

Autonomic Nervous System Markers of Music-Elicited Analgesia in People with Fibromyalgia: A Double-Blind Randomized Pilot Study

1 **Rebecca J. Lepping^{1*}, Miranda L. McMillan², Andrea L. Chadwick², Zaid M. Mansour³, Laura**
2 **E. Martin^{1,4,5}, Kathleen M. Gustafson^{1,6}**

3 ¹Hoglund Biomedical Imaging Center, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, USA

4 ²Department of Anesthesiology, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, USA

5 ³Department of Physical and Occupational Therapy, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

6 ⁴Department of Population Health, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, USA

7 ⁵Cofrin Logan Center for Addiction Research and Treatment, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS,
8 USA

9 ⁶Department of Neurology, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, USA

10 *** Correspondence:**

11 Rebecca J. Lepping, Ph.D.

12 rlepping@kumc.edu

13 **Keywords: pain₁, auditory distraction₂, quantitative sensory testing₃, music₄, nature sounds₅**

14

15 **Abstract**

16 **Purpose:** To investigate the feasibility of using music listening by adults with fibromyalgia (FM) as
17 a potential tool for reducing pain sensitivity.

18 **Patients and methods:** We report results from a double-blind two-arm parallel randomized pilot
19 study (NCT04059042) in 9 participants with FM. Pain tolerance and threshold were measured
20 objectively using quantitative sensory tests; autonomic nervous system (ANS) reactivity was
21 measured with electrocardiogram. Participants were randomized to listen to instrumental Western
22 Classical music or a nature sound control to test whether music listening elicits greater analgesic
23 effects over simple auditory distraction. Participants also completed separate control testing with no
24 sound that was counterbalanced between participants.

25 **Results:** Participants were randomized 1:1 to music or nature sounds (4 Music, 5 Nature). Although
26 the groups were not different on FM scores, the Music group had marginally worse pain summation
27 ($p=.09$) and tolerance ($p=.13$). The Nature group had higher Anxiety scores ($p<.05$). Outcome
28 measures showed a significant Group by Session interaction for pain tolerance ($p<.05$) revealing that
29 the Nature group had greater pain reduction during audio compared to silence, while the Music group
30 had no difference between sessions. No significant effects were observed for ANS testing. Within the
31 Music group, there was a trend of vagal response increase from baseline to music listening, but it did
32 not reach statistical significance; this pattern was not observed in the Nature group.

33 **Conclusion:** Auditory listening significantly altered pain responses. There may be greater vagal
34 response to music versus nature sounds, however, results could be due to group differences in pain
35 and anxiety. This line of study will help determine whether music could be prophylactic for people
36 with FM when acute pain is expected.
37

38 1 Introduction

39 The term “centralized pain” describes any central nervous system (CNS) dysfunction or
40 pathology that may contribute to the development or maintenance of chronic pain.(1-3) There is a
41 growing appreciation of the role of CNS augmentation of pain processing in many chronic pain
42 conditions.(2, 4) A hallmark of the centralized pain phenotype is the presence of hyperalgesia and
43 reduced or absent endogenous analgesia.(5-7) Data from quantitative sensory testing (QST) studies
44 suggest a wide, bell-shaped distribution in pain sensitivity across the general population. Most
45 individuals with centralized pain fall on the right side of this curve and have QST findings consistent
46 with hypersensitivity (hyperalgesia and allodynia).(1, 8-14) QST evidence of widespread
47 hypersensitivity is consistently observed in many chronic pain conditions, including FM, irritable
48 bowel syndrome, tension headache, low back pain, temporomandibular joint disorder, interstitial
49 cystitis, and vulvodynia.(15-25) In this study, we used QST to objectively measure pain sensitivity
50 while listening to music compared to listening to nature sounds, in patients with FM.

51 Music has been previously shown to influence parameters of the autonomic nervous system
52 associated with anxiety, (26) such as slowing heart rate and respiration.(27) Music listening can also
53 reduce acute pain during surgery,(28) post-operative recovery,(29) orthodontic procedures,(30) and
54 during thermic pain induction in healthy participants.(31) The *subjective* analgesic, anxiolytic, and
55 antidepressant effects of music for people with chronic pain were recently confirmed in a meta-
56 analysis.(32) However, the impact of music listening on objective measures of pain sensitivity in
57 patients with chronic pain has not yet been described. The goal of this pilot study was to understand
58 possible analgesic effects of music listening on objective measures of pain sensitivity in patients with
59 fibromyalgia (FM).

60 The analgesic effect of music is thought to occur through several mechanisms: Contextual,
61 Cognitive, Emotional, and Physiological.(33) First, music provides a predictable *context* that can
62 increase the listeners’ sense of control. This is further enhanced if the music is familiar, as this can
63 bring in other effects that are not related to aspects of music specifically, such as setting up
64 expectations and heightening nostalgia. Studies have shown the greatest analgesic effects when
65 music is selected by participants. Second, similar to other types of stimulation such as reading or
66 listening to nature sounds, (34) music can serve as a *cognitive* distraction and take attention away
67 from the painful stimulus. Third, music is a powerful inducer of *emotion*.(35, 36) Music that is
68 positive, liked by the listener, and low on arousal has the strongest analgesic effect.(31) Finally,
69 music listening interventions and music therapy have also been shown to reduce anxiety and
70 depression.(37, 38) The anxiolytic effect may be due to the *physiological* effect of music on the
71 parasympathetic nervous system, increasing the vagal response and reducing heart rate and
72 respiration rate.(26) Music also has effects on the brain directly, causing the release of endogenous
73 opioids and dopamine and activating areas of the descending pain modulatory system.(39, 40) The
74 specific musical characteristics that yield the greatest analgesic effects are difficult to pinpoint, as
75 there is not a standard for reporting. Meta-analyses have revealed that music with 60-80 beats per
76 minute, in a major key and without lyrics or percussion have the largest effects.(41)

77 Previous studies in patients with FM have shown that patients have reduced self-reported pain
78 and increased mobility after even a short, 10-minute music listening intervention. After listening to
79 music of their choice, participants were faster in a standard mobility assessment, the timed-up-and-go
80 task.(42) A second study using resting state functional magnetic resonance imaging confirmed the
81 impact of a 5-minute music listening intervention on the centralized descending pain modulatory
82 system (DPMS), identified as changes in functional connectivity between regions of the DPMS that
83 positively correlated with changes in pain scores.(43) Our study is the first to investigate whether
84 objectively measured pain sensitivity is reduced by music listening.

85 The goal of the current study was to identify whether music listening has a promising
86 analgesic effect during pain threshold and tolerance testing for patients with FM that supersedes any
87 effect of auditory distraction. We hypothesized that because the nature listening condition provides a
88 distraction from pain sensations, and may also provide some of the same Contextual, Cognitive,
89 Emotional, and Physiological impacts as Music, both listening conditions (Music and Nature) would
90 reduce pain sensitivity compared to testing during Silence. However, as noted previously, the
91 Emotional and Physiological impacts are anticipated to be stronger in Music due in part to temporal
92 structure and expectancy building, we therefore hypothesized that Music listening would reduce pain
93 sensitivity compared to Nature sounds. We further hypothesized that Music would increase vagal
94 input to the autonomic nervous system, decreasing heart rate and increasing heart rate variability
95 compared to both Silence and Nature sounds, and that analgesic responsiveness would be moderated
96 by symptoms of FM, anxiety, and depression.
97

98 **2 Material and methods**

99 **2.1 Trial Design**

100 This was a single center, two-arm parallel double-blind randomized controlled pilot study
101 conducted in the United States (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04059042). Participants with FM underwent
102 two testing sessions, one week apart: testing as usual with no-sound (Silence), and testing while
103 listening to instrumental Western Classical music, or nature sound control (Audio). Participants were
104 randomized 1:1 to the two arms (Music or Nature sounds), counterbalanced for session order. Study
105 data were collected and managed and randomization was implemented using REDCap electronic data
106 capture tools (44, 45) using a computer-generated random order for the four possible session orders
107 (Music/Silence, Silence/Music, Nature/Silence, Silence/Nature), and was stratified by gender.

