

1 Restoration of normal central pain processing following manual 2 therapy in nonspecific chronic neck pain

3 Josu Zabala Mata, PT, MSc^{1,2¶}, Jon Jatsu Azkue, MD, PhD^{2¶}, Joel E. Bialosky, PT, PhD^{3,4&}, Marc Saez,
4 PhD^{5,6&}, Estibaliz Dominguez López, PT^{2&}, Maialen Araolaza Arrieta, PT, PhD^{1&}, Ion Lascurain-
5 Aguirrebeña, PT, PhD^{7¶}

6
7 ¹Deusto Physical Therapist, Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Health Science, University of Deusto, San Sebastian,
8 Spain

9
10 ²Department of Neurosciences, Faculty of Medicine and Nursing, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Leioa, Spain

11
12 ³University of Florida Department of Physical Therapy, Gainesville, Florida, United States of America

13
14 ⁴Clinical Research Center, Brooks Rehabilitation, Jacksonville, Florida, United States of America

15
16 ⁵Research Group on Statistics, Econometrics and Health (GRECS), University of Girona, Girona, Spain

17
18 ⁶CIBER of Epidemiology and Public Health (CIBERESP), Madrid, Spain

19
20 ⁷Physiotherapy, Department of Physiology, Faculty of Medicine and Nursing, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Leioa,
21 Spain

22
23
24 Corresponding author

25 E-mail: josu.zabala@deusto.es (JZ)

26

27 [¶]These authors contributed equally to this work.

28 [&]These authors also contributed equally to this work.

29

30 **Abstract**

31 Objective: to determine if a 4-week manual therapy treatment restores normal functioning of central pain
32 processing mechanisms in non-specific chronic neck pain (NSCNP), as well as the existence of a possible
33 relationship between changes in pain processing mechanisms and clinical outcome.

34 Design: cohort study.

35 Methods: sixty-three patients with NSCNP received four treatment sessions (once a week) of manual
36 therapy. Pressure pain thresholds (PPTs), conditioned pain modulation (CPM) and temporal summation
37 of pain (TSP) were evaluated at baseline and after treatment completion. Therapy outcome was measured
38 using the Global Rating of Change Scale, the Neck disability Index, intensity of pain during the last 24
39 hours, Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia and Pain Catastrophizing Scale.

40 Results: Following treatment, an increased CPM response and attenuated TSP were found, along with
41 amelioration of pain and improved clinical status. PPTs at trapezius muscle on the side of neck pain were
42 increased after therapy, but not those on the contralateral trapezius and tibialis anterior muscles. Only
43 minor associations were found between normalization of TSP/CPM and measures of clinical outcome.

44 Conclusion: Clinical improvement after manual therapy is accompanied by restoration of CPM and TSP
45 responses to normal levels in NSCNP patients. The existence of only minor associations between changes

46 in central pain processing and clinical outcome suggests multiple mechanisms of action of manual therapy
47 in NSCNP.

48 Keywords: neck pain, manual therapy, conditioned pain modulation, temporal summation of pain.

49

50 **Introduction**

51 Neck pain is among the top five causes of Disability in middle- and high-income countries and among the
52 top ten as a cause of global disability(1). Despite investment in research, the prevalence of neck pain has
53 not declined substantially in the last two decades(2). Moreover, recurrence reaches 50-75% within the
54 next 5 years following the first episode,(3,4) and 68% of individuals experiencing an episode of acute neck
55 pain will become chronic neck pain sufferers(5). Since little relationship with radiological findings and no
56 specific cause is found to explain symptoms, they are usually classified as patients with non-specific neck
57 pain (NSCNP)(6).

58 Guidelines advocate treating patients with NSCNP with exercise and manual therapy(7). Despite the
59 widespread use of manual therapy, systematic reviews assessing clinical outcomes report low to
60 moderate treatment effects at best(8). The lack of larger reported effects should be of no surprise, since
61 several aspects of treatment remain to be established, such as optimal dosage and clinical parameters,
62 best indicated forms of mobilization, and possible target patient subpopulations. This may be partly due
63 to the fact that mechanisms of action of manual therapy are not yet fully understood. Although
64 biomechanical effects(9), neural hysteresis,(10) and segmental neurological modulation(11) have long
65 been postulated as underlying mechanisms of action of manual therapy, hypotheses have in recent years
66 shifted towards a potential role of central nervous system pain processing(12).

