at a
94 sampling rate of 10 kHz using a Power 1401 mk II interface and Spike 2 software (version 7.10;
95 Cambridge Electronic Design Limited, Cambridge, UK).

96

97 With the coil held $\sim 45^\circ$ in the mid-sagittal plane, the approximate location of the FDI muscle on
98 the right hemisphere was explored in 1-cm step until reliable MEP could be evoked in the FDI.
99 The optimal location for eliciting MEP in the FDI was found (hotspot). This site was then marked
100 on the scalp of the participants with a marker to ensure consistent coil positioning. Throughout
101 the experiment, the experimenter frequently reassessed the coil position to ensure that it
102 remained over the optimal stimulation site. At this point, stimulations of varying intensities were
103 sent to determine the resting motor threshold (rMT), defined for each participant as the
104 minimal intensity of stimulation capable of eliciting MEPs of at least 50 μV in 50% of the trials
105 with the FDI at rest (no muscle contraction). Then, 4 blocks of 10 stimulations were provided
106 randomly to participants (delay between each stimulation = 5 to 8 sec), with the stimulation in
107 each block given at the same intensity (i.e., 90, 110, 130, and 150 % of rMT). The peak-to-peak
108 amplitude of MEP responses were measured off-line and averaged for each participant to derive
109 mean values. The slope of the recruitment curve (describing the relationship between MEP
110 amplitude and TMS intensity) was then calculated using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM)
111 (Roberts et al., 2010).

112

113 *Electroencephalography (EEG)*

114 EEG activity was recorded at rest using a 32-channel EEG acquisition system (Brain Products
115 GmbH, Munich, Germany) with electrodes positioned according to the international 10-20
116 system. Data were recorded at 500 Hz for 5 minutes in each condition using FCz reference and

117 keeping all electrode impedances below 5 k Ω . Eye blinks and motion artifacts were removed
118 from the data using independent component analysis (ICA) denoising (Brain Vision Analyzer,
119 Brain Products GmbH, Munich, Germany). Data were then re-referenced to the common
120 average.

121

122 For each participant, 15 non-overlapping, 2-second segments without artifacts were randomly
123 selected and decomposed in eight frequency bands: δ (delta: 1.5–4 Hz), θ (theta: 4–8 Hz), α_1
124 (alpha 1: 8–10 Hz), α_2 (alpha 2: 10–13 Hz), β_1 (beta 1: 13–21 Hz), β_2 (beta 2: 21–30 Hz), β_3 (beta
125 3: 30–60 Hz) and ω (omega > 60 Hz). For each segment, intracranial source current densities
126 were then computed using sLORETA software (Pascual-Marqui, 2002), yielding sources in 6239
127 5x5x5 mm³ cortical grey matter voxels in standard MNI space (Fonov et al., 2011). sLORETA
128 allows the localization of spatially distributed sources of activity without *a priori* on their
129 number, which is well suited in the context of pain (Apkarian et al., 2005, Tracey and Mantyh,
130 2007, Schweinhardt and Bushnell, 2010). Current density maps were then averaged across
131 segments for each subject and condition (i.e., baseline and pain condition).

132

133 *Capsaicin application*

134 After the evaluation of baseline TMS and EEG measures, experimental pain was induced by a 1%
135 capsaicin cream. More specifically, 0.06 ml of capsaicin was applied on the middle volar part of
136 the left forearm in a perimeter of 4 cm X 4 cm. Capsaicin-induced pain was evaluated by the
137 participants using a visual analogue scale (VAS; 0 = “no pain”, 10 = “the worst imaginable pain”),
138 every 5 minutes until the pain sensation stabilized (i.e., when participants rated same intensity
139 of pain in 2 consecutive VAS pain measures). Once the pain became stable, EEG and TMS
140 measures were assessed again (see Figure 1).

