1	
2 3	Continuous pain report demonstrates time delay of pain ratings in Fibromyalgia
4 5	Anna Y Kharko ¹ , Stephen D Hall ¹ , Paul L Furlong ² , Matthew E Roser ¹
6 7	¹ Brain Research & Imaging Centre, Faculty of Health, University of Plymouth
8	² Aston Brain Centre, Faculty of Life & Health Sciences, Aston University
9	
10	Corresponding author
11 12	Anna Yurievna Kharko, Faculty of Health, 208 Link Building, University of Plymouth, Drake Circus, Plymouth PL4 8AA, UK.

13 Email: <u>anna.kharko@plymouth.ac.uk</u>

14

ABSTRACT

Background: Enhanced temporal summation (TS), measured through self-reported pain ratings, has been interpreted as indicative of central sensitisation in fibromyalgia. Greater TS in patients, however, has not been universally observed. It is also unclear whether increased pain report maintains beyond the TS period.

19 **Methods:** In this study, we measured TS through continuously reported pain ratings. 20 Fibromyalgia-diagnosed patients (n = 17) and matched pain-free controls (n = 13)21 rated painful transcutaneous electrical stimulation of various intensity levels in 18 22 one-minute-long blocks. Pain was rated on a 101-point visual analogue scale. The 23 resulting continuous response was divided into TS (< 15s) and adaptation (15 - 60s) 24 periods. Average pain values were extracted for each period alongside the timing of 25 key events such as maximal pain ratings. The difference in temporal summation and adaptation measures between fibromyalgia and control participants was analysed 26 27 using mixed-effects modelling.

Results: The average pain ratings for TS and adaptation periods were not significantly associated with fibromyalgia diagnosis but were with stimulation intensity. The same was true for the magnitude of the maximal rating during TS and the slope leading to that peak rating. The presence of fibromyalgia, however, did predict the time of the maximal TS rating, as well as the value and the time of the maximal adaptation rating.

Conclusions: Our study did not find homogeneously increased TS pain ratings. Instead, by utilising continuous pain data we demonstrate for the first time that the time of TS peak rating, as well as the magnitude and time of adaptation peak rating are linked to fibromyalgia diagnosis.

38

39 Keywords

40 fibromyalgia, temporal summation, continuous pain ratings, transcutaneous electrical

41 stimulation, pain, experimental pain, chronic pain

42 INTRODUCTION

43 Fibromyalgia (FM) is a chronic widespread pain condition of unknown aetiology, associated with disrupted sleep, fatigue and mild cognitive disturbances; resulting in 44 high emotional burden (Clauw, 2014). The high prevalence, 2% to 5% of the 45 46 population (Queiroz, 2013), and limited long-term success of symptom management 47 (Häuser et al., 2014), has put pressure on understanding the mechanisms that 48 underlie pain processing in FM. Allodynia and hyperalgesia, the key markers of FM 49 pain (Sluka & Clauw, 2016), have been attributed to deficient pain inhibition in the 50 central nervous system (CNS) (Meeus & Nijs, 2007), a phenomenon known as 51 central sensitisation. In psychophysical research, it has been studied through temporal summation (TS). 52

TS is the increase in reported pain in response to unremitting stimulation at a fixed frequency (Arendt-Nielsen et al., 2000). It is considered the behavioural counterpart of wind-up (WU), a central spinal mechanism where an increased excitation of dorsal horn neurons is observed following repeated engagement of Cfibres (Gebhart & Schmidt, 2013). While TS and WU are part of healthy nociception, both have been reported to be augmented in chronic pain conditions, such as FM (Staud, 2012).

The majority of observations on TS in FM come from a series of studies began by Staud and Price (Staud et al., 2001). They have reported that FM patients require lesser stimulation intensity than pain-free controls to produce similar TS pain ratings (Staud et al., 2003). Further, maintenance of TS required less stimulation in the FM cohort than control (Staud et al., 2004). Importantly, this pattern of increased TS in FM has been demonstrated across several stimulation modalities (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2000; Staud et al., 2003, 2014).

Greater TS in FM, however, is not a universally-observed phenomenon. Several studies report mixed results, in which increased TS in patients was contingent on stimulation location or modality (for review see O'Brien (2018). One study failed to find any deviancy in the clinical cohort (Lim et al., 2016). Part of this literature heterogeneity may stem from varying methods of TS elicitation and measurement. The conventional approach dictates deriving a measure based on comparison between a single pain rating and a later rating following repeated

3

stimulation at a frequency that evokes TS (Lim et al., 2016; Staud et al., 2001). Such a low rate of pain sampling provides a coarse measure of the *temporal* aspect of TS and does not show whether the enhanced pain perception maintains beyond the period of TS. The following period, here termed adaptation, is also a marker of WU and can be used to characterise central sensitisation (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2000) but has not yet been adopted in FM.

The conventional approach has limited utility. Firstly, the use of singular pain ratings does not capture the possible development of pain perception across a fixed interval. Secondly, the reporting of a single value from a point in time is likely subject to high measurement error and individual variation. Thirdly, the serial processes of summation and adaptation are likely to be conflated by use of a fixed measurement point and the temporal envelope of these processes overlooked.