67 Inter-individual variability in the functioning of central pain processing mechanisms has been postulated
68 as an alternative framework to understand heterogeneity of treatment outcomes(13). Several studies
69 have reported disturbances in central pain processing in patients with NSCNP(14–16). A meta-analysis has
70 confirmed the occurrence of hyperalgesia distal to the most painful site, a probable indication of the
71 occurrence of central sensitization in the NSCNP population¹⁹. The phenomenon of central sensitization
72 (CS) is a state of increased central responsiveness to nociceptive inputs associated with plastic changes in
73 nociceptive circuits and pathways(17). There is consistent evidence of altered central pain processing in
74 patients with NSCNP, including both pronociceptive and antinociceptive mechanisms. Temporal
75 summation of pain (TSP), a gradual increment of the pain sensation elicited by repeated C-fiber–mediated
76 stimuli which is evaluated as a measure of pronociceptive mechanisms, is enhanced in NSCNP
77 patients(14,16,18). In addition, disruption of endogenous antinociception has also been found, such as
78 the impairment of the so-termed Conditioned Pain Modulation (CPM)(15,16).

79 Although changes in central nervous system pain processing have been shown following manual therapy
80 intervention, most studies have relied on static psychophysical measures (largely PPTs), and found
81 reduction in local(19–21) and in some cases distal hyperalgesia(22,23). However, studies assessing the
82 effects of manual therapy using dynamic psychophysical tests are scarce, and relatively little is known on
83 the effects of manual therapy on central pain processing mechanisms. Dynamic psychophysical tests have
84 been postulated to better assess central nervous system pain processing(24) since they evaluate central
85 nervous system mechanisms rather than signs. Although a systematic review showed that physical
86 therapy may reverse alterations in pain processing that accompany several musculoskeletal
87 conditions(25), few studies have specifically addressed the effect of manual therapy, and only one
88 considered NSCNP(26) treated by neurodynamic upper limb mobilizations, which found beneficial effects

89 of therapy on CPM but not on TSP. Other studies in patients with NSCNP found no effects of treatment
90 on central pain processing mechanisms(27,28), however none of them involved manual therapy.

91 For normalization of central pain processing to be considered as a potential mechanism of action of
92 manual therapy, normalization should be associated with improvements in clinical outcome(29). The only
93 studies that have so far addressed this issue have relied on PPTs as the sole measure of central pain
94 processing, and failed to find associations between clinical outcome and changes in mechanical pain
95 thresholds(30,31). No study has assessed the association between changes in dynamic measures of pain
96 processing and clinical outcome following manual therapy.

97 The present study aimed to determine whether manual therapy restores normal functioning of central
98 pain processing mechanisms in patients with NSCNP. As a secondary aim, we sought to evaluate the
99 relationship between clinical outcome and changes in central pain processing mechanisms following
100 treatment with manual therapy.

101

102 **Methods**

103 A single-center, prospective study was conducted at a primary care physiotherapy clinic in the Bizkaia
104 region of Spain between March 2020 and July 2021. All patients provided written consent before data
105 collection and their rights were protected. The study was approved by the institutional review board at
106 the University of the Basque Country–UPV/EHU (Ethical approval reference: M10_2018_160MR1_ZABALA
107 MATA) and registered before study commencement (ClinicalTrials.gov record number:
108 ACTRN12620000163909).

109

110 **Participants**

111 In a two-sided contrast, with an alpha risk of 5%, a statistical power of 80%, and assuming maximum
112 indeterminacy, 63 subjects were required to detect a maximum difference of 10% in TSP and CPM
113 measures. People seeking treatment for NSNP at a primary care physiotherapy clinic were invited to
114 participate. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants are shown in **Table 1**.

115

116 **Table 1. Inclusion/exclusion criteria.**

117

Inclusion criteria

- 118 - Non Specific Chronic Neck Pain.
- Pain of mechanical origin, i.e. pain is reproduced by neck movements or positions.
- 119 -Non-traumatic (insidious) onset.