108 **2.1.1 Changes to Trial Design**

109 The study was stopped early due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

110 **2.2 Participants**

111 Participants with a diagnosis of FM were recruited from pain clinics at a large Midwestern
112 US university medical center and by word of mouth. Eligible participants were 18 years or older, able
113 to read and speak English, willing to refrain from alcohol, nicotine, and physical activity or exercise
114 on the day of testing, and on a stable dose of adjunctive pain medications, including tricyclic
115 antidepressants, serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors, and gabapentinoids. Participants were
116 excluded if they were not able to provide written consent, were pregnant, had peripheral neuropathy
117 in the upper extremities, had severe physical impairment or co-morbid medical conditions such as
118 blindness, deafness, paraplegia, cancer, autoimmune disorder, liver failure or cirrhosis, hepatitis,
119 cardiovascular disease, illicit drug or opioid abuse, or average daily opioid dosing of >15 mg oral
120 morphine equivalents (e.g., > two 5 mg oxycodone tablets/day or > three 5 mg hydrocodone
121 tablets/day). Conversions were made based on well-accepted conversion tools.(46, 47)

122 **2.2.1 Study Setting**

123 The study was conducted at a research laboratory within the medical center campus. Data
124 were collected with participants seated in a small, quiet room across a small table from the
125 researcher.

126 **2.3 Procedures (Interventions)**

127 Participants in both arms had QST and electrocardiogram (ECG) testing on two separate days,
128 one week apart: baseline (Testing as Usual, Silence) and auditory listening (Music or Nature sounds),
129 counterbalanced across participants. After completing informed consent, participants were fitted with
130 ECG electrodes and were given instructions about the procedures. Participants were given noise-
131 cancelling headphones to wear during all testing procedures. The researcher wore ear plugs to remain
132 blinded to what the participant was hearing and communicated with the participant through written
133 instructions and gestures for the remainder of the test. After the electrodes and headphones were in
134 place, the researcher left the room and baseline ECG was recorded for five minutes while participants
135 sat quietly. The researcher returned to the room, started the specified audio track, and then left the
136 room for 10 minutes while participants sat quietly listening to the track. The researcher then returned
137 to the room for QST testing while the participant continued to listen to the audio track. Written
138 instruction reminders were provided to participants before each task. At the end of the first day of
139 testing, participants completed surveys electronically on a laptop through REDCap. (44, 45) After
140 completing all procedures on the second day of testing, participants were given \$100 for their time.

141 **2.3.1 Music and Sound Delivery**

142 Auditory stimuli were presented using a digital music player and noise-cancelling
143 headphones. Four audio tracks were identified by number only, and the researcher was blinded to the
144 contents of each track. One track was Music, one was Nature sounds, and two were Silence. The
145 randomization procedure indicated to the researcher which track (1-4) should be used for the testing
146 session. Each track began with instructions to the participant indicating what they would hear during
147 testing, and that they should continue to wear the headphones even if the track is Silence so that the
148 researcher would not know what they were hearing.

149 **2.3.2 Music Characteristics**

150 The musical selections consisted of professional recordings of instrumental Western Classical
151 music selected by the researcher (Supplementary Table 1). All participants heard the same pieces in
152 the same order. Instrumentation ranged from piano solo to full orchestra, but all were without lyrics
153 or heavy percussion. Pitch ranged across pieces but was standard across participants and not
154 controlled by either the participant or the researcher. Tempo for all pieces was slow (~60 beats per
155 minute). The pieces were in either major keys or minor keys, but all consisted primarily of
156 consonant harmonies and sustained melodic phrases. Participants were allowed to control the volume
157 to their individual comfort level.

158 **2.3.3 Active Control**

159 Professional recordings of nature sounds (including forest, river, and wind sounds and
160 birdsong) selected by the researcher without added music were used as the active control condition
161 (Supplementary Table 1). All participants heard the same recording. This active control condition
162 allowed for non-musical analgesic effects, such as distraction, to be controlled in the experimental
163 design. Participants were allowed to control the volume to their individual comfort level.

164 **2.4 Outcomes**

165 **2.4.1 Autonomic Nervous System Activity (ECG)**

166 Participants' ECG were recorded using three standard snap-on ECG electrodes with Biopac
167 MP150 and Acqknowledge 4.3 software (Goleta, CA). ECG electrodes were placed under the collar
168 bone and below the rib cage on the opposite side, with a ground electrode placed on the abdomen
169 near the navel. The time of each condition (Baseline, Listening only, and Pain while listening) was
170 recorded by the investigator with a mark in the Acqknowledge recording. The ECG data were

171 uploaded to Kubios software (Kuopio, Finland) for analysis. Summary metrics of heart rate and
172 variability during each condition were corrected for within-session baseline levels and compared
173 between conditions (Listening only vs. Pain while listening) and between auditory groups (Music vs.
174 Nature sounds).

175 **2.4.2 Patient Characteristics Related to Pain and Music**

176 Demographics: Participants completed a demographics questionnaire that included questions
177 on participant sex, gender, age, race, ethnicity, marital status, education level, body mass index, and
178 current medications.

179 Fibromyalgia-ness (FMness): FMness is a measure of pain and co-morbid symptom
180 extensiveness and severity, calculated by combining the scores from the Widespread Pain Index with
181 the Symptom Severity Scale from the 2011 FM Survey(48) to derive a continuous metric purportedly
182 indicative of the degree of CNS pain amplification present in a given individual.(49)

183 Clinical Pain Severity: Pain severity and functional interference due to pain were assessed
184 using the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI). The BPI is validated for chronic, non-malignant forms of pain,
185 and asks patients to rate their current pain intensity, as well as their worst, least and average pain in
186 the 7 days (0-10 NRS) and has been recommended by IMMPACT as a measure of choice for the
187 assessment of pain in clinical research.(50-52)

188 Fibromyalgia Functional Status: Current health and functional status in FM patients was
189 measured using the Revised Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire (FIQR).(53) The FIQR measures
190 physical functioning, work status, and overall well-being.

191 Depression and Anxiety: Mood symptoms were assessed with the static short forms for
192 Depression and Anxiety, developed by the NIH roadmap initiative PROMIS.(54) The PROMIS
193 measures have a standardized mean of 50, a standard deviation of 10, and a range of 1-100.

194 Music Experience: Participants rated their music listening habits (i.e. frequency, styles,
195 reasons for listening, etc.) using the Brief Music Experience Questionnaire (MEQ)(55). The Brief
196 MEQ is a 53 item self-report measure of music centrality in the respondent's life, their musical
197 aptitude, and experience with and reaction to music. Questions are rated using a 5-point Likert scale
198 (1: very untrue; 5: very true), from which six summary scores are derived for Commitment to Music,
199 Innovative Musical Aptitude, Social Uplift, Affective Reactions to Music, Positive Psychotropic
200 Effects from Music, and Reactive Musical Behavior.