Here, we describe the collection of continuous pain ratings, to address the limitations of single fixed pain reports. Continuous pain ratings, concurrent to stimulation, have been found to reliably reflect acute pain perception (Boormans et al., 2009; Wijk et al., 2013). In FM research, one study used continuous pain report but did not analyse the time property of the gathered pain data (Potvin et al., 2012). The extraction of key timepoints from TS and adaptation for comprehensive analysis of acute pain processing in the presence of FM is yet to be done.

To address this, we carried out a study with FM patients and pain-free controls using transcutaneous electrical stimulation (TES), a well-established method for eliciting TS (Arendt-Nielsen et al., 2000). We applied tonic single-pulse TES at individual-derived intensity levels and asked participants to rate their pain continuously on an automated visual analogue scale (VAS). We anticipated that time, a new property of the extracted data, will be the key measure to characterise TS in FM.

100

101 **METHODS**

102 2.1. Participants

Participants were recruited on the basis of several strict eligibility criteria (see
Table 1). Ethical permission was granted by the School of Psychology, University of
Plymouth (17/18-890).

106

107 Table 1. Eligibility Requirements for Participation

All Participants	
(a) Age	18 to 60 years
(b) No diagnosis of a CNS	Including infections (e.g. meningitis),
condition *	inflammatory diseases (e.g. multiple sclerosis),
	genetic conditions (e.g. Huntington's
	diseases), neurological conditions (e.g.
	autism), neurode-generative disorders (e.g.
	Parkinson's disease), or cancer.
(c) No diagnosis of a rheumatoid condition	E.g. lupus, rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis.
(d) No acute pain at time of testing	E.g. temporary pain from mechanical trauma.
(e) No contradiction for receiving	E.g. unexplained fainting spells, familial history
TES as dictated by equipment	of epilepsy or diagnosis of epilepsy, heart
manufacturer.	conditions, shunts, stents, or implantable
	devices.
(f) No intake of gabapentinoids or	Incidental intake of mild analgesics such as
prescribed analgesics in the	paracetamol or ibuprofen was allowed.
month preceding testing.	
(g) No caffeine and alcohol 24hrs	-
prior to testing.	

FM Patients

(a) A formal diagnosis of FM	Either by general practitioner or a
	rheumatologist.
(b) No other chronic pain	E.g. chronic nonspecific low back pain.
condition	

HC Participants

By gender, age, ethnicity, site of stimulation
nd time of the day testing slot.
1

CNS – central nervous system, FM – fibromyalgia, HC – healthy control. * Apart from FM diagnosis for patients.

Participant characteristics pertinent to the study were gathered. These included
 demographic data (gender, age, ethnicity, marital status and years in education), medical
 history (any formal diagnoses) and medication intake (at present and preceding month).

111 2.2. Psychological Testing

Presence or absence of FM was confirmed on the day of testing through the American College of Rheumatology Criteria from 1990, ACR '90, and 2010, ACR '10 (Wolfe et al., 1990, 2010). The latter were scored considering the redactions from 2016 (Wolfe et al., 2016). Recent pain history was assessed through the Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire, SF-MPQ (Melzack, 1987).

117 2.3. Psychophysical Testing

118 All psychophysical testing was performed on the skin over the sural nerve at 119 lateral border of tendo-Achilles. The testing setup can be seen in Figure 1. Body side 120 was counterbalanced between participants. The area was to be free of skin damage, 121 tattoos, and hair. Prior to placing electrodes, the stimulation site was cleaned with an 122 abrasive gel followed by 70% isopropyl alcohol. Two disposable 2 cm self-adhesive 123 disk electrodes were then positioned with inter-electrode distance of 3 cm. Impedance was checked by D175 impedance meter (Digimeter Ltd., United 124 125 Kingdom) and was maintained below 50 kohm.



127 Figure 1. Experimental Setup. A. Equipment setup; B. Study stages; C. Acquired measures 128 at each study stage. VAS - visual analogue scale; TES - transcutaneous electrical stimulator; ACR'90/'10 - American College of Rheumatology Criteria for fibromyalgia 129 130 diagnosis from 1990 and 2010; SF-MPQ - Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire; STHR sensory threshold; PTHR - pain threshold; PTOL - pain tolerance; PRAN - pain range; 131 132 TS/Aµ - average pain rating during temporal summation/adaptation; TS/Amax - maximal 133 pain rating during TS/A: Amin – minimal pain rating during A. Stimulator image is supplied by 134 manufacturer (Digitimer Ltd., UK) and sitting position image from Dimensions.Guide. 135 Reproduced from respective sources with permission.

136

Stimulation Parameters. Stimulation was delivered by a constant current stimulator DS7AH Digitimer (Digitimer Ltd., UK). The equipment was operated semiautomatically by the same experimenter: a computer maintained the frequency while the experimenter adjusted the intensity. Stimulation was a single-square wave pulse of 500 µs duration, with maximum of 400V for the output.