120

Exclusion criteria

- 121 -Whiplash Associated Disorder pathology.
- 122 -Widespread, non-anatomical distribution of pain; stimulus-independent spontaneous pain.
- 123 -Neurological (either sensory or motor) deficit.
- Radicular pain.
- 124 -Referral to other health professional to exclude red flags is required.
- Have undergone or are awaiting neck surgery.

125

126

127 **Clinical Assessment**

128 Age, sex, height, and weight were recorded from participants, and patients completed the Neck Disability
129 Index (NDI), the Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS) and The Tampa Scale of Kinesophobia (TSK)
130 questionnaires. The NDI is a widely used, self-administered questionnaire for assessing cervical disability.
131 The questionnaire consists of 10 items on activities of daily living, and each item is scored from 0 to 5,
132 where higher scores indicate greater disability(32). The PCS is a 13-item questionnaire that measures
133 catastrophic thoughts and feelings about pain(33). Total scores range from 0 to 52, and higher scores
134 indicate higher levels of pain-related catastrophizing. Pain-related fear of movement was assessed using
135 the 11-item TSK; scores on each item range from 1 to 4, where higher scores are indicative of greater
136 fear(34).

137 Maximum and average intensities of pain experienced over the last 24 hours, and pain experienced during
138 neck movements (flexion, extension, right and left rotation and side flexion) were recorded using a 0-10
139 numeric rating scale anchored with 0= no pain at all to 10= worst pain imaginable. Patients were also
140 asked to complete the Patient Specific Functional Scale (PSFS)(35), a self-reported measure of perceived
141 level of disability on specific items relevant for them.

142 In addition, patients were asked to rate their perceived treatment effect using the Global Rating of Change
143 Scale (GROC). The GROC is a 15-point scale where clinical change is rated from -7 (a very great deal worse),
144 through 0 (no change), to +7 (a great deal better)(36).

145 All clinical measures except GROC (recorded only post-treatment) were obtained in single sessions both
146 at baseline and after treatment completion. A maximum of 24 hours elapsed both from the first clinical
147 assessment session to treatment initiation, and from the last treatment session to the second clinical
148 assessment.

149

150 **Psychophysical assessment**

151 Pressure Pain Thresholds (PPT), defined as the minimum pressure at which pressure sensation becomes
152 a painful sensation(37), were measured at several locations using a digital hand-held algometer with a 1-
153 cm²-diameter rubber tip (Fisher, Pain Diagnostics and Thermography Inc, Great Neck, NY, USA). For local
154 assessment of pain sensitivity, PPTs were measured bilaterally at the angle of the upper trapezius fibers,
155 5 and 8 cm above and medial to the superior angle of the scapula, and remote sensitivity was assessed on
156 the tibialis anterior at a location 2.5 cm lateral and 5 cm inferior to the anterior tibial tuberosity. Subjects
157 were instructed to report their first perceived pain sensation during an incremental pressure application
158 at 1 kg/ sec. The same procedure was repeated three times, 1 min apart, and the average of three
159 measurements was used for analysis. Patients were familiarized with the measurement protocol prior to
160 the actual measurements. This procedure has shown high reliability in neck pain patients(38).

161 For assessing TSP, patients were seated in a quiet room with their hand rested on a table (same side as
162 neck pain, or the side of most painful neck pain in patients with bilateral pain) and two adhesive Ag/AgCl
163 electrodes were placed on the hand dorsum, 2 cm apart. Electrical stimuli consisting of brief bursts of five,
164 1 ms-long positive-square pulses, were generated by a constant current electrical stimulator (DS7;
165 Digitimer Ltd, Welwyn Garden City, UK) and delivered at 200 Hz(39), which were perceived by the
166 participant as single stimuli. Electrical pain thresholds were first determined using the increasing and
167 decreasing staircase method with 0.2 mA stimulus increments/decrements. The electrical pain threshold
168 was defined as the minimum current intensity evoking a sensation rated as painful in an incremental series
169 or the current intensity no longer evoking pain in a decremental series, and the final value was recorded
170 as the average of three consecutive incremental and three decremental measures. For assessing TSP, a
171 single stimulus was administered at 1.2 times the electrical pain threshold intensity, and the participant

172 was asked to rate the evoked pain sensation on a 0–100 numeric scale where 0 denotes no pain at all and
173 100 indicates the worst pain imaginable. Two minutes thereafter, 5 consecutive stimuli of the same
174 current intensity were delivered at a frequency of 2 Hz (2.5-millisecond total stimulus duration), and the
175 participant was asked to rate the pain sensation evoked by the stimulus perceived as the most painful.
176 The ratio of the second rating to the first was used as the TSP measure(40). A higher ratio was indicative
177 of greater TSP. This protocol has been previously used(41) and is based on well-known parameters for
178 evaluating TSP(39).