141

142 *Statistical analysis*

143 Paired-sample t-tests were used to determine if there was a difference between the baseline
144 and pain condition for the HLM values. Changes in current density power (EEG activity) between
145 the baseline and pain condition were assessed using paired-sample t-tests across subjects,
146 independently for each frequency band and each voxel. Statistical significance was assessed
147 through statistical nonparametric mapping using 5,000 randomizations to account for multiple
148 comparisons. A threshold on the t-statistic corresponding to $p < 0.05$ was used to uncover pain-
149 evoked activation maps and identify regions of the brain displaying changes in activity between
150 the rest and pain conditions.

151

152 Because the analyses revealed no consistent changes in TMS measures and EEG activity
153 between the baseline and pain condition (see results section), separate functional connectivity
154 analyses were conducted in participants who showed a reduction in corticospinal output and an
155 increase in M1 β activity (group 1), and in participants who did not (group 2). For each group,
156 linear lagged connectivity was assessed in the β band frequency using sLORETA software
157 between M1 (region of interest) and other brain regions in which an increase in activity was
158 observed during the pain condition. These functional connectivity analyses allowed us to
159 evaluate if the activation of M1 was related to an interaction with other brain structures also
160 activated in the presence of pain (Apkarian et al., 2000, Tracey et al., 2000).

161

162

163

164

165 **Results**

166 *Pain assessment*

167 Every participant experienced pain following capsaicin application (mean pain intensity = 4 ± 2).

168 On average, 42 minutes were required after capsaicin application before the pain stabilized.

169

170 *Effect of experimental pain on TMS recruitment curves*

171 TMS recruitment curves obtained before and after capsaicin application are presented in Figure

172 2. As can be seen from this figure, pain did not affect corticospinal output, as evidenced by the

173 comparable TMS recruitment curves obtained for the baseline and pain conditions. The absence

174 of difference between the two conditions was confirmed by the statistical analysis, with the

175 paired-sample t-test showing no difference in HLM slope values between the baseline and pain

176 condition ($p = 0.26$). Pearson correlational analyses showed that there were no relationships

177 between the change in the slope of the recruitment curve and the time needed for pain to reach

178 a plateau ($r = -0.02$; $p = 0.92$) and between the change in the slope of the recruitment curve and

179 the intensity of pain reported by the participants ($r = -0.21$; $p = 0.36$).

180

181 *Effect of experimental pain on brain activity*

182 Source localization analyses conducted to compare brain responses between the baseline and

183 pain condition revealed a significant increase in brain activity across the central cuneus ($x = 0$, $y =$

184 -85 , $z = 10$ at theta frequency), the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DFPLC) ($x = -45$, $y = 30$, $z =$

185 35 at alpha frequency), and the left cuneus ($x = -20$, $y = -90$, $z = 35$) and right insula ($x = 35$, $y = -5$,

186 $z = 20$ both at the beta frequency) while participants were in the pain condition (all $t_s > 4.40$,

187 corresponding to $p < 0.05$). No changes were noted in other brain regions, including M1 (all p -

188 values > 0.05).

189 *Between-group analyses*

190 Careful examination of the data revealed that about two thirds of the participants (n = 12)
191 showed a decrease in corticospinal output (reduced TMS recruitment curve slope) during the
192 pain condition while the other third (n = 7) showed an increase in corticospinal output
193 (increased TMS recruitment slope; see Figure 3 A, B and Figure 4). These observations brought
194 us to evaluate and to compare the changes in EEG brain activity and functional connectivity
195 between these two groups of participants.

196

197 The between-group analysis first revealed that, compared to participants who showed an
198 increase in corticospinal output, participants who showed a decrease in corticospinal output
199 also showed greater right M1 beta frequency activity (x= 35, y= -15, z=50; t = 4.69, p = 0.049) in
200 the “pain condition” (see Figure 5). Importantly, this group difference was absent at baseline (all
201 ts < 4.80, p > 0 .48). Between-group comparisons, looking at changes in EEG functional
202 connectivity, showed that, compared to participants who showed an increase in corticospinal
203 output, those who showed a decrease demonstrated greater pain-related beta M1-cuneus
204 connectivity (t = 3.58, p = 0.03). Again, these between group differences in beta M1-cuneus
205 connectivity were not found at baseline (t = 3.73, p = 0.73). No other connectivity change was
206 observed (all p-values > 0.05).