Psychophysical Measures. To derive participant-specific stimulation levels, static quantitative sensory testing (QST) was first performed. Three psychophysical measures were collected: innocuous stimulus detection (ISD), pain threshold (PTHR), and pain tolerance (PTOL). ISD was the first instance of any sensation at the site of stimulation. PTHR was the first instance of stimulation being perceived as painful. PTOL was the first instance of participant indicating that they no longer wish

to experience the next stimulation level increase. At each point, participants
 described the sensation to ensure understanding of instructions. Static QST was
 performed three times and each measure was defined as the average from these.

At the start of stimulation, the current was set at 0 mA and then increases in 0.1 mA increments. Stimulation was delivered manually by experimenter at an approximate interval of 1 s to prevent adaptation. Maximal current intensity was predetermined to be 40 mA. If PTOL was not established prior to that, the stimulation was stopped. If more runs were left, the procedure was restarted. If during all runs the limit was reached, it was deemed that a participant's pain tolerance was not established, and they were excluded from further participation.

At the end of the procedure a secondary psychophysical measure was derived: pain range (PRAN), which was determined as the difference between pain threshold and tolerance (PTOL – PTHR = PR).

161 **2.4. Continuous Pain Testing**

162 **Stimulation Conditions.** There were six stimulation levels 10%PRAN, 163 20%PRAN, 30%PRAN, 40%PRAN, 50%PRAN, and 60%PRAN, calculated as PTHR 164 + (PRAN x %/100). Each stimulation intensity was delivered three times, resulting in 165 18 experimental blocks, presented in a computer-randomised order. Short breaks 166 (no more than 1 min) were available between each block, with mandatory longer 167 breaks after the 6th and 12th blocks (no more than 5 min).

Stimulation Parameters. During continuous pain testing, stimulation protocol was adjusted to elicit TS. The current remained as single-wave pulses with 500 µs duration and up to 50 V. Instead of manual stimuli delivery, a computer maintained a 2.5 Hz frequency. Current intensity was dictated by stimulation condition and was thus always within acceptable to the participant range. The experimenter was responsible for the manual adjustment of intensity and did so before each block, without the awareness of the participant.

175 **Continuous Pain Rating.** To continuously reassess pain, a pain visual 176 analogue scale (VAS) was used. The scale ranged from '0' to '100', with major ticks 177 at every tenth mark. On the scale '0' was no pain, '1' was minimal pain, and '100' 178 was the worst pain imaginable. Participants were instructed to constantly rate the

experienced pain for the duration of the stimulation block. If other pain was present, which was the case for the clinical cohort, participants were to exclude it from the rating.

The rating was provided using a proprietary response device fitted with an Arduino Genuino (Arduino LLC) and a rotary button. By adjusting the rotation of the button, participants adjusted a sliding marker on the VAS. It is the position of that marker that was constantly resampled every 200 ms.

186 **2.5. Analysis**

187 Analysis was carried out in RStudio (v. 1.0.136).

Participant characteristics were summarised through average values and standard deviation (*SD*). Group differences were assessed through separate Student's t-tests (two-tailed, with post-hoc Bonferroni correction) where appropriate.

Psychological Testing. Cumulative and subsection questionnaire scores were
 summarised as average values and SD. Student's t-test (two-tailed) was used to
 compare cohorts on all forms.

Psychophysical Testing. STHR, PTHR and PTOL were calculated as the mean of each of the three recorded measurements. The average of each values was compared between groups through a Student's t-test (two-tailed, with post-hoc Bonferroni correction). Group level mean, SD, and range were used to describe psychophysical values. The same procedure was repeated for stimulation conditions.

199 **Continuous Pain Testing.** To assess whether the presence of FM diagnosis 200 was related to increased average and continuous pain ratings, key events and 201 timepoints were extracted from the data for analysis. Figure 1, panel A) shows a 202 prototypical pain response with measures of interest. First the response was broken 203 into period of TS (0 to 15 s) and period of adaptation (15 s to 60 s). An average pain 204 rating was calculated for each period (**TS** μ and **A** μ) to assess the overall pain rating 205 for that period. Then maximal pain ratings were then extracted for each period 206 (TSmax and Amax). Both value and time were recorded for each, resulting in the 207 variables TSmax-v, TSmax-t, Amax-v, Amax-t. Lastly, for the TS period we 208 calculated the slope from start of response to TSmax (TSm) to quantify the time 209 needed to reach maximal rating during TS.

210 To analyse what factors predict the measures we used mixed-effect modelling. 211 Separate models were created for each of the seven outcome variables. Predictors' 212 inclusion was predetermined based on relevancy to hypotheses. Group (FM vs HC) 213 was entered as a fixed factor to determine whether the presence of a diagnosis is 214 associated with an increase in pain measures. Stimulation (stimulation intensity in 215 mA) was entered as a fixed factor to account for the mediating effects of stimulation 216 intensity. And finally, Participant was entered as a random effect, to account for 217 individual variance.