179 For CPM assessment, PPT was measured first on the trapezius muscle as above, and the participant was
180 then asked to immerse his/her contralateral foot in cold water (kept at 10° C) for 2 minutes or until pain
181 became unbearable. Immediately thereafter, the PPT was measured again at the same location. The CPM
182 response was obtained by subtracting the second measure from the first(42). A greater value was
183 indicative of higher endogenous pain inhibition. This procedure has demonstrated good to very good
184 reliability(43).

185

186 **Intervention**

187 Patients received weekly, 45-minute sessions of manual therapy for 4 weeks. Treatments consisted of
188 articular passive mobilizations, soft tissue mobilization, and trigger point treatment performed by the
189 clinician following clinical reasoning. Passive mobilization treatment consisted of passive, low-speed
190 movements performed on hypomobile and pain-reproducing spinal segments in the cervical and thoracic
191 spine(36,44), including segmental translations and physiological movements both through and at the end
192 of the range of movement(45). Soft tissue mobilization (gentle longitudinal and transverse stroking) of

193 neck muscles was administered in order to improve connective tissue function and reduce myofascial
194 pain. This was accompanied by a trigger point technique on neck muscles were appropriate(46). All
195 treatments were administered by a physiotherapist with postgraduate training and 15 years of experience
196 in musculoskeletal physiotherapy.

197 Two sets of generalized linear mixed model (GLMM), with Gaussian response and the identity link (i.e.
198 equivalent to a linear regression), were used to assess the effect of the intervention on clinical,
199 psychological and psychophysical measures, and the association between treatment-induced
200 psychophysical changes and clinical and psychological outcomes. Analyses were controlled for sex, age,
201 BMI, baseline value of the variables of interest, and individual heterogeneity. Individual heterogeneity,
202 controlled for including a random effect, collects unobserved invariant variables over time that are specific
203 to each individual participant, i.e. residual confounding. Given the complexity of the models, we
204 performed inferences using a Bayesian framework. In particular, we followed the Integrated Nested
205 Laplace Approximation (INLA) approach(47,48). In addition to the coefficient estimators and their 95%
206 credibility intervals, the probability of the coefficient estimator (an absolute value being more than 1
207 ($\text{Prob}(|\text{estimator}|) > 1$), Prob , was also computed (note that this is unilateral and may not coincide with
208 the credibility interval). Unlike the p-value in a frequentist approach, this probability allows us to make
209 inferences about associations between dependent and independent variables. For the sake of simplicity,
210 Prob values exceeding 0.95 are equivalent to $p < .05$ in a non-Bayesian context. All analyses were
211 conducted using the open access software *R* (version 4.2.2)(49) available through the INLA
212 package(47,48,50)

213

214 **Results**

215 Sixty-three participants took part in the study between 03/03/2020 and 21/07/2021. Demographics and
216 baseline clinical characteristics are shown in **Table 2**. All participants attended the scheduled therapy
217 sessions and completed the treatment, and there were no drop outs (Fig 1).

218

219 **Fig 1.** CONSORT Flow Diagram.

220

221 **Table 2.** Demographics and clinical Characteristics. Values are mean (SD) or number of cases.

N	63
Sex (f/m)	50/13
Age (y)	45.8 (14.3)
BMI	23.5 (3.2)
Neck pain duration (y)	6.7 (5.2)
Average pain 24 hours (0–10)	4.72 (1.83)
Maximum pain 24 hours (0–10)	6.26 (1.82)
NDI (0–50)	11.56 (5.23)
PCS (0–52)	15.38 (9.28)
TSK (0–44)	23.99 (7.29)
PSFS (0-10)	4.24 (1.93)
Pain on movement	3.48 (2.03)

222 Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; NDI, neck disability index; PCS, pain
223 catastrophizing scale; TSK, Tampa scale kinesophobia; PSFS, Patient specific
224 functional scale; TSP, temporal summation pain; CPM, conditioned pain
225 modulation.