207

208

209 **Discussion**

210 The current study’s objective was to better understand the corticomotor changes induced by
211 pain. More specifically, we wanted to determine if a prolonged/inescapable nociceptive
212 stimulation pain, induced with a capsaicin cream, could modify TMS recruitment curves as well

213 as EEG activity of the motor cortex, and if these eventual alterations could be associated to
214 functional connectivity changes. Our analyses revealed that capsaicin pain produced variable
215 effects, with approximately two thirds of participants showing a reduced TMS recruitment curve
216 slope. Participants who showed this type of decrease also showed an increase in M1 β activity.

217

218 *Effect of pain on cortical representation and corticospinal output*

219 In the past years, many studies have revealed the presence of functional reorganizations in the
220 somatosensory and motor system of pain patients. For example, Krause et al. observed that
221 patients with complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS) had a smaller corticomotor representation
222 of the affected limb, compared to pain-free participants (Krause et al., 2006). Flor et al. reported
223 similar changes in the primary somatosensory cortex (S1) in people suffering from phantom pain
224 (Flor, 2003). Interestingly, researchers observed the presence of a positive correlation between
225 pain intensity and the amplitude of cortical reorganization in amputee patients, suggesting that
226 these neuroplastic changes could play an important role in the physiopathology of persistent
227 pain (Flor et al., 1995).

228

229 The idea that cortical reorganization could play an important role in the physiopathology of
230 chronic pain was reinforced by Maihofner et al. and Pleger et al., who observed a normalization
231 of the cortical changes in CRPS patients after treatment, once pain subsided (Maihofner et al.,
232 2004, Pleger et al., 2005). The results of Maihofner et al. and Pleger et al. support the idea that
233 pain could drive cortical reorganization; however, the ultimate way to confirm the presence of a
234 causal relationship between pain and cortical changes is to experimentally manipulate the
235 presence of pain, as it is the case in this study. Our results show that pain can, indeed, drive
236 changes in the corticomotor system, but that its effect is not uniform across all individuals.

237 Nevertheless, we must remember that the results obtained from experimental pain paradigm
238 cannot be directly generalized to clinical pain populations. It should also be noted that the effect
239 of pain on the motor system can vary depending on the duration of the painful stimulus (phasic
240 vs tonic pain), the submodality (deep vs superficial pain), and the location (proximal vs distal
241 pain) (Valeriani et al., 1999, Farina et al., 2001, Le Pera et al., 2001, Valeriani et al., 2001, Cheong
242 et al., 2003, Svensson et al., 2003, Mercier and Leonard, 2011). Replicating the present results
243 with different experimental pain paradigms and pursuing research in pain populations is
244 essential before any final conclusions can be made.

245

246 *Effect of pain on EEG activity of the motor cortex*

247 Several neuroimaging studies have shown that experimental pain can affect the activity of the
248 motor cortex (Apkarian et al., 2000, Tracey et al., 2000, Burns et al., 2016). For the most part,
249 these studies were done using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). Although useful –
250 in particular because of its ability to measure changes in deep areas of the brain – it is important
251 to remember that fMRI BOLD responses reflect changes in cerebral blood flow, cerebral blood
252 volume and cerebral metabolic rate of oxygen following neural activation (Fox and Raichle,
253 1986, Uludag et al., 2009, Attwell et al., 2010). As such, changes in BOLD can, at best, be related
254 to changes in neural activity and cannot be interpreted specifically in terms of excitatory
255 (increase in the activity of excitatory neurons) or inhibitory (increase in the activity of inhibitory
256 neurons) activity. Contrary to fMRI, EEG directly measures the neuroelectric activity of brain
257 cells, allowing a better characterization of neuronal changes (Aine, 1995). In this study, the EEG
258 analyses have revealed that the majority of participants showed increased contralateral M1 β
259 frequency activity during pain, suggesting that pain increases the inhibitory activity in this area
260 (Pogosyan et al., 2009). The biological reasons for these cortical changes remain hypothetical. A