Model syntax was guided by protocol described elsewhere (Brysbaert & Stevens, 2018; Matuschek et al., 2017), suitable for minimising Type I error in small samples. Sample size was estimated through power simulations following an established method (Green & MacLeoud, 2016). A Kenward-Roger approximation was calculated for each fixed covariate, with the goal of observing \geq 80% power for effect size .5.

224

225 **RESULTS**

226 33 participants met all eligibility requirements. Three participants from the 227 control cohort were unable to complete the experiment due to failure to establish 228 PTOL, thus leaving a sample of 30 participants. 17 were FM participants and 13 229 were pain-free controls.

230 3.1. Participants & Psychological Testing

All participants were Caucasian females. No significant differences were found between samples on individual characteristics (see Table 2). Psychological testing did find that the FM sample experienced more pain due to their condition in the week preceding testing.

- 235
- 236
- 237
- 238

	M	Mean (SD)	
	FM	НС	μ-vaiue
Age (n years)	35.35 (11.9)	35.7 (12.84)	.941
Education (n years)	17.88 (2.23)	18.46 (2.3)	.492
Marital Status (n married) ^a	9 (53%)	4 (31%)	-
FM diagnosis duration (years)	3.63 (3.13)	-	-
FM symptoms duration (years)	10.04 (7.98)	-	-
Medication in the last 30 day *	17 (100%)	4 (31%)	-
Analgesics ^{a b}	12 (71%)	3 (18%)	-
Anticonvulsants ^a	1 (6%)	-	-
Antidepressants ^a	10 (59%)	1 (8%)	-
ACR'90			
Widespread Pain	7.76 (.75)	.15 (.38)	< .001 ***
Tender Points	14.24 (2.49)	.31 (.63)	< .001 ***
ACR'10			
Widespread Pain Index	13.88 (3.18)	1.54 (1.44)	< .001 ***
Somatic Symptoms Severity	7.65 (1.58)	1.92 (2.22)	< .001 ***
Other Somatic Symptoms	2.06 (.56)	1.08 (.64)	< .001 ***
SF-MPQ			
Pain Descriptors	24.77 (7.4)	2.85 (2.61)	< .001 ***
Visual Analog Scale	6.65 (1.37)	1.15 (.8)	< .001 ***
Present Pain Intensity	3 (1.23)	-	-

239 Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Participants Samples & Psychological Testing

240 SD – standard deviation, FM – fibromyalgia group, HC – healthy control group.P-values

241 were calculated using Student's t-test. Post-hoc Bonferroni correction indicated corrected p-

value of < .006.

- ^a Number and percentage calculated.
- ^b Analgesics included mild over the counter medication.
- 245 *** Statistically significant.

246 3.2. Psychophysical Testing

No significant group differences were observed for STHR and PTHR (see Table
3). Both PTOL and PRAN were significantly higher in the clinical sample, just as all
stimulation levels.

	FM		НС		n voluo
	Mean (SD)	Range	Mean (SD)	Range	_ p-value
STHR	1.38 (0.49)	.73 – 2.3	1.5 (0.33)	1 – 1.97	.427
PTHR	4.71 (2.83)	1.97 – 13.17	6.57 (3.62)	2.43 – 13.9	.124
PTOL	11.82 (7.85)	5.3 - 34.33	22.14 (9.75)	9.33 – 38.9	.003 ***
PRAN	7.11 (5.7)	2.53 – 24.5	15.57 (8.22)	5.6 – 27.5	.002 ***
10% PRAN	5.42 (3.23)	2.3 – 14.69	8.13 (3.89)	3.12 – 16.37	.047
20% PRAN	6.13 (3.67)	2.7 – 16.22	9.68 (4.32)	3.81 – 18.87	.022
30% PRAN	6.84 (4.15)	3 – 17.75	11.24 (4.84)	4.5 – 21.37	.012
40% PRAN	7.55 (4.65)	3.3 – 19.63	12.8 (5.44)	5.19 – 23.87	.008
50% PRAN	8.27 (5.16)	3.7 – 22.08	14.35 (6.09)	5.88 – 26.37	.006
60%PRAN	8.98 (5.69)	4 – 24.53	15.91 (6.78)	6.57 – 28.87	.005 ***

250 Table 3. Average Values (mA) for Psychophysical Measures & Stimulation Levels

SD – standard deviation, FM – fibromyalgia group, HC – healthy controls group, STHR –
 sensory threshold, PTHR – pain threshold, PTOL – pain tolerance, PRAN – pain range. P values were calculated using Student's t-test. Post-hoc Bonferroni correction indicated

corrected p-value of < .005.

255 *** Statistically significant.

256

257 3.3. Continuous Pain Testing

The best mixed-fixed effects model for all measures had the following formula:

259

~ Group + Stimulation + (1 + Stimulation | Participant)

A full model summary can be found in Supplementary Material 1. Analysis of

TS μ showed that it is significantly associated with Stimulation (*Coeff.* = 5.56, *SE* =

262 6.52, t = 7.14, p < .001) but not Group (*Coeff.* = 10.64, *SE* = 6.52, t = 1.63, p = .110),

indicating that an increase in stimulus intensity was reflected in the average rating for

the period, unlike the presence of diagnosis. Marginal means estimated based on

- that model show a trend for increased pain rating in FM group (see Table 4). This
- trend, however, was not statistically significant, a pattern that was repeated in the

subsequent analyses of TS pain measures.