201 **2.4.3 Quantitative Sensory Testing (QST)**

202 Pain testing was performed using the Multimodal Automated Sensory Testing (MAST) System, a
203 computerized QST device developed at the University of Michigan, and currently being employed in
204 several clinical trials, including the NIH MAPP Network. Two measures of QST were used in this
205 study: mechanical pain sensitivity (MPS) and temporal summation (TS). MPS was assessed by
206 applying discrete pressure stimuli to the thumbnail bed (Figure 1A). The MAST system delivered an
207 ascending series of 5-s duration stimuli at 25-s intervals, beginning at 0.50 kg/cm² and increasing in
208 0.50 kg/cm² intervals up to tolerance or a maximum of 10 kg/cm². Participants rated pain intensity
209 after each stimulus on a 0 (no pain) – 100 (extreme pain) numerical rating scale (NRS). Pain
210 threshold, the point at which participants rated >0 pain, and tolerance, the point at which participants
211 rated >80 pain, were determined from this procedure. To measure TS, a 256 mN pinprick stimulus
212 (MRC Systems, Heidelberg, Germany, Figure 1B) was applied once to the forearm or hand, followed
213 by a train of 10 identical stimuli at a rate of 1 Hz. Following the single stimulus and the train of 10
214 stimuli, patients reported the pain intensity of the pinprick sensation using the 0-100 NRS. This
215 procedure was repeated three times, and the mean pain rating of the three stimulus trains was divided
216 by the mean pain rating of the single stimuli to calculate a wind-up ratio (WUR); a WUR >1
217 indicates temporal summation.⁸²

218 **2.5 Sample Size**

219 Ten White female participants with FM were enrolled in the study (Table 1). Centralized pain
220 and nearly any chronic pain condition is 1.5 – 2 times more common in women than in men.(56) One
221 person in the music group did not return for the second visit and was lost to follow-up. That person
222 only received the Silence session and is not included in the analysis (Figure 2).

223 The intended sample size was 40 participants with FM based on power analysis, however, due
224 to the COVID-19 pandemic, recruitment was stopped and only 10 participants took part in this study.

225 **2.6 Randomization**

226 **2.6.1 Randomization Sequence Generation**

227 Randomization was defined using an online random number generator.

228 **2.6.2 Randomization Type**

229 Patients were randomized 1:1 to Music or Active Control (Nature sounds), counterbalanced
230 for session order with Silence. Randomization was implemented with the REDCap Randomization
231 tool (44, 45) using a computer-generated random order for the four possible session orders
232 (Music/Silence, Silence/Music, Nature/Silence, Silence/Nature), coded by track number only, and
233 was stratified by gender.

234 **2.6.3 Randomization Allocation/Concealment Method and Implementation**

235 Audio tracks for Music, Nature sounds, and two tracks for Silence were labelled with dummy
236 codes (1-4) to blind the researcher collecting the data. The original audio tracks were given to a
237 person outside the study team who renamed the files and placed the code into a sealed opaque
238 envelope. The researcher selected the track by number assigned during randomization.
239 Randomization was concealed from the researchers until final group analysis.

240 **2.6.4 Blinding**

241 The study team were blinded throughout data collection and analysis. Sound cancelling
242 headphones for the participant, earplugs for the researcher, and randomization of sessions were
243 employed to blind the researcher to which audio track the participant was hearing and minimize bias.

244 **2.6.5 Similarity of Interventions**

245 The participant wore headphones for all sessions, regardless of what they were hearing
246 (Music, Nature sounds, or Silence). All sessions were conducted in the same way and lasted
247 approximately the same amount of time.

248 **2.7 Statistical Methods**

249 Demographic characteristics and questionnaire measures were compared between the two
250 Audio Groups using Student's *t*-tests for continuous variables and Chi square (X^2) for categorical
251 variables. Outcome measures were assessed using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA).
252 Pain measures of mechanical pain tolerance and temporal summation, which were collected once per
253 session, were assessed with a 2 (Audio Group: Music, Nature) X 2 (Session: Silence, Audio) repeated
254 measures ANOVA. ANS measures of heart rate and heart rate variability (root mean square of
255 successive differences, HRV) were assessed with a 2 (Audio Group: Music, Nature) X 2 (Session:
256 Silence, Audio) X 2 (Condition: Listen, Pain) repeated measures ANOVA. Statistical significance
257 was set at $p < .05$ for each test.

258 2.7.1 Additional Analyses

259 To account for variability related to FMness, depression, and anxiety symptoms, a second set
260 of ANOVAs was conducted including FMness, depression, and anxiety symptom as covariates.
261 Further relationships were explored between the questionnaire measures and the magnitude of change
262 in pain and ANS variables between sessions using Pearson's correlations. Statistical significance was
263 set at $p < .05$ for each test.

264 3 Results

265 3.1 Demographic and Questionnaire Measures

266 Group differences in demographic measures are presented in Table 1. The groups did not
267 differ on age, gender, ethnicity, relationship status, or education level. Questionnaire measures are
268 presented in Table 2. Participants in both groups were experiencing moderate FM, depression, and
269 anxiety symptoms. They also reported low to moderate commitment to music and innovative musical
270 aptitude, but reported moderate to high affective reactions to music, positive psychotropic effects
271 from music and reactive musical behavior. The groups did not differ in FM symptom severity or
272 music experience; however, they were significantly different on symptoms of anxiety, with
273 participants in the Nature group experiencing higher anxiety than participants in the Music group.

274 3.2 Pain Measures

275 In the ANOVA for temporal summation, the difference between a single stimulus and a series
276 of stimuli, there was a significant interaction of Group by Session, with the Nature group showing
277 lower temporal summation while listening to the audio compared to silence, while the Music group
278 was not different between sessions. The main effect for Session was also significant, with lower
279 temporal summation during audio compared to silence. Temporal summation was marginally higher
280 but not significantly different in the Music group compared to the Nature group ($p = .089$) indicating
281 that participants in the Music group may have had higher temporal summation. Mechanical pain
282 tolerance, the amount of pressure on the thumb that was rated at >80 , was not significantly different
283 between groups or between sessions (Table 3).

284 Adding covariates of FMness, depression, and anxiety symptoms to the ANCOVA for
285 temporal summation (Table 4) revealed that the significant interaction of Group by Session was still
286 present, but that there were significant interactions of Session and FM symptoms and Session and
287 anxiety symptoms. These individual differences appear to mediate the effects of Group and Session,
288 as the main effects for both were no longer significant.

289 Adding covariates to the ANCOVA for mechanical pain tolerance (Table 5) revealed a
290 significant interaction of Session and depression as well as non-significant trends for the main effects
291 of Session and FM symptoms. No other effects or interactions were significant.

292 3.3 ANS Measures

293 The ANOVA for heart rate revealed a non-significant trend for Group, with the Nature group
294 having slightly more reduced heart rate from baseline compared to the Music group (Figure 3). No
295 other effects were significant. The ANOVA for heart rate variability (HRV) revealed no significant
296 effects (Figure 4, Supplementary Table 2).

297 However, the addition of FMness, depression, and anxiety symptoms in the ANCOVA for
298 heart rate (Supplementary Table 3) yielded several significant effects and interactions. The main
299 effects of Condition (Listen versus Pain) and Session (Audio versus Silence) were both significant,
300 but the main effect for Group was no longer near the significance threshold. The two-way

301 interactions of Condition by anxiety and Session by anxiety were significant, as was the Session by
302 FM symptoms. The interaction of Condition by FM symptoms was marginal. Finally, the three-way
303 interaction of Session by Condition by anxiety was significant and Session by Condition by
304 depression was marginal though not significant, suggesting that mood symptoms were impacting
305 how heart rate changed with pain compared to listening alone. No significant effects or interactions
306 were found in the ANCOVA for HRV (Supplementary Table 4).

307 **3.4 Correlations**

308 **3.4.1 Fibromyalgia, Mood, and Music Experience**

309 Correlations between FMness, depression, anxiety symptoms, music experience scores and
310 between-session changes in the primary outcomes of temporal pain summation, mechanical pain
311 tolerance, heart rate and heart rate variability are presented in Supplementary Table 5. FM
312 questionnaires were related to one another, but not with the pain or ANS outcome measures. FMness
313 was negatively correlated with both depression and anxiety symptoms, though neither reached
314 significance. FM symptoms were also negatively correlated with affective reactions to music, and
315 FMness was positively correlated with commitment to music. Depression was negatively correlated
316 with commitment to music and innovative musical aptitude. Anxiety was strongly positively
317 correlated with affective reactions to music. Innovative musical aptitude and positive psychotropic
318 effects were strongly positively correlated with reactive musical behavior.