261 possible explanation is that increased β activity could force the injured individual to limit his
262 movements, in order to promote healing. However, in certain cases, this inhibitory effect could
263 be detrimental, for example by interfering with motor learning and rehabilitation (Boudreau et
264 al., 2007, Bouffard et al., 2014).

265

266 In the past years, accumulating evidence stemming from paired-pulse TMS studies has
267 suggested that chronic pain populations display changes in GABA-mediated intracortical
268 inhibition (see for instance Parker et al. (2016) for a review). Perhaps the most compelling
269 observations are the ones made by Lefaucheur and colleagues (Lefaucheur et al., 2006). In this
270 study, Lefaucheur and colleagues observed that (1) neuropathic pain patients had reduced
271 intracortical inhibition, when compared to age-matched healthy controls, (2) application of high-
272 frequency (10 Hz) repetitive TMS (rTMS) in these pain patients increased intracortical inhibition,
273 and (3) there was a significant association between the extent of pain relief and the increase in
274 intracortical inhibition observed following the application of rTMS. Changes in GABA-mediated
275 intracortical inhibition ([SICI](#)) have also been documented with experimental pain paradigms
276 (Fierro et al., 2010, Schabrun and Hodges, 2012). Results from these studies indicate that the
277 effect of experimental pain on SICI may depend on the nature/location of the nociceptive
278 stimulus; while Fierro et al. (Fierro et al., 2010) observed reduced SICI following a topical
279 capsaicin application (superficial cutaneous pain), Schabrun & Hodges (Schabrun and Hodges,
280 2012) reported increased SICI following injection of a hypertonic saline solution (deep muscle
281 pain). Changes in intracortical facilitation (ICF) were also noted by Schabrun & Hodges (Schabrun
282 and Hodges, 2012), but not by Fierro et al. (Fierro et al., 2010). These findings help to better
283 understand the role played by intracortical circuits and remind researchers that the effect of

284 pain on the corticomotor system likely varies depending on the type of pain (clinical vs
285 experimental pain; deep vs superficial pain).

286

287 The increase in β power observed in the majority of our participants contrast with the results of
288 Stancák and colleagues, who showed that thermode induced pain *decreased* M1 β activity
289 (Stancák et al., 2007). This discrepancy could be explained by the fact that prolonged pain (e.g.
290 capsaicin) and brief pain (e.g. thermode) stimulation may foster the emergence of different
291 motor strategies. Whereas immobilization can be a successful strategy in the former case, this
292 same response could be detrimental in the second case, when it is possible for the individual to
293 remove the body part away from the painful stimuli. Decreasing β activity during
294 brief/escapable nociceptive stimulation could promote movement and help the individual avoid
295 potential threats.

296

297 Interestingly, associations between M1 β power and GABA concentration have been observed
298 by Baumgarten and colleagues (2016). Similarly, Farzan and colleagues (2013) noted that the
299 duration of the silent period (a TMS measure mediated by GABA receptors (Abbruzzese and
300 Trompetto, 2002, Jono et al., 2016)) is related to β oscillations. Taken together, these
301 observations suggest that the changes observed in corticospinal output in some of our
302 participants could be linked to changes in GABA activity.