Group	EMM	SE	95% Cl	
Gloup			Lower	Upper
ΤS μ				
HC	24.12	(6.49)	11.03	37.22
FM	34.76	(5.86)	22.94	46.59
TSmax.v				
HC	36.47	(9.61)	17.09	55.86
FM	50.51	(8.69)	32.98	68.03
TSmax.t *				
HC	7.38	(.98)	5.39	9.37
FM	10.56	(.91)	8.72	12.39
TSm				
HC	6.36	(.79)	4.74	7.97
FM	6.76	(.71)	5.32	8.2
Αμ		,		
HC	30.48	(9.61)	11.05	49.91
FM	50.52	(8.6)	33.15	67.88
Amax.v *				
HC	29.25	(9.3)	10.39	48.12
FM	59.05	(8.32)	42.22	75.88
Amax.t *				
HC	24.33	(3.31)	17.58	31.07
FM	36.81	(3.05)	30.66	42.97

268 Table 4. Estimated Marginal Means.

269 EMM – estimated marginal means, SE – standard error, CI – confidence interval.

* Significant (p < .05) group difference established in respective linear mixed-effects models.

271

The magnitude of the maximal TS pain rating (**TSmax.v**) was similarly

273 predicted by Stimulation (*Coeff.* = 7.81, SE = 1.08, t = 7.22, p < .001) but not the

274 Group (*Coeff.* = 14.03, *SE* = 9.53, *t* = 1.47, *p* = .152). The time when the maximal

rating was made (TSmax.t), however, was significantly associated both with

276 Stimulation (*Coeff.* = .51, *SE* = .09, *t* = 5.46, *p* < .001) and Group (*Coeff.* = 3.17, *SE*

277 = 1.23, t = 2.58, p = .016). Increase in stimulation slightly increased the time to the 278 peak rating. Separately, belonging to the FM cohort was associated with an 279 additional almost 3 s delay (see Table 4).

The slope from the start of the response to the maximal pain rating (**TSm**) was not related to Stimulation (*Coeff.* = .14, *SE* = .08, *t* = 1.8, *p* = .089) or Group (*Coeff.* = .41, *SE* = .98, *t* = .42, *p* = .681), suggesting that the slope did not differ on basis of stimulus intensity nor the presence of FM diagnosis.

The average pain rating during the period of adaptation ($A\mu$) significantly increased with Stimulation (*Coeff.* =8.15, *SE* = .98, *t* = 8.29, *p* < .001) but not Group (*Coeff.* = 20.04, *SE* = 10.6, *t* = 1.89, *p* = .069). As with TSµ, the trend exhibited by FM patients for higher average pain rating for the period did not reach statistical significance.

289 In contrast, the maximal rating made during adaptation (Amax.v) was sensitive 290 to both stimulation and presence of diagnosis. An increase of Stimulation intensity 291 was associated with an increase of reported pain (*Coeff.* = 7.96, SE = .97, t = 8.23, p 292 < .001). The FM Group additionally produced significantly higher maximal pain 293 ratings during adaptation (*Coeff.* = 29.8, SE = 10.87, t = 2.74, p = .011). The same 294 was true for the time the peak rating was made (Amax.t). Increased Stimulation 295 (Coeff. = 1.26, SE = .37, t = 3.41, p = .006) and belonging to the FM group (Coeff. = 12.49. SE = 4.1, t = 3.04, p = .005) predicted a delay in reaching that maximal rating. 296

297

298 **DISCUSSION**

Despite a large body of research reporting augmented TS in FM (O'Brien et al., 2018), several studies have failed to consistently achieve the same results (Lim et al., 2016; Potvin et al., 2012; Staud et al., 2008). To address this discrepancy, we adopted a different pain measurement approach, in which pain perception was assessed through continuously gathered pain ratings. Using it, we were able to analyse not only the value of a given pain rating but also the time it was made.

We found that FM was significantly associated with delays in reaching peak pain ratings during the periods of TS and adaptation. In contrast, only the magnitude of the maximal peak rating during adaptation differed significantly between cohorts.

308 The value of the peak TS rating was not significantly associated with diagnosis, and 309 neither was the slope to that peak. Average pain rating during TS and adaptation 310 were also not found to be significantly different between participant groups. The best 311 mixed-effects model for each measure included stimulation intensity as a factor. 312 Apart from the TS slope, all measures were found to be predicted by it. An increase 313 in stimulus intensity was mirrored by an increase in average pain ratings during TS 314 and adaptation, as well as magnitude and time of maximal ratings. Together, the 315 findings show that continuous pain report not only enabled the extraction of a new variable property but that it was this temporal property that was consistently 316 317 associated with the presence of FM diagnosis.