319 **3.4.2 Pain and ANS Response with Mood and Music Experience**

320 Anxiety was related to both temporal pain summation and heart rate, such that greater anxiety
321 was associated with a smaller change in temporal summation and a smaller change in heart rate
322 during pain. Temporal pain summation change between sessions was positively correlated with
323 reactive musical behavior. There was a marginal negative correlation between the change in
324 mechanical pain tolerance and depression, such that the higher the depression symptoms, the less
325 tolerance changed between audio and silence. There was also a significant positive correlation
326 between positive psychotropic effects from music and the change in mechanical pain tolerance, such
327 that those who had greater psychotropic effects had a greater change in mechanical pain tolerance
328 between audio and silence. Heart rate change with pain between sessions was negatively correlated
329 with affective reactions to music. HRB change with pain between sessions was negatively correlated
330 with positive psychotropic effects from music and positively correlated with between session change
331 in temporal pain summation, such that greater change in heart rate variability was associated with
332 greater change in temporal summation between sessions.

333 **4 Discussion**

334 In this pilot study, we measured the analgesic effects associated with music and nature sounds
335 on objective autonomic system responsiveness to painful stimuli. Our experimental design allowed
336 for blinding during both data collection and analysis, reducing the potential for bias. By
337 counterbalancing the order of audio presentation, we showed feasibility of repeated measures testing
338 in patients with FM while controlling for order effects. Even in our small sample, randomization
339 successfully yielded relatively matched groups, with no group differences observed for FM
340 symptoms, age, marital status, or education. By random chance, we did observe between group
341 differences on anxiety, although the Nature group was numerically only 7 points higher than the
342 Music group, and both groups were within one standard deviation of the standardized mean on the
343 PROMIS scale.

344 **4.1 Objective Pain**

345 This study aimed to manipulate two potential mechanisms for music-evoked analgesia:
346 cognitive distraction and physiological or vagal response alteration. By using musical stimuli and an
347 active control (Nature sounds), and comparing to each participant's own Silence control, our
348 experimental design allows for examination of distraction due to general relaxing audio, as well as
349 examining music-specific analgesia by comparing the Music to the Nature Sound condition directly.
350 We also examined the relationship to individual differences on FM severity, anxiety and depression
351 symptoms, and variability in music experience. We hypothesized that both listening conditions
352 (Music and Nature) would reduce pain sensitivity compared to testing during Silence and that Music
353 listening would reduce pain sensitivity compared to Nature sounds.(30-32)

354 **4.1.1 Temporal Summation**

355 We observed a strong effect of cognitive distraction, with reduced temporal summation
356 during either audio condition compared to silence, indicating that the auditory stimulus was effective
357 in reducing pain. The direction of the group difference was opposite to our hypothesis, with the
358 Nature group showing an analgesic effect, while the Music group showed none. This could be due to
359 the confound of anxiety symptoms between the groups, or it could be a potential confound of pre-
360 existing differences in sensitization between the groups, as temporal summation overall was
361 somewhat higher in the Music group compared to the Nature group.(23)

362 **4.1.2 Mechanical Pain Tolerance**

363 Interestingly, we did not observe any effects of group or condition on tolerance to thumb
364 pressure. This was surprising as this test usually shows high sensitivity for variations in pain
365 response.(25) However, it is possible that the transient changes between sessions were too small to be
366 observed in this small sample, and that a larger sample or longer intervention would be necessary to
367 see differences in maximal pain tolerance.

368 **4.2 ANS**

369 **4.2.1 Heart Rate**

370 We also hypothesized that Music would increase vagal input to the autonomic nervous
371 system, decreasing heart rate and increasing heart rate variability compared to both Silence and
372 Nature sounds. Vagal response during pain is a coping mechanism (57). We did observe a difference
373 between the groups on heart rate pointing to the feasibility of the chosen stimuli, yet the direction
374 was opposite to our hypothesis with the Nature group having greater reductions from baseline
375 compared to the Music group. This could also be related to group differences in anxiety or other pre-
376 existing physiological differences between the groups. The Nature group, having higher anxiety ($p =$
377 0.03), could have had elevated heart rate at baseline, thereby having more chance for the analgesic
378 effect to be observed. In our analysis, we corrected for the within-session baseline to address this
379 possibility.

380 **4.2.2 Heart Rate Variability**

381 HRV is a better measure for vagal response than raw heart rate.(58) However, we observed no
382 significant effects for HRV, suggesting that we were underpowered to observe a vagal response with
383 this small sample. While not significant, the Music group did show a pattern of response that was
384 consistent with vagal activation similar to other studies, with reduction from baseline and then further
385 reduction during pain, that was not observed in the Nature group.(59, 60) Such anticipated response
386 might be due to emotional expression towards the music stimulus, enjoyment, or simply just being

387 entertained. A larger sample would be needed to clarify whether there is a greater vagal response to
388 music.

389 **4.3 Individual Differences**

390 Individual differences likely play a role in how a person will respond to auditory
391 stimulation.(61-63) In this study, we hypothesized that analgesic responsiveness would vary
392 dependent on symptoms of FMness, anxiety, and depression.(54) We therefore examined correlations
393 between the outcomes of interest and various individual difference measures to elucidate the potential
394 relationships between them.

395 **4.3.1 FM symptoms**

396 In our sample of participants, we did not find relationships with FM symptoms and objective
397 pain or ANS measures, contrary to what we had hypothesized. However, we did see weak negative
398 correlations with an aggregate metric of FM symptoms, FMness, and both depression and anxiety
399 mood symptoms. In our sample, those with higher FMness reported lower depression and anxiety
400 symptoms. Although not significant, these relationships underscore the fuzzy boundaries and
401 complex relationships between FMness and mood symptoms. Depression specifically can be
402 associated with both increased and decreased physical motor symptoms.(64) These relationships
403 should be explored further to determine whether a specific profile of mood symptoms is related to
404 analgesic responsiveness in people with FM. Moreover, and on a broader scale, physical and
405 emotional symptoms should also be explored to determine their relationship with analgesic
406 responsiveness.

407 **4.3.2 Music Experience**

408 The Music Experience Questionnaire (MEQ) revealed several interesting relationships. We
409 observed that people with greater FM symptoms reported weaker affective reactions to music, or
410 alternatively, that the less people reported responding to music affectively, the greater their FM
411 symptoms. However, the aggregate FMness measure was positively related to commitment to music,
412 suggesting that even though people with more severe FM symptoms may be having weaker affective
413 responses to music, they still report a deep commitment and importance of music in their lives. This
414 may in part underlie the positive effects of music interventions for FM.(32, 42, 65)

415 Mood symptoms have previously been related to the MEQ.(55) In our sample, we saw a
416 negative relationship between depression and commitment to music and innovative musical aptitude.
417 This is consistent with symptoms of depression of anhedonia and self-criticism. As the innovative
418 musical aptitude is self-reported and not objectively measured, it is impossible to know how accurate
419 that assessment was. The relationship with depression suggests that participants may have been more
420 critical of their own abilities in this area compared to those who are not experiencing depressive
421 symptoms.

422 A positive relationship was observed between anxiety and affective reactions to music. As
423 anxiety is often associated with labile emotional reactions, strong affective responses to music would
424 be consistent with that. This relationship may also be underlying some of our other findings
425 associated with anxiety. More research is necessary to determine whether people with higher anxiety
426 would benefit more from an auditory listening analgesia intervention. (66-68)

427 Finally, there were some relationships between measures of the MEQ showing that innovative
428 musical aptitude and positive psychotropic effects from music were both strongly positively
429 correlated with reactive musical behavior. These relationships are perhaps unsurprising from a
430 reward perspective where those who get intrinsic reward from music are more likely to engage in
431 it.(69) However, this preliminary study could not suggest who might benefit from music more than

432 nature sounds. Future studies are needed to determine whether specific patient characteristics would
433 allow some to benefit more from music compared to nature sounds.