226

227 **Changes in pain processing, and clinical and psychological outcomes** 228 **following the intervention**

229 Patients showed an improvement in central pain processing following manual therapy. Namely, the
230 intervention both attenuated TSP response (Coefficient: -0.63; 95% credibility interval = -0.82 to -0.43; P=
231 1.00) and improved conditioned modulation of pain (Coefficient: 0.89; 95% credibility interval = 0.14 to
232 1.65; P= .99). In addition, manual therapy increased PPT on the trapezius muscle on the side of neck pain
233 (Coefficient: 0.22; 95% credibility interval = 0.03 to 0.42; P= .98), but not on the contralateral trapezius
234 (Coefficient: 0.01; 95% credibility interval = -0.19 to 0.21; P= .54) or the tibialis anterior muscle (ipsilateral
235 Coefficient: -0.03; 95% credibility interval = -0.29 to 0.22; P= .59 on the side of neck pain.
236 Contralateralcoefficient: 0.01; 95% credibility interval = -0.26 to 0.29; P= .54 contralaterally) (Table 3).

237 Clinical pain was also ameliorated following manual therapy, as shown by the reduction in average pain
238 ratings at 24 hours (Coefficient: -2.52; 95% credibility interval = -2.92 to -2.13; P= 1.00), maximal pain
239 ratings at 24 hours (Coefficient: -3.07; 95% credibility interval = -3.54 to -2.59; P= 1.00) and pain ratings
240 during neck movements (Coefficient: -2.19; 95% credibility interval = -2.51 to -1.87; P= 1.00) (Table 3). The
241 majority of patients reported feeling “a very great deal better” or “a great deal better” (21% and 33%
242 respectively) following treatment, 16% reported feeling “quite a bit better”, 12% “moderately better”, 5%
243 “somewhat better”, 5% “a little bit better”, 6% “a tiny bit better” and 2% “about the same”. Favorable
244 changes in functional and psychological status were also noted, as shown by statistically significant
245 improvements in measures of disability (Coefficient: 2.24; 95% credibility interval = 1.28 to 3.19; P= .99),
246 function (Coefficient: 2.58; 95% credibility interval = 1.89 to 3.26; P= 1.00), fear of movement (Coefficient:
247 -4.04; 95% credibility interval = -5.24 to -2.85; P= 1.00) and catastrophization (Coefficient: -7.41; 95%
248 credibility interval = -9.00 to -5.82; P= 1.00) (**Table 3**).

249

250 **Table 3.** Effect of intervention on clinical, psychological and psychophysical variables. Model adjusted
 251 for sex, age, BMI, individual heterogeneity (random effect) and baseline value of variable.

Variables	Coefficient	95% Credibility Interval	P
NDI (50)	-2.23	1.29 to 3.17	0.99 *
PCS (52)	-7.43	-9.01 to -5.85	1.00 *
TSK (44)	-4.07	-5.25 to -2.88	1.00 *
PSFS_average	2.58	1.89 to 3.26	1.00 *
Maximum pain 24h	-3.05	-3.53 to -2.58	1.00 *
Average pain 24h	-2.52	-2.91 to -2.13	1.00 *
Pain on movement	-2.19	-2.51 to -1.87	1.00 *
PPT ipsilateral trapezius	0.22	0.03 to 0.42	0.98 *
PPT contralateral trapezius	0.01	-0.19 to 0.21	0.54
PPT ipsilateral TA	-0.02	-0.28 to 0.23	0.59
PPT contralateral TA	0.01	-0.25 to 0.29	0.54
TSP change (ratio)	-0.63	-0.82 to -0.43	1.00 *
CPM change (absolute)	0.89	0.14 to 1.65	0.99 *

252 Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; NDI, neck disability index; PCS, pain catastrophizing scale; TSK,
 253 Tampa scale kinesophobia; PSFS, Patient specific functional scale; PPT, pressure pain threshold; TA,
 254 tibialis anterior; TSP, temporal summation pain; CPM, conditioned pain modulation.