303

304 *Effect of pain on other brain areas*

305 The EEG analysis revealed an increase of the activity of the insula, DFPLC and cuneus in the pain
306 condition in all participants, when compared to baseline. The role of the insula and DFPLC in
307 pain perception and modulation has been well documented in previous pain studies (Rainville et

308 al., 2000, Borckardt et al., 2007); however, the activation of the cuneus in the pain condition is
309 more unexpected. A previous study, from our research group, did suggest that a brain area
310 adjacent to the cuneus could play a significant role in the perception of pain (Goffaux et al.,
311 2014). In this past study, we observed that individuals who showed increased activity in the
312 precuneus in the presence of experimental pain also showed the promptest response to pain.
313 Traditionally linked to the treatment of visual information (Corbetta et al., 1995, Nobre et al.,
314 2003), the cuneus also plays an important role in the integration of sensory information, as well
315 as cognitive processes such as attention, learning and memory (Cabeza et al., 2002, Makino et
316 al., 2004).

317

318 The functional connectivity analyzes, done on the subgroup of participants for whom pain
319 reduced corticospinal output, further highlighted the potential role that the cuneus could play in
320 pain processes. These analyses have shown that the application of a capsaicin cream increases
321 the functional connectivity between the motor cortex and the cuneus in individuals who show a
322 reduced TMS recruitment curve slope. These results reinforce the role that the cuneus could
323 play as a significant brain area for the integration of sensory and attentional information. This
324 integrative function of the cuneus makes it an ideal cerebral structure, capable of modulating
325 the activity and organization of the motor cortex based on the ascending sensory information
326 and on the context in which the individual is placed and asked to interact.

327

328

329 **Limits**

330 The most important limit of this study probably relates to the inconsistent effect produced by
331 pain on the corticomotor system. Indeed, it should be reminded that the most compelling

332 findings (i.e., increased M1 β activity and reduced corticospinal output) were found in a
333 subsample of participants. Future studies need to be conducted to determine if these results
334 can be consistently reproduced and validate that the observed TMS and EEG changes are not
335 spurious effects only. An additional limitation concerns the absence of control group. Although
336 the TMS and EEG measures have been proven to be reliable (Cacchio et al., 2009, Cannon et al.,
337 2012, Ngomo et al., 2012), the addition of a control group would have been an important asset
338 for the study to document the stability of the TMS and EEG measures over time. Finally, it
339 should be noted that the effect of pain on TMS and EEG measures was investigated only once
340 (i.e., when pain stabilized). Again, futures studies, looking into the long-term effects are
341 warranted.

342

343 **Conclusion**

344 In conclusion, our results show that tonic experimental pain increases M1 β activity in certain
345 individuals, and that this increase in β activity is intimately tied to corticomotor and functional
346 connectivity changes. These observations remind us that the cerebrum works as an integrated
347 system of circuits and that certain brain areas, other than those classically involved in pain
348 perception and modulation can be affected by nociceptive stimulations. The differential pattern
349 of response observed in our participants suggest that the effect of pain on the motor system is
350 variable from on individual to another; an observation that could have important clinical
351 implications for rehabilitation professionals working with pain patients.

352 **Conflict of interest**

353 The authors have no conflict of interest to report.

354

355 **Acknowledgments**

356 The authors gratefully acknowledge Antoine Guillerand and Mathieu Hamel for their help with
357 data collection.

358

359 **Ethical approval**

360 All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the
361 ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964
362 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