434 **4.3.3 Anxiety, Depression**

435 We observed significant effects of anxiety on temporal summation. In the ANCOVA analysis,
436 participants with higher anxiety had greater analgesic effects during the audio listening session. In
437 our correlation analysis, we observed that higher anxiety was associated with smaller changes in
438 temporal summation and smaller changes in heart rate during pain, which indicates those with higher
439 anxiety had reduced analgesic effect of distraction. This is potentially an important finding, as
440 anxiety is a common clinical presentation for people with fibromyalgia and chronic pain and may
441 influence treatment choices.(70, 71) In our sample, anxiety was randomly different between our two
442 audio groups, with those in the Nature group having higher anxiety. Unfortunately, this confound
443 means that we cannot completely separate the effects of anxiety from the response to Music versus
444 Nature sounds and will be important to address in future studies.

445 We also observed a significant relationship between depression and analgesic effects for
446 mechanical pain tolerance, with depression blunting the analgesic effect from the audio condition.
447 Depression often includes physical manifestations, including blunting of energy and increased
448 tiredness. The relationship with mechanical pain tolerance could be a sign of those physical
449 manifestations. In our correlation analysis, higher depression symptoms were related to less change
450 in mechanical pain tolerance between sessions, which could be related to sensory symptoms of
451 depression. However, the PROMIS depression measures that we used in this study are not sensitive
452 enough to capture depression subtypes.

453 Perhaps unsurprisingly, mood symptoms significantly impacted heart rate. When the effects
454 of anxiety and depression were controlled, significant effects of pain and audio session were revealed
455 that were not observed in the uncorrected ANOVA models. However, the effect of Group was no
456 longer significant, indicating that there were no additional analgesic effects of music over nature
457 sounds, although, as for temporal summation, these results are limited by the confounding of anxiety
458 with random group assignment. Further studies are needed to clarify these relationships.

459 Finally, we observed that those with greater behavioral reactions to music, as measured by the
460 MEQ, had greater change in temporal summation scores between sessions, regardless of whether they
461 were listening to music or nature sounds, and those who reported experiencing greater psychotropic
462 effects from music had greater changes in mechanical pain tolerance between sessions.

463 **5 Limitations**

464 This study is limited by the small sample size, and results should be interpreted with caution.
465 Additionally, our groups differed on anxiety potentially confounding our results, although all
466 participants were in the mild-moderate anxiety range. However, inherently when having a small
467 sample size, it is somewhat easier to detect within-participant effects rather than between-participant
468 effects. The effects we observed relating to anxiety, depression, and FMness symptoms indicate the
469 need for future studies to include these factors in the study design. Our experimental design using
470 nature sounds as an auditory control and carefully selected musical selections with characteristics
471 hypothesized to facilitate relaxation and analgesia is a strength, and one that can be used in future
472 studies to separate the effects of auditory distraction from music-specific effects.

473 **6 Conclusion**

474 In conclusion, our current results did not support our hypothesis of stronger analgesic effects
475 of music versus distracting nature sounds, however, we did observe strong effects of auditory
476 distraction on pain temporal summation and tolerance. The confounding effect of anxiety symptoms

477 in our study, as well as the individual differences observed on the MEQ, suggest that variability in
478 mood and other factors may be important in understanding how individuals will respond to music or
479 other auditory stimuli to gain therapeutic analgesic effects. While these results should be treated with
480 caution, this study provides preliminary evidence that some individuals may benefit from music or
481 audio stimulation as a treatment more than others. Further study is warranted.

482 **7 Conflict of Interest**

483 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
484 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

485 **8 Author Contributions**

486 **Rebecca J. Lepping:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data
487 Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Project administration, Funding acquisition, **Miranda L.**
488 **McMillan:** Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Project
489 administration, **Andrea L. Chadwick:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Writing -
490 Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Funding acquisition, **Zaid M. Mansour:** Writing -
491 Review & Editing, **Laura E. Martin:** Resources, Writing - Review & Editing, **Kathleen M.**
492 **Gustafson:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Resources, Writing - Review & Editing

493 **9 Funding**

494 This study was funded by the National Institutes of Health through a KUMC Frontiers
495 Arts+Medicine Trailblazer to Rebecca Lepping (NIH UL1TR002366), NIH K23GM123320 to
496 Andrea Chadwick, and by the KUMC Hoglund Biomedical Imaging Center (HBIC Neurophysiology
497 Core, and Cognitive Neuroscience Unit). The Hoglund Biomedical Imaging Center is supported by a
498 generous gift from Forrest and Sally Hoglund and funding from the National Institutes of Health
499 including: UL1 TR002366: Frontiers: KU Institute for Clinical & Translational Science, and a
500 KUMC Equipment Grant.

501 **10 Acknowledgments**

502 We humbly thank the participants for contributing to the study.

504 **11 Data Availability Statement**

505 This trial and protocol are registered at ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04059042 and Open Science
506 Framework (OSF) Preregistration <https://osf.io/84baz>. The datasets generated and analyzed for this
507 study can be found in the OSF website <https://osf.io/84baz>.

508

509 12 References

- 510 1. Williams DA, Clauw DJ. Understanding fibromyalgia: lessons from the broader pain research
511 community. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society.* 2009;10(8):777-91.
- 512 2. Woolf CJ. Central sensitization: implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain. *Pain.*
513 2011;152(3 Suppl):S2-15.
- 514 3. Melemedjian OK, Tillu DV, Asiedu MN, Mandell EK, Moy JK, Blute VM, et al. BDNF
515 regulates atypical PKC at spinal synapses to initiate and maintain a centralized chronic pain state.
516 *Molecular pain.* 2013;9:12.
- 517 4. Clauw DJ. Fibromyalgia: A Clinical Review. *JAMA.* 2014;311(5):1547-55.
- 518 5. Aasvang EK, Gmaehle E, Hansen JB, Gmaehle B, Forman JL, Schwarz J, et al. Predictive
519 risk factors for persistent postherniotomy pain. *Anesthesiology.* 2010;112(4):957-69.
- 520 6. Arendt-Nielsen L, Yarnitsky D. Experimental and clinical applications of quantitative sensory
521 testing applied to skin, muscles and viscera. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American*
522 *Pain Society.* 2009;10(6):556-72.
- 523 7. Yarnitsky D, Crispel Y, Eisenberg E, Granovsky Y, Ben-Nun A, Sprecher E, et al. Prediction
524 of chronic post-operative pain: pre-operative DNIC testing identifies patients at risk. *Pain.*
525 2008;138(1):22-8.
- 526 8. Ablin K, Clauw DJ. From fibrositis to functional somatic syndromes to a bell-shaped curve of
527 pain and sensory sensitivity: evolution of a clinical construct. *Rheum Dis Clin North Am.*
528 2009;35(2):233-51.
- 529 9. Diatchenko L, Nackley AG, Slade GD, Bhalang K, Belfer I, Max MB, et al. Catechol-O-
530 methyltransferase gene polymorphisms are associated with multiple pain-evoking stimuli. *Pain.*
531 2006;125(3):216-24.
- 532 10. Gwilym SE, Keltner JR, Warnaby CE, Carr AJ, Chizh B, Chessell I, et al. Psychophysical and
533 functional imaging evidence supporting the presence of central sensitization in a cohort of
534 osteoarthritis patients. *Arthritis and rheumatism.* 2009;61(9):1226-34.
- 535 11. Nielsen CS, Staud R, Price DD. Individual differences in pain sensitivity: measurement,
536 causation, and consequences. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society.*
537 2009;10(3):231-7.
- 538 12. Neddermeyer TJ, Fluhr K, Lotsch J. Principle components analysis of pain thresholds to
539 thermal, electrical, and mechanical stimuli suggests a predominant common source of variance. *Pain.*
540 2008;138(2):286-91.
- 541 13. Fillingim RB. Individual differences in pain responses. *Curr Rheumatol Rep.* 2005;7(5):342-
542 7.
- 543 14. Kleinbohl D, Holz R, Moltner A, Rommel C, Weber C, Osswald PM. Psychophysical
544 measures of sensitization to tonic heat discriminate chronic pain patients. *Pain.* 1999;81(1-2):35-43.
- 545 15. Wilder-Smith OHG, Tassonyi E, Arendt-Nielsen L. Preoperative back pain is associated with
546 diverse manifestations of central neuroplasticity. *Pain.* 2002;97(3):189-94.
- 547 16. Whitehead WE, Holtkotter B, Enck P, Hoelzl R, Holmes KD, Anthony J, et al. Tolerance for
548 rectosigmoid distention in irritable bowel syndrome. *Gastroenterology.* 1990;98(5 Pt 1):1187-92.