318 Although using the maximal pain rating in response to TS eliciting stimulation 319 has been the conventional approach to characterising central sensitisation in FM 320 (Staud et al., 2001), our study suggests that this may be only one of several markers 321 of deficient pain modulation. In previous studies, pain ratings were collected at 322 predetermined timepoints following a prolonged stimulation needed to elicit TS 323 (Staud et al., 2001). This both limited the measurement window and the number of 324 observations. In our study, we purposefully extended the pain rating collection time. 325 This gave us sufficient time to measure the TS part of the response, as well as to observe how participants adapt to pain post-TS. Let us consider both in succession. 326 327 First, the extended record enabled the flexible extraction of maximal TS rating. We 328 propose that it was this key change that allowed us to observe significant group 329 differences in the TS period. It may be that previous research, which was not 330 successful in finding augmented TS, measured peak TS rating too early, as our 331 results indicate that FM patients were slow in reaching their peak rating. That delay 332 is of particular importance when considered together with analysis of the later 333 adaptation period.

Extending data collection past the TS period was the second major advancement of our study. The conventional focus on TS as a method of quantifying centrally dysregulated pain modulation in FM had demotivated further inspection into *how* participants adapt to prolonged pain. This is different to studies where aftersensations to TS-inducing pain stimulation were studied (Banic et al., 2004). Here, we were interested to observe whether FM participants continue to rate their pain increasingly high, thus indicating sensitisation, or whether they would slowly

15

begin to habituate to it, evident in reduced pain ratings. The finding that maximal
adaptation rating was not only higher but reached later by the FM group suggests
that these participants continued to sensitise to the stimulation. The yet again
delayed peak further supports the idea of disrupted pain inhibition under FM (Sluka &
Clauw, 2016).

346 Our study also agreed with previous research that hyperalgesia is integral to the FM 347 pain profile (Nielsen & Henriksson, 2007). We chose to apply individually-derived 348 stimulation conditions in order to demonstrate the differences in sensitivity between 349 the participant cohorts. Despite the stimulation levels being calculated so that 350 comparable pain ratings are be observed between participants, this was not found. 351 For example, the 10% PRAN condition should have elicited pain ratings around the 352 10th mark on the VAS, regardless of which group the participant belonged to. As 353 could be seen in Figure 3, however, patients consistently provided ratings higher 354 than their pain-free counterparts. Further, the average stimulation values were lower 355 in the FM group, yet they still rated the evoked pain as higher than the control. 356 Together, this pattern of results suggests that hyperalgesia, a key marker of central 357 sensitisation, is present in FM.



358

359 Figure 3. Average Trajectory of Continuous Pain Ratings per Stimulation Condition.

360 VAS – visual analogue scale, PRAN – pain range; HC – healthy control; FM – fibromyalgia.

361

It is interesting that HC participants produced consistently lower ratings than those expected for the respective stimulation condition. Perhaps the trend is partially attributable to habituation. The ability to adjust to continuous mild nociceptive input is part of the CNS regulatory mechanisms. The failure to see a similar effect in FM participants further supports the theory of the CNS origin of the syndrome (Nielsen & Henriksson, 2007).

368 Limitations & Future Directions

Unlike other studies (Staud et al., 2005), we only examined continuous pain 369 370 report in response to TES. Research has shown that a comprehensive pain profile can only be achieved when testing pain perception through multiple stimulus 371 372 modalities (Hastie et al., 2005). In FM, employing a multidimensional pain testing protocol with continuous pain ratings would further clarify the role of time in the 373 augmented development of TS and adaptation. Further, the focus of the current 374 375 study were only behavioural markers of central sensitisation. It remains unclear how 376 does the subjective pain report connect to the physiological response. Although, TS 377 and adaptation are assumed to reflect underlying WU (Graven-Nielsen et al., 2000), 378 psychological modulators such as stress have been theorised to mediate self-379 reported pain at supraspinal level (Crettaz et al., 2013). A concurrent measurement 380 of both TS and WU is not only plausible due the common stimulation protocol but would also be useful in the clarification of their relationship and allow for further 381 382 investigation of psychological mediating factors. Lastly, while the benefits of 383 individually derived stimulation levels were evident, they do complicate data 384 interpretation. Here we calculated stimulation conditions using an individual's pain 385 range, which led us to deliver vastly different stimulation between cohorts. The 386 alternative approach where predetermined values are used may be adopted instead.

387 Conclusion

Continuous pain ratings of TES were simple to implement while rich in produced data. The newly extracted time property of the maximal pain ratings made during TS and adaptation were found to be reliable measures of differentiation between FM-diagnosed and pain-free cohorts. Analysis of the later pain response

- 392 period, adaptation, was also beneficial for the characterisation of central sensitisation
- in FM, and should be analysed alongside of TS in future investigations.