255
 256 * Statistically significant change.
 257

258 **Association between changes in central pain processing and clinical and**
 259 **psychological outcomes**

260 Improvements in the functioning of central pain modulatory mechanisms (CPM and TSP) following
 261 intervention were found to be very weakly associated with only few measures of clinical and psychological
 262 outcome as shown in **Table 4**. Improvement in the CPM response was found to be negatively correlated
 263 with changes in PSFS (Coefficient: -0.65; 95% credibility interval = -1.22 to -0.07; P= 0.98), and attenuation
 264 of TSP was found to be associated with a greater improvement in pain during movement (Coefficient:
 265 0.42; 95% credibility interval = 0.10 to 0.74; P= 0.99).

266

267 **Table 4.** Association between changes in central pain processing mechanisms and clinical/psychological
 268 variables. Model adjusted for sex, age, BMI and individual heterogeneity (random effect).

269

	Change in CPM		
	Coefficient	95% Credibility Interval	P
Change in NDI	-0.57	-1.75 to 0.59	0.83
Change in PCS	-0.24	-2.16 to 1.66	0.60
Change in TKS	0.43	-1.01 to 1.88	0.72
Change in PSFS	-0.65	-1.22 to -0.07	0.98*
Change in Max pain 24h	0.10	-0.55 to 0.75	0.61
Change in Average pain 24h	-0.40	-0.92 to 0.11	0.93
Change in Pain on movement	-0.17	-0.40 to 0.05	0.93
Change in GROC	0.28	-0.29 to 0.87	0.83
	Change in TSP		
	Coefficient	95% Credibility Interval	P
Change in NDI	0.45	-0.65 to 1.57	0.79
Change in PCS	0.18	-1.74 to 2.10	0.57
Change in TKS	1.09	-0.28 to 2.48	0.94

Change in PSFS	-0.41	-1.25 to 0.42	0.83
Change in Max pain 24h	0.22	-0.38 to 0.83	0.76
Change in Average pain 24h	0.21	-0.25 to 0.69	0.82
Change in Pain on movement	0.42	0.10 to 0.74	0.99*
Change in GROC	-0.19	-1.37 to 5.29	0.87

270 Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; NDI, neck disability index; PCS, pain catastrophizing scale; TSK, Tampa scale kinesophobia; PSFS, Patient
271 specific functional scale; PPT, pressure pain threshold; TA, tibialis anterior; TSP, temporal summation pain; CPM, conditioned pain modulation;
272 GROC, global rating of change.

273 * Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

274

275 Discussion

276 The present work provides novel evidence of restoration of normal central pain processing following
277 manual therapy in NSCNP patients, as shown by TSP, CPM and PPT values returning to normal levels (i.e.
278 comparable to normative data collected in our lab(16)). In addition, clinical pain was ameliorated, and
279 both functional and psychological measures were improved.

280 Significant attenuation of TSP was noted following manual therapy. A normalizing effect of manual
281 therapy on temporal summation has been previously reported both in healthy volunteers(51) and pain
282 conditions such as low back pain(52) and carpal tunnel syndrome(53). In contrast, previous studies
283 evaluating physical therapy outcome in patients with NSCNP have failed to report changes in TSP following
284 treatment with a variety of interventions including virtual reality(28), cervical therapeutic exercise(28,54)
285 and a combined protocol of electrotherapy and cervical therapeutic exercise²⁸. It is possible that TSP may
286 preferentially or to a greater extent be affected by manual therapy in patients with NSCNP, but not by
287 other treatment modalities. Alternatively, methodological differences related to the ability of the
288 employed stimuli to activate afferent nociceptive pathways may have also contributed to this disparity of

289 results, since the mechanical stimuli used to measure TSP in previous studies (weighted pinprick
290 stimuli(27), or pressure exerted by either a cuff (54) or an algometer(28)) stimulate superficial and deep
291 nociceptors whereas the electrical stimuli used in the current study may directly recruit afferent C-
292 fibers(55). Moreover, electrical stimulation has been shown to be more effective at producing cortical
293 somatosensory activation(56).

294 We found that manual therapy also restored CPM response in our cohort. This finding is consistent with
295 a previous study where neurodynamic treatment, i.e. a form of manual therapy, improved CPM in a similar
296 patient population²⁷. Indeed, several studies have shown a general normalizing effect of treatment on
297 CPM response in NSCNP(26,54,57) and in other pain conditions(58,59) regardless of the therapeutic
298 intervention. It thus appears that the normalizing effects of interventions on CPM are frequent, and less
299 dependent on the type of treatment or target population.