- 549 17. Gibson SJ, Littlejohn GO, Gorman MM, Helme RD, Granges G. Altered heat pain thresholds
550 and cerebral event-related potentials following painful CO₂ laser stimulation in subjects with
551 fibromyalgia syndrome. *Pain*. 1994;58(2):185-93.
- 552 18. Giesecke J, Reed BD, Haefner HK, Giesecke T, Clauw DJ, Gracely RH. Quantitative sensory
553 testing in vulvodynia patients and increased peripheral pressure pain sensitivity. *Obstetrics and*
554 *gynecology*. 2004;104(1):126-33.
- 555 19. Gracely RH, Petzke F, Wolf JM, Clauw DJ. Functional magnetic resonance imaging evidence
556 of augmented pain processing in fibromyalgia. *Arthritis and rheumatism*. 2002;46(5):1333-43.
- 557 20. Greenspan JD, Slade GD, Bair E, Dubner R, Fillingim RB, Ohrbach R, et al. Pain sensitivity
558 risk factors for chronic TMD: descriptive data and empirically identified domains from the OPPERA
559 case control study. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society*. 2011;12(11
560 Suppl):T61-74.
- 561 21. Leffler AS, Hansson P, Kosek E. Somatosensory perception in a remote pain-free area and
562 function of diffuse noxious inhibitory controls (DNIC) in patients suffering from long-term trapezius
563 myalgia. *Eur J Pain*. 2002;6(2):149-59.
- 564 22. Clauw DJ, Chrousos GP. Chronic pain and fatigue syndromes: overlapping clinical and
565 neuroendocrine features and potential pathogenic mechanisms. *Neuroimmunomodulation*.
566 1997;4(3):134-53.
- 567 23. Hsu MC, Harris RE, Sundgren PC, Welsh RC, Fernandes CR, Clauw DJ, et al. No consistent
568 difference in gray matter volume between individuals with fibromyalgia and age-matched healthy
569 subjects when controlling for affective disorder. *Pain*. 2009;143(3):262-7.
- 570 24. As-Sanie S, Harris RE, Harte SE, Tu FF, Neshewat G, Clauw DJ. Increased pressure pain
571 sensitivity in women with chronic pelvic pain. *Obstetrics and gynecology*. 2013;122(5):1047-55.
- 572 25. Petzke F, Harris RE, Williams DA, Clauw DJ, Gracely RH. Differences in unpleasantness
573 induced by experimental pressure pain between patients with fibromyalgia and healthy controls. *Eur*
574 *J Pain*. 2005;9(3):325-35.
- 575 26. Ribeiro MKA, Alcantara-Silva TRM, Oliveira JCM, Paula TC, Dutra JBR, Pedrino GR, et al.
576 Music therapy intervention in cardiac autonomic modulation, anxiety, and depression in mothers of
577 preterms: randomized controlled trial. *BMC Psychol*. 2018;6(1):57.
- 578 27. Witvliet CVO, Vrana SR. Play it again Sam: Repeated exposure to emotionally evocative
579 music polarises liking and smiling responses, and influences other affective reports, facial EMG, and
580 heart rate. *Cognition & Emotion*. 2007;21(1):3-25.
- 581 28. Williams C, Hine T. An investigation into the use of recorded music as a surgical
582 intervention: A systematic, critical review of methodologies used in recent adult controlled trials.
583 *Complement Ther Med*. 2018;37:110-26.
- 584 29. Hole J, Hirsch M, Ball E, Meads C. Music as an aid for postoperative recovery in adults: a
585 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2015;386(10004):1659-71.
- 586 30. Fleming PS, Strydom H, Katsaros C, MacDonald L, Curatolo M, Fudalej P, et al. Non-
587 pharmacological interventions for alleviating pain during orthodontic treatment. *Cochrane Database*
588 *Syst Rev*. 2016;12:CD010263.
- 589 31. Basinski K, Zdun-Ryzewska A, Majkowicz M. The Role of Musical Attributes in Music-
590 Induced Analgesia: A Preliminary Brief Report. *Front Psychol*. 2018;9:1761.

- 591 32. Garza-Villarreal EA, Pando V, Vuust P, Parsons C. Music-Induced Analgesia in Chronic Pain
592 Conditions: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Pain Physician*. 2017;20(7):597-610.
- 593 33. Lunde SJ, Vuust P, Garza-Villarreal EA, Vase L. Music-induced analgesia: how does music
594 relieve pain? *Pain*. 2019;160(5):989-93.
- 595 34. Villarreal EA, Brattico E, Vase L, Ostergaard L, Vuust P. Superior analgesic effect of an
596 active distraction versus pleasant unfamiliar sounds and music: the influence of emotion and
597 cognitive style. *Plos One*. 2012;7(1):e29397.
- 598 35. Juslin PN, Sloboda JA. *Music and emotion : theory and research*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford
599 University Press; 2001. viii, 487 p. p.
- 600 36. Reybrouck M, Eerola T. Music and Its Inductive Power: A Psychobiological and
601 Evolutionary Approach to Musical Emotions. *Front Psychol*. 2017;8:494.
- 602 37. Aselton P. Sources of stress and coping in American college students who have been
603 diagnosed with depression. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs*. 2012;25(3):119-23.
- 604 38. Brandes V, Terris DD, Fischer C, Loerbroks A, Jarczok MN, Ottowitz G, et al. Receptive
605 music therapy for the treatment of depression: a proof-of-concept study and prospective controlled
606 clinical trial of efficacy. *Psychother Psychosom*. 2010;79(5):321-2.
- 607 39. Blood AJ, Zatorre RJ. Intensely pleasurable responses to music correlate with activity in brain
608 regions implicated in reward and emotion. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2001;98(20):11818-23.
- 609 40. Salimpoor VN, Benovoy M, Larcher K, Dagher A, Zatorre RJ. Anatomically distinct
610 dopamine release during anticipation and experience of peak emotion to music. *Nat Neurosci*.
611 2011;14(2):257-62.
- 612 41. Martin-Saavedra JS, Vergara-Mendez LD, Pradilla I, Velez-van-Meerbeke A, Talero-
613 Gutierrez C. Standardizing music characteristics for the management of pain: A systematic review
614 and meta-analysis of clinical trials. *Complement Ther Med*. 2018;41:81-9.
- 615 42. Garza-Villarreal EA, Wilson AD, Vase L, Brattico E, Barrios FA, Jensen TS, et al. Music
616 reduces pain and increases functional mobility in fibromyalgia. *Front Psychol*. 2014;5:90.
- 617 43. Garza-Villarreal EA, Jiang Z, Vuust P, Alcauter S, Vase L, Pasaye EH, et al. Music reduces
618 pain and increases resting state fMRI BOLD signal amplitude in the left angular gyrus in
619 fibromyalgia patients. *Front Psychol*. 2015;6:1051.
- 620 44. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data
621 capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational
622 research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009;42(2):377-81.
- 623 45. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap
624 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*.
625 2019;95:103208.
- 626 46. Brummett CM, Janda AM, Schueller CM, Tsodikov A, Morris M, Williams DA, et al. Survey
627 Criteria for Fibromyalgia Independently Predict Increased Postoperative Opioid Consumption after
628 Lower-extremity Joint Arthroplasty: A Prospective, Observational Cohort Study. *Anesthesiology*.
629 2013;119(6):1434-43.
- 630 47. Janda AM, As-Sanie S, Rajala B, Tsodikov A, Moser SE, Clauw DJ, et al. Fibromyalgia
631 survey criteria are associated with increased postoperative opioid consumption in women undergoing
632 hysterectomy. *Anesthesiology*. 2015;122(5):1103-11.