394

395 Acknowledgments

- The authors thank Carol Hambly, the organiser of a local Fibromyalgia Support
- 397 Group for her support in participant recruitment.
- 398

399 Disclosures

Anna Kharko received funding from the School of Psychology, University of Plymouth, to carry out the study. The grant provider had no input into the conduct of the study. The other authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

403 **References**

404	Arendt-Nielsen, L., Sonnenborg, F. A., & Andersen, O. K. (2000). Facilitation of the
405	withdrawal reflex by repeated transcutaneous electrical stimulation: An
406	experimental study on central integration in humans. <i>European Journal of</i>
407	<i>Applied Physiology</i> , <i>81</i> (3), 165–173. https://doi.org/10.1007/s004210050026
408	Banic, B., Petersen-Felix, S., Andersen, O. K., Radanov, B. P., Villiger, M. P.,
409	Arendt-Nielsen, L., & Curatolo, M. (2004). Evidence for spinal cord
410	hypersensitivity in chronic pain after whiplash injury and in fibromyalgia: <i>Pain</i> ,
411	<i>107</i> (1), 7–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2003.05.001
412	Boormans, E. M., van Kesteren, P. J., Perez, R. S., Brölmann, H. A., & Zuurmond,
413	W. W. (2009). Reliability of a Continuous Pain Score Meter: Real Time Pain
414	Measurement. <i>Pain Practice</i> , 9(2), 100–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-
415	2500.2009.00260.x
416	Brysbaert, M., & Stevens, M. (2018). Power Analysis and Effect Size in Mixed
417	Effects Models: A Tutorial. <i>Journal of Cognition</i> , <i>1</i> (1), 9.
418	https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.10
419	Clauw, D. J. (2014). Fibromyalgia: A Clinical Review. <i>JAMA</i> , <i>311</i> (15), 1547–1555.
420	https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.3266
421	Crettaz, B., Marziniak, M., Willeke, P., Young, P., Hellhammer, D., Stumpf, A., &
422	Burgmer, M. (2013). Stress-Induced Allodynia – Evidence of Increased Pain
423	Sensitivity in Healthy Humans and Patients with Chronic Pain after
424	Experimentally Induced Psychosocial Stress. <i>PLOS ONE</i> , <i>8</i> (8), e69460.
425	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0069460
426	Gebhart, G. F., & Schmidt, R. F. (Eds.). (2013). Wind-Up (Phenomenon). In
427	<i>Encyclopedia of Pain</i> (pp. 4267–4267). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-
428	3-642-28753-4_202471
429	Graven-Nielsen, T., Kendall, S. A., Henriksson, K. G., Bengtsson, M., SoÈrensen, J.,
430	Johnson, A., Gerdle, B., & Arendt-Nielsen, L. (2000). Ketamine reduces
431	muscle pain, temporal summation, and referred pain in fibromyalgia patients.
432	<i>Pain</i> , 9.
433 434 435	 Hastie, B. A., Riley, J. L., Robinson, M. E., Glover, T., Campbell, C. M., Staud, R., & Fillingim, R. B. (2005). Cluster analysis of multiple experimental pain modalities. <i>Pain</i>, <i>116</i>(3), 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2005.04.016
436 437 438	Häuser, W., Walitt, B., Fitzcharles, MA., & Sommer, C. (2014). Review of pharmacological therapies in fibromyalgia syndrome. <i>Arthritis Research & Therapy</i> , <i>16</i> (1), 201. https://doi.org/10.1186/ar4441
439	Lim, M., Roosink, M., Kim, J. S., Kim, H. W., Lee, E. B., Son, K. M., Kim, H. A., &
440	Chung, C. K. (2016). Augmented Pain Processing in Primary and Secondary
441	Somatosensory Cortex in Fibromyalgia: A Magnetoencephalography Study
442	Using Intra-Epidermal Electrical Stimulation. <i>PLOS ONE</i> , <i>11</i> (3), e0151776.
443	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151776