363

364 **References**

- 365 Abbruzzese G, Trompetto C (2002) Clinical and research methods for evaluating cortical
366 excitability. *Journal of clinical neurophysiology : official publication of the American*
367 *Electroencephalographic Society* 19:307-321.
- 368 Aine CJ (1995) A conceptual overview and critique of functional neuroimaging techniques in
369 humans: I. MRI/fMRI and PET. *Critical reviews in neurobiology* 9:229-309.
- 370 Apkarian AV, Bushnell MC, Treede RD, Zubieta JK (2005) Human brain mechanisms of pain
371 perception and regulation in health and disease. *Eur J Pain* 9:463-484.
- 372 Apkarian AV, Gelnar PA, Krauss BR, Szeverenyi NM (2000) Cortical responses to thermal pain
373 depend on stimulus size: a functional MRI study. *J Neurophysiol* 83:3113-3122.
- 374 Attwell D, Buchan AM, Chrapak S, Lauritzen M, Macvicar BA, Newman EA (2010) Glial and
375 neuronal control of brain blood flow. *Nature* 468:232-243.
- 376 Baumgarten TJ, Oeltzschner G, Hoogenboom N, Wittsack HJ, Schnitzler A, Lange J (2016) Beta
377 Peak Frequencies at Rest Correlate with Endogenous GABA+/Cr Concentrations in
378 Sensorimotor Cortex Areas. *PLoS One* 11:e0156829.
- 379 Borckardt JJ, Smith AR, Reeves ST, Weinstein M, Kozel FA, Nahas Z, Shelley N, Branham RK,
380 Thomas KJ, George MS (2007) Fifteen minutes of left prefrontal repetitive transcranial
381 magnetic stimulation acutely increases thermal pain thresholds in healthy adults. *Pain*
382 *Res Manag* 12:287-290.
- 383 Boudreau S, Romaniello A, Wang K, Svensson P, Sessle BJ, Arendt-Nielsen L (2007) The effects of
384 intra-oral pain on motor cortex neuroplasticity associated with short-term novel tongue-
385 protrusion training in humans. *Pain* 132:169-178.
- 386 Bouffard J, Bouyer LJ, Roy JS, Mercier C (2014) Tonic pain experienced during locomotor training
387 impairs retention despite normal performance during acquisition. *J Neurosci* 34:9190-
388 9195.
- 389 Burns E, Chipchase LS, Schabrun SM (2016) Primary sensory and motor cortex function in
390 response to acute muscle pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Pain*
391 20:1203-1213.
- 392 Cabeza R, Dolcos F, Graham R, Nyberg L (2002) Similarities and differences in the neural
393 correlates of episodic memory retrieval and working memory. *Neuroimage* 16:317-330.
- 394 Cacchio A, Cimini N, Alosi P, Santilli V, Marrelli A (2009) Reliability of transcranial magnetic
395 stimulation-related measurements of tibialis anterior muscle in healthy subjects. *Clin*
396 *Neurophysiol* 120:414-419.
- 397 Cannon RL, Baldwin DR, Shaw TL, Diloreto DJ, Phillips SM, Scruggs AM, Riehl TC (2012) Reliability
398 of quantitative EEG (qEEG) measures and LORETA current source density at 30 days.
399 *Neurosci Lett* 518:27-31.
- 400 Cheong JY, Yoon TS, Lee SJ (2003) Evaluations of inhibitory effect on the motor cortex by
401 cutaneous pain via application of capsaicin. *ElectromyogrClin Neurophysiol* 43:203-210.
- 402 Corbetta M, Shulman GL, Miezin FM, Petersen SE (1995) Superior parietal cortex activation
403 during spatial attention shifts and visual feature conjunction. *Science* 270:802-805.
- 404 Devanne H, Lavoie BA, Capaday C (1997) Input-output properties and gain changes in the human
405 corticospinal pathway. *Experimental brain research* 114:329-338.
- 406 Farina S, Valeriani M, Rosso T, Aglioti S, Tamburin S, Fiaschi A, Tinazzi M (2001) Transient
407 inhibition of the human motor cortex by capsaicin-induced pain. A study with
408 transcranial magnetic stimulation. *NeurosciLett* 314:97-101.

409 Farzan F, Barr MS, Hoppenbrouwers SS, Fitzgerald PB, Chen R, Pascual-Leone A, Daskalakis ZJ
410 (2013) The EEG correlates of the TMS-induced EMG silent period in humans.
411 *Neuroimage* 83:120-134.

412 Fierro B, De Tommaso M, Giglia F, Giglia G, Palermo A, Brighina F (2010) Repetitive transcranial
413 magnetic stimulation (rTMS) of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) during
414 capsaicin-induced pain: modulatory effects on motor cortex excitability. *Experimental*
415 *brain research* 203:31-38.