- 633 48. Wolfe F, Clauw DJ, Fitzcharles MA, Goldenberg DL, Hauser W, Katz RS, et al.
634 Fibromyalgia criteria and severity scales for clinical and epidemiological studies: a modification of
635 the ACR Preliminary Diagnostic Criteria for Fibromyalgia. *The Journal of rheumatology*.
636 2011;38(6):1113-22.
- 637 49. Wolfe F. Fibromyalgianess. *Arthritis and rheumatism*. 2009;61(6):715-6.
- 638 50. Tan G, Jensen MP, Thornby JI, Shanti BF. Validation of the Brief Pain Inventory for chronic
639 nonmalignant pain. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society*.
640 2004;5(2):133-7.
- 641 51. Jensen MP, Turner JA, Romano JM, Fisher LD. Comparative reliability and validity of
642 chronic pain intensity measures. *Pain*. 1999;83(2):157-62.
- 643 52. Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Wyrwich KW, Beaton D, Cleeland CS, Farrar JT, et al. Interpreting
644 the clinical importance of treatment outcomes in chronic pain clinical trials: IMMPACT
645 recommendations. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society*. 2008;9(2):105-
646 21.
- 647 53. Bennett RM, Friend R, Jones KD, Ward R, Han BK, Ross RL. The Revised Fibromyalgia
648 Impact Questionnaire (FIQR): validation and psychometric properties. *Arthritis research & therapy*.
649 2009;11(4):R120.
- 650 54. Giesecke T, Williams DA, Harris RE, Cupps TR, Tian X, Tian TX, et al. Subgrouping of
651 fibromyalgia patients on the basis of pressure-pain thresholds and psychological factors. *Arthritis and*
652 *rheumatism*. 2003;48(10):2916-22.
- 653 55. Werner PD, Swope AJ, Heide FJ. The Music Experience Questionnaire: development and
654 correlates. *J Psychol*. 2006;140(4):329-45.
- 655 56. Wolfe F, Smythe HA, Yunus MB, Bennett RM, Bombardier C, Goldenberg DL, et al. The
656 American College of Rheumatology 1990 Criteria for the Classification of Fibromyalgia. Report of
657 the Multicenter Criteria Committee. *Arthritis and rheumatism*. 1990;33(2):160-72.
- 658 57. Fabes RA, Eisenberg N. Regulatory control and adults' stress-related responses to daily life
659 events. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1997;73(5):1107-17.
- 660 58. Nussinovitch U, Elishkevitz KP, Katz K, Nussinovitch M, Segev S, Volovitz B, et al.
661 Reliability of Ultra-Short ECG Indices for Heart Rate Variability. *Ann Noninvasive Electrocardiol*.
662 2011;16(2):117-22.
- 663 59. Forte G, Troisi G, Pazzaglia M, Pascalis V, Casagrande M. Heart Rate Variability and Pain:
664 A Systematic Review. *Brain Sci*. 2022;12(2).
- 665 60. Koelsch S, Jancke L. Music and the heart. *Eur Heart J*. 2015;36(44):3043-9.
- 666 61. Martarelli CS, Mayer B, Mast FW. Daydreams and trait affect: The role of the listener's state
667 of mind in the emotional response to music. *Conscious Cogn*. 2016;46:27-35.
- 668 62. Carlson E, Burger B, London J, Thompson MR, Toiviainen P. Conscientiousness and
669 Extraversion relate to responsiveness to tempo in dance. *Hum Mov Sci*. 2016;49:315-25.
- 670 63. Eerola T, Vuoskoski JK, Kautiainen H. Being Moved by Unfamiliar Sad Music Is Associated
671 with High Empathy. *Front Psychol*. 2016;7:1176.
- 672 64. First MB, Spitzer, Robert L, Gibbon Miriam, and Williams, Janet B.W. Structured Clinical
673 Interview for DSM-IV-TR Axis I Disorders, Research Version, Non-patient Edition. (SCID-I/NP).
674 New York: Biometrics Research, New York State Psychiatric Institute; 2002.

- 675 65. Onieva-Zafra MD, Castro-Sanchez AM, Mataran-Penarrocha GA, Moreno-Lorenzo C. Effect
676 of music as nursing intervention for people diagnosed with fibromyalgia. *Pain Manag Nurs*.
677 2013;14(2):e39-46.
- 678 66. Vuong V, Mosabbir A, Paneduro D, Picard L, Faghfoury H, Evans M, et al. Effects of
679 Rhythmic Sensory Stimulation on Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome: A Pilot Study. *Pain Res Manag*.
680 2020;2020:3586767.
- 681 67. Torres E, Pedersen IN, Perez-Fernandez JI. Randomized Trial of a Group Music and Imagery
682 Method (GrpMI) for Women with Fibromyalgia. *J Music Ther*. 2018;55(2):186-220.
- 683 68. Guetin S, Ginies P, Siou DK, Picot MC, Pommie C, Guldner E, et al. The effects of music
684 intervention in the management of chronic pain: a single-blind, randomized, controlled trial. *Clin J*
685 *Pain*. 2012;28(4):329-37.
- 686 69. Varella MAC. Evolved Features of Artistic Motivation: Analyzing a Brazilian Database
687 Spanning Three Decades. *Front Psychol*. 2021;12:769915.
- 688 70. Aaron LA, Burke MM, Buchwald D. Overlapping conditions among patients with chronic
689 fatigue syndrome, fibromyalgia, and temporomandibular disorder. *Arch Intern Med*.
690 2000;160(2):221-7.
- 691 71. Yunus MB. Fibromyalgia and overlapping disorders: the unifying concept of central
692 sensitivity syndromes. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. 2007;36(6):339-56.
- 693
- 694

695 **13 Tables**

696 **Table 1 Participant demographic variables by audio group assignment (Music, Nature)**

	Music Group (<i>n</i> = 4)	Nature Group (<i>n</i> = 5)	<i>t</i> / X^2	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Age (years) (<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>))	49.18 (13.86)	40.28 (9.93)	1.13	.30	[-9.78, 27.59]
Dominant Hand, Right (<i>n</i> (%))	4 (100%)	5 (100%)	--	--	--
Gender, Female	4 (100%)	5 (100%)	--	--	--
Sex Assigned at Birth, Female	4 (100%)	4 (80%)	0.90	.34	--
Race, White	4 (100%)	5 (100%)	--	--	--
Ethnicity: Not Hispanic or Latinx	2 (50%)	5 (100%)	3.21	.20	--
Hispanic or Latinx	1 (25%)	0 (0%)			
Other/Unknown/No Response	1 (25%)	0 (0%)			
Relationship Status: Married	2 (50%)	4 (80%)	3.60	.31	--
Never Married	1 (25%)	0 (0%)			
Divorced or Separated	1 (25%)	1 (20%)			
Education: High School/ GED	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3.94	.27	--
Some College	1 (25%)	1 (20%)			
Technical/ Associate's Degree	0 (0%)	1 (20%)			
Bachelor's Degree	0 (0%)	2 (40%)			
Advanced/ Professional Degree	3 (75%)	1 (20%)			

697
698 **Notes:** Continuous measures were assessed with independent samples *t* tests; categorical variables
699 were assessed with Chi-square tests.