300 The relationship between an increased TSP response and the level of perceived pain in the NSCNP
301 population is not entirely clear. Although a systematic review with meta-analysis did find some association
302 in a population of back pain patients(60), two recent case-control studies studying NSCNP failed to do
303 so(16,61). In light of the fact that the expression of wind up at spinal cord neurons may be genetically
304 encoded(62), an enhanced TSP may be viewed as an indicator of higher propensity to developing pain
305 hypersensitivity. In support of this notion, a number of studies have shown TSP to be a predictor of pain
306 prospectively(63–65). From a neurophysiological standpoint, temporal summation is considered as one
307 of the initiating neuroplastic mechanisms of central sensitization(66,67). On the other hand, wind up as
308 the correlate of TSP in animal models has also been found to be profoundly influenced by descending
309 supraspinal modulation(68–70). It thus seems reasonable to assume that the reducing effects of manual
310 therapy on TSP as shown here may, at least in part, be produced by recruiting central pain modulatory
311 mechanisms. This view is further strengthened by the enhancing effect of manual therapy on the CPM

312 response in patients with NSCNP as shown here. The CPM paradigm is an experimental model to assess
313 the functional state of the so-termed Diffuse Noxious Inhibitory Controls, a widespread modulatory
314 mechanism arising from the brainstem and operating on second order wide dynamic range neurons in the
315 spinal dorsal horn via the spinal dorsolateral funiculi(71). An enhanced CPM is considered to reflect
316 greater efficacy of endogenous analgesia mechanisms and thus a more favorable position to control
317 central excitation induced by incoming peripheral nociceptive input(72).

318 Whilst pain processing and clinical status were both improved following therapy, we found no distinct
319 relationship between the two types of outcomes. Therefore, our present results provide no support for
320 normalization of central pain processing as the sole or main mechanism of action of manual therapy in
321 NSCNP. However, it is likely that the nature of our sample may have contributed, at least in part, to this
322 lack of association. Although central pain processing mechanisms at baseline were altered as compared
323 to controls(16), alterations were indeed modest and patients presented only mild baseline disability(73),
324 therefore any clinical improvement could be expected to be accompanied by only limited beneficial
325 effects on pain processing.

326 The physiological mechanisms underlying the clinical effect of manual therapy on NSCNP remain unclear.
327 Collectively, however, our present observations of the beneficial effects on TSP and CPM responses
328 support the notion that manual therapy may operate, to some extent, by influencing central pain
329 processing to ameliorate pain and improve clinical status. Nonetheless, the fact that no clear association
330 was observed between restoration of normal central pain processing and clinical outcome suggests a
331 plurality of underlying mechanisms that may also likely involve biomechanical, physiological and
332 psychological changes. More studies are needed to determine specifically which mechanisms of action
333 influence the clinical improvement of NSCNP with manual therapy.

334

335 **Limitations**

336 Since no control group was used, changes in both clinical and pain measures noted here cannot
337 unequivocally be attributed to the intervention. However, no study to date has reported spontaneous
338 normalization of central pain processing, and the fact that clinical improvement following the intervention
339 was achieved after three months of persisting clinical manifestations renders an alternative explanation
340 less likely.

341 The present study only measured outcomes in the short term, and thus whether the observed changes
342 are long lasting was not determined.

343

344 **Acknowledgments**

345 I would like to express my gratitude to Hiru Fisioterapia for generously offering us their facility as a
346 research location.

347 REFERENCES

- 348 1. GBD 2016 Disease and Injury Incidence and Prevalence Collaborators. Global, regional, and national
349 incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries,
350 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet*. 2017 Sep
351 16;390(10100):1211-59.
- 352 2. Safiri S, Kolahi AA, Hoy D, Buchbinder R, Mansournia MA, Bettampadi D, et al. Global, regional, and
353 national burden of neck pain in the general population, 1990-2017: systematic analysis of the Global
354 Burden of Disease Study 2017. *BMJ*. 2020 26;368:m791.
- 355 3. Carroll LJ, Hogg-Johnson