416 Flor H (2003) Cortical reorganisation and chronic pain: implications for rehabilitation. *J Rehabil*
417 *Med* 66-72.

418 Flor H, Elbert T, Knecht S, Wienbruch C, Pantev C, Birbaumer N, Larbig W, Taub E (1995)
419 Phantom-limb pain as a perceptual correlate of cortical reorganization following arm
420 amputation. *Nature* 375:482-484.

421 Fonov V, Evans AC, Botteron K, Almli CR, McKinstry RC, Collins DL (2011) Unbiased average age-
422 appropriate atlases for pediatric studies. *Neuroimage* 54:313-327.

423 Forster C, Handwerker HO (2014) *Frontiers in Neuroscience*

424 Central Nervous Processing of Itch and Pain. In: *Itch: Mechanisms and Treatment*(Carstens, E.
425 and Akiyama, T., eds) Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press/Taylor & Francis FF(c) 2014 by
426 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

427 Fox PT, Raichle ME (1986) Focal physiological uncoupling of cerebral blood flow and oxidative
428 metabolism during somatosensory stimulation in human subjects. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S*
429 *A* 83:1140-1144.

430 Goffaux P, Girard-Tremblay L, Marchand S, Daigle K, Whittingstall K (2014) Individual differences
431 in pain sensitivity vary as a function of precuneus reactivity. *Brain topography* 27:366-
432 374.

433 Jono Y, Iwata Y, Mizusawa H, Hiraoka K (2016) Change in Excitability of Corticospinal Pathway
434 and GABA-Mediated Inhibitory Circuits of Primary Motor Cortex Induced by Contraction
435 of Adjacent Hand Muscle. *Brain topography*.

436 Karl A, Birbaumer N, Lutzenberger W, Cohen LG, Flor H (2001) Reorganization of motor and
437 somatosensory cortex in upper extremity amputees with phantom limb pain. *J Neurosci*
438 21:3609-3618.

439 Krause P, Forderreuther S, Straube A (2006) TMS motor cortical brain mapping in patients with
440 complex regional pain syndrome type I. *Clin Neurophysiol* 117:169-176.

441 Le Pera D, Graven-Nielsen T, Valeriani M, Oliviero A, Di Lazzaro V, Tonali PA, Arendt-Nielsen L
442 (2001) Inhibition of motor system excitability at cortical and spinal level by tonic muscle
443 pain. *Clin Neurophysiol* 112:1633-1641.

444 Lefaucheur JP, Drouot X, Menard-Lefaucheur I, Keravel Y, Nguyen JP (2006) Motor cortex rTMS
445 restores defective intracortical inhibition in chronic neuropathic pain. *Neurology*
446 67:1568-1574.

447 Maihofner C, Handwerker HO, Neundorfer B, Birklein F (2004) Cortical reorganization during
448 recovery from complex regional pain syndrome. *Neurology* 63:693-701.

449 Makino Y, Yokosawa K, Takeda Y, Kumada T (2004) Visual search and memory search engage
450 extensive overlapping cerebral cortices: an fMRI study. *Neuroimage* 23:525-533.

451 Mercier C, Leonard G (2011) Interactions between pain and the motor cortex: Insights from
452 research on phantom limb pain and complex regional pain syndrome. *Physiotherapy*
453 *Canada* 63:305-314.

454 Nakata H, Sakamoto K, Kakigi R (2014) Meditation reduces pain-related neural activity in the
455 anterior cingulate cortex, insula, secondary somatosensory cortex, and thalamus.
456 *Frontiers in psychology* 5:1489.

457 Ngomo S, Leonard G, Moffet H, Mercier C (2012) Comparison of transcranial magnetic
458 stimulation measures obtained at rest and under active conditions and their reliability.
459 *Journal of neuroscience methods* 205:65-71.

460 Nobre AC, Coull JT, Walsh V, Frith CD (2003) Brain activations during visual search: contributions
461 of search efficiency versus feature binding. *Neuroimage* 18:91-103.