700 **Abbreviations:** *CI*, confidence interval; *M*, mean; *SD*, standard deviation; *GED*, general education
701 development.

702

703 **Table 2** Participant reported clinical and musical experience variables by audio group assignment
 704 (Music, Nature)

	Music Group (<i>n</i> = 4)	Nature Group (<i>n</i> = 5)	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
WOLFE FMness (<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>))	17.00 (4.76)	13.00 (3.74)	1.42	.20	[-2.68, 10.68]
BPI Worst 2 Average	4.25 (2.63)	4.20 (1.64)	.04	.97	[-3.32, 3.42]
FIQR Score	45.50 (22.19)	40.23 (15.78)	0.42	.69	[-24.55, 35.08]
PROMIS: Depression	45.98 (5.30)	50.40 (5.79)	-1.18	.28	[-13.28, 4.43]
PROMIS: Anxiety	52.65 (4.71)	59.92 (3.33)	-2.72	.03*	[-13.59, -0.95]
MEQ: Commitment to Music	2.04 (0.92)	1.60 (0.71)	0.81	.45	[-0.84, 1.72]
MEQ: Innovative Musical Aptitude	2.11 (0.63)	2.17 (1.08)	-0.11	.92	[-1.51, 1.38]
MEQ: Social Uplift	2.62 (0.48)	2.70 (1.22)	-0.12	.91	[-1.62, 1.47]
MEQ: Affective Reactions to Music	4.03 (0.84)	4.40 (0.33)	-0.93	.39	[-1.33, 0.58]
MEQ: Positive Psychotropic Effects from Music	3.53 (1.00)	3.45 (0.58)	0.15	.88	[-1.17, 1.33]
MEQ: Reactive Musical Behavior	3.58 (0.57)	4.00 (0.66)	-1.00	.35	[-1.40, 0.57]

705
 706 **Notes:** Continuous measures were assessed with independent samples *t* tests. *Indicates significant
 707 group differences at $p < .05$.

708 **Abbreviations:** CI, confidence interval; M, mean; SD, standard deviation; FM, fibromyalgia; BPI,
 709 Brief Pain Inventory; FIQR, Fibromyalgia Impact Questionnaire – Revised; PROMIS, Patient-
 710 Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System; MEQ, Music Experience Questionnaire.
 711

712 **Table 3** Pain variables by session (Audio, Silence) and audio group assignment (Music, Nature)
 713

	Music Group (<i>n</i> = 4) (<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>))	Nature Group (<i>n</i> = 5) (<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>))	Session <i>F</i> (1, 7) (<i>p</i> , partial η^2)	Group <i>F</i> (1, 7) (<i>p</i> , partial η^2)	Group by Session <i>F</i> (1, 7) (<i>p</i> , partial η^2)
Temporal Summation: Audio	20.25 (14.29)	4.13 (5.60)	5.94 (.045*, .46)	3.90 (.089 [†] , .36)	6.33 (.04*, .48)
Temporal Summation: Silence	20.17 (13.14)	9.40 (7.44)			
Mechanical Pain Tolerance: Audio	4.12 (1.02)	5.17 (0.85)	0.01 (.92, .002)	2.94 (.13, .30)	.09 (.77, .01)
Mechanical Pain Tolerance: Silence	4.18 (1.00)	5.05 (0.94)			

714
 715 **Notes:** Temporal summation is the difference in pain rating out of 100 between a single stimulus and
 716 the series of ten in the non-dominant forearm. Mechanical pain tolerance is the pressure intensity
 717 (kg/cm^2) at which participants rated pain in their non-dominant thumb at 70 out of 100. Pain
 718 measures were assessed with repeated measures ANOVA. Effect sizes are indicated by partial η^2 .
 719 *Indicates significant effects at $p < .05$. [†]Indicates non-significant effects at $p < .10$.

720 **Abbreviations:** PSI, pounds per square inch; M, mean; SD, standard deviation.
 721
 722

723 **Table 4** ANCOVA table for temporal summation by session (Audio, Silence) and audio group
 724 assignment (Music, Nature) corrected for FMness, depression, and anxiety symptom severity
 725

	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Session	4.89	1 (4)	3.39	.14	.46
Group	31.08	1 (4)	0.13	.74	.03
WOLFE FMness	35.67	1 (4)	0.15	.72	.04
PROMIS Depression	96.40	1 (4)	0.40	.56	.09
PROMIS Anxiety	77.86	1 (4)	0.32	.60	.07
Session by Group	9.66	1 (4)	6.69	.06 [†]	.63
Session by WOLFE FMness	12.11	1 (4)	8.39	.04*	.68
Session by PROMIS Depression	1.87	1 (4)	1.29	.32	.24
Session by PROMIS Anxiety	11.92	1 (4)	8.25	.045*	.67

726
 727 **Notes:** Adjusted temporal summation measures were assessed with repeated measures ANCOVA.
 728 Effect sizes are indicated by partial η^2 . *Indicates significant effects at $p < .05$. [†]Indicates non-
 729 significant effects at $p < .10$.

730 **Abbreviations:** ANCOVA, analysis of covariance; HR, heart rate; *df*, degrees of freedom; FM,
 731 fibromyalgia; PROMIS, Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System.
 732

733 **Table 5** ANCOVA table for mechanical pain tolerance by session (Audio, Silence) and audio group
 734 assignment (Music, Nature) corrected for FMness, depression, and anxiety symptom severity
 735

	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Session	0.88	1 (4)	4.64	.097 [†]	.54
Group	0.79	1 (4)	1.38	.31	.26
WOLFE FMness	3.58	1 (4)	6.29	.07 [†]	.61
PROMIS Depression	0.46	1 (4)	0.81	.42	.17
PROMIS Anxiety	0.71	1 (4)	1.25	.33	.24
Session by Group	0.34	1 (4)	1.82	.25	.31
Session by WOLFE FMness	0.42	1 (4)	2.24	.21	.36
Session by PROMIS Depression	2.07	1 (4)	10.97	.03*	.73
Session by PROMIS Anxiety	0.11	1 (4)	0.58	.25	.31

736
 737 **Notes:** Adjusted mechanical pain tolerance measures were assessed with repeated measures
 738 ANCOVA. Effect sizes are indicated by partial η^2 . *Indicates significant effects at $p < .05$. [†]Indicates
 739 non-significant effects at $p < .10$.

740 **Abbreviations:** ANCOVA, analysis of covariance; HR, heart rate; *df*, degrees of freedom; FM,
 741 fibromyalgia; PROMIS, Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System.
 742

743 **14 Figure Captions**

744 **Figure 1 A.** Multimodal Automated Sensory Testing (MAST) stimulator for assessing mechanical
745 pain tolerance, and **B.** Pinprick stimulator used to assess temporal summation.

746
747 **Figure 2** CONSORT 2010 Flow Diagram.

748
749 **Figure 3** Heart Rate difference from within-session baseline. Both groups' heart rate decreased from
750 baseline to the Listening condition, and further decreased during Pain. The Music group had greater
751 pain-related decrease to Music compared to silence, and the Nature group had greater pain-related
752 decrease to Silence compared to Nature Sounds.

753
754 **Figure 4** Heart Rate Variability (HRV) difference from within-session baseline. The Music group's
755 HRV increased from baseline to the Listening condition, and further increased during Pain, with no
756 effect observed for Silence. The Nature group had marginally greater HRV during Pain. The HRV
757 during Pain was associated with a high standard deviation in both groups.


758
759


760

A.




B.






A.




B.



Error bars: 95% CI

A.

Heart Rate Variability: Music Group



B.

Heart Rate Variability: Nature Group