444	Matuschek, H., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., Baayen, H., & Bates, D. (2017). Balancing
445	Type I error and power in linear mixed models. <i>Journal of Memory and</i>
446	<i>Language</i> , <i>94</i> , 305–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2017.01.001
447	Meeus, M., & Nijs, J. (2007). Central sensitization: A biopsychosocial explanation for
448	chronic widespread pain in patients with fibromyalgia and chronic fatigue
449	syndrome. <i>Clinical Rheumatology</i> , 26(4), 465–473.
450	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10067-006-0433-9
451	Melzack, R. (1987). The short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire. <i>Pain, 30</i> (2), 191–197.
452	https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3959(87)91074-8
453	Nielsen, L. A., & Henriksson, K. G. (2007). Pathophysiological mechanisms in
454	chronic musculoskeletal pain (fibromyalgia): The role of central and peripheral
455	sensitization and pain disinhibition. <i>Best Practice & Research Clinical</i>
456	Rheumatology, <i>21</i> (3), 465–480. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.berh.2007.03.007
457	O'Brien, A. T., Deitos, A., Triñanes Pego, Y., Fregni, F., & Carrillo-de-la-Peña, M. T.
458	(2018). Defective Endogenous Pain Modulation in Fibromyalgia: A Meta-
459	Analysis of Temporal Summation and Conditioned Pain Modulation
460	Paradigms. <i>The Journal of Pain</i> , <i>19</i> (8), 819–836.
461	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2018.01.010
462	Potvin, S., Paul-Savoie, E., Morin, M., Bourgault, P., & Marchand, S. (2012).
463	Temporal Summation of Pain Is Not Amplified in a Large Proportion of
464	Fibromyalgia Patients. <i>Pain Research and Treatment</i> , 2012, 1–6.
465	https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/938595
466 467	Queiroz, L. P. (2013). Worldwide Epidemiology of Fibromyalgia. <i>Current Pain and Headache Reports</i> , <i>17</i> (8), 356. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11916-013-0356-5
468	Sluka, K. A., & Clauw, D. J. (2016). Neurobiology of fibromyalgia and chronic
469	widespread pain. <i>Neuroscience</i> , 338, 114–129.
470	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2016.06.006
471	Staud, R. (2012). Abnormal endogenous pain modulation is a shared characteristic
472	of many chronic pain conditions. <i>Expert Review of Neurotherapeutics</i> , 12(5),
473	577–585. https://doi.org/10.1586/ern.12.41
474 475 476	 Staud, R., Cannon, R. C., Mauderli, A. P., Robinson, M. E., Price, D. D., & Jr, C. J. V. (2003). Temporal summation of pain from mechanical stimulation of muscle tissue in normal controls and subjects with fibromyalgia syndrome. 10.
477 478 479 480	 Staud, R., Craggs, J. G., Perlstein, W. M., Robinson, M. E., & Price, D. D. (2008). Brain activity associated with slow temporal summation of C-fiber evoked pain in fibromyalgia patients and healthy controls. <i>European Journal of Pain</i>, 12(8), 1078–1089. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2008.02.002
481	Staud, R., Price, D. D., Robinson, M. E., Mauderli, A. P., & Vierck, C. J. (2004).
482	Maintenance of windup of second pain requires less frequent stimulation in
483	fibromyalgia patients compared to normal controls: <i>Pain</i> , <i>110</i> (3), 689–696.
484	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2004.05.009

485 486 487 488	 Staud, R., Vierck, C. J., Cannon, R. L., Mauderli, A. P., & Price, D. D. (2001). Abnormal sensitization and temporal summation of second pain (wind-up) in patients with fibromyalgia syndrome: <i>Pain</i>, <i>91</i>(1), 165–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3959(00)00432-2
489	Staud, R., Vierck, C. J., Robinson, M. E., & Price, D. D. (2005). Effects of the N-
490	methyl-D-aspartate receptor antagonist dextromethorphan on temporal
491	summation of pain are similar in fibromyalgia patients and normal control
492	subjects. <i>The Journal of Pain: Official Journal of the American Pain Society</i> ,
493	6(5), 323–332. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2005.01.357
494	Staud, R., Weyl, E. E., Riley, J. L., & Fillingim, R. B. (2014). Slow Temporal
495	Summation of Pain for Assessment of Central Pain Sensitivity and Clinical
496	Pain of Fibromyalgia Patients. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 9(2), e89086.
497	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0089086
498	Wijk, A. J. van, Lobbezoo, F., & Hoogstraten, J. (2013). Reliability and validity of a
499	continuous pain registration procedure. <i>European Journal of Pain</i> , <i>17</i> (3), 394–
500	401. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1532-2149.2012.00194.x
501 502 503 504 505	 Wolfe, F., Clauw, D. J., Fitzcharles, MA., Goldenberg, D. L., Häuser, W., Katz, R. L., Mease, P. J., Russell, A. S., Russell, I. J., & Walitt, B. (2016). 2016 Revisions to the 2010/2011 fibromyalgia diagnostic criteria. <i>Seminars in Arthritis and Rheumatism</i>, <i>46</i>(3), 319–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semarthrit.2016.08.012
506	 Wolfe, F., Clauw, D. J., Fitzcharles, MA., Goldenberg, D. L., Katz, R. S., Mease, P.,
507	Russell, A. S., Russell, I. J., Winfield, J. B., & Yunus, M. B. (2010). The
508	American College of Rheumatology Preliminary Diagnostic Criteria for
509	Fibromyalgia and Measurement of Symptom Severity. <i>Arthritis Care &</i>
510	Research, 62(5), 600–610. https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.20140
511 512 513 514 515 516	 Wolfe, F., Smythe, H. A., Yunus, M. B., Bennett, R. M., Bombardier, C., Goldenberg, D. L., Tugwell, P., Campbell, S. M., Abeles, M., Clark, P., Fam, A. G., Farber, S. J., Fiechtner, J. J., Franklin, C. M., Gatter, R. A., Hamaty, D., Lessard, J., Lichtbroun, A. S., Masi, A. T., Sheon, R. P. (1990). The american college of rheumatology 1990 criteria for the classification of fibromyalgia. <i>Arthritis & Rheumatism</i>, <i>33</i>(2), 160–172. https://doi.org/10.1002/art.1780330203
517	