462 Parker RS, Lewis GN, Rice DA, McNair PJ (2016) Is Motor Cortical Excitability Altered in People
463 with Chronic Pain? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Brain Stimul* 9:488-500.

464 Pascual-Marqui RD (2002) Standardized low-resolution brain electromagnetic tomography
465 (sLORETA): technical details. In: *Methods Find Exp Clin Pharmacol*, vol. 24 Suppl D, pp 5-
466 12 Spain.

467 Pleger B, Tegenthoff M, Ragert P, Forster AF, Dinse HR, Schwenkreis P, Nicolas V, Maier C (2005)
468 Sensorimotor retuning in complex regional pain syndrome parallels pain reduction.
469 *AnnNeurol* 57:425-429.

470 Pogosyan A, Gaynor LD, Eusebio A, Brown P (2009) Boosting cortical activity at Beta-band
471 frequencies slows movement in humans. *Current biology : CB* 19:1637-1641.

472 Rainville P, Duncan G, Bushnell M (2000) Représentation cérébrale de l'expérience subjective de
473 la douleur chez l'homme. *Médecine/sciences* 16:519-527.

474 Rittig-Rasmussen B, Kasch H, Fuglsang-Frederiksen A, Svensson P, Jensen TS (2014) The role of
475 neuroplasticity in experimental neck pain: a study of potential mechanisms impeding
476 clinical outcomes of training. *Man Ther* 19:288-293.

477 Roberts DR, Ramsey D, Johnson K, Kola J, Ricci R, Hicks C, Borckardt JJ, Bloomberg JJ, Epstein C,
478 George MS (2010) Cerebral cortex plasticity after 90 days of bed rest: data from TMS
479 and fMRI. *Aviation, space, and environmental medicine* 81:30-40.

480 Schabrun SM, Hodges PW (2012) Muscle pain differentially modulates short interval intracortical
481 inhibition and intracortical facilitation in primary motor cortex. *J Pain* 13:187-194.

482 Schabrun SM, Jones E, Kloster J, Hodges PW (2013) Temporal association between changes in
483 primary sensory cortex and corticomotor output during muscle pain. *Neuroscience*
484 235:159-164.

485 Schweinhardt P, Bushnell MC (2010) Pain imaging in health and disease--how far have we come?
486 *J Clin Invest* 120:3788-3797.

487 Stancák A, Poláček H, Vrána J, Mlyná J (2007) Cortical oscillatory changes during warming and
488 heating in humans. *Neuroscience* 147:842-852.

489 Svensson P, Miles TS, McKay D, Ridding MC (2003) Suppression of motor evoked potentials in a
490 hand muscle following prolonged painful stimulation. *EurJ Pain* 7:55-62.

491 Tracey I, Becerra L, Chang I, Breiter H, Jenkins L, Borsook D, Gonzalez RG (2000) Noxious hot and
492 cold stimulation produce common patterns of brain activation in humans: a functional
493 magnetic resonance imaging study. *Neurosci Lett* 288:159-162.

494 Tracey I, Mantyh PW (2007) The cerebral signature for pain perception and its modulation.
495 *Neuron* 55:377-391.

496 Uludag K, Muller-Bierl B, Ugurbil K (2009) An integrative model for neuronal activity-induced
497 signal changes for gradient and spin echo functional imaging. *Neuroimage* 48:150-165.

498 Valeriani M, Restuccia D, Di Lazzaro V, Oliviero A, Le Pera D, Profice P, Saturno E, Tonali P (2001)
499 Inhibition of biceps brachii muscle motor area by painful heat stimulation of the skin.
500 *ExpBrain Res* 139:168-172.

501 Valeriani M, Restuccia D, Di Lazzaro V, Oliviero A, Profice P, Le Pera D, Saturno E, Tonali P (1999)
502 Inhibition of the human primary motor area by painful heat stimulation of the skin. Clin
503 Neurophysiol 110:1475-1480.

504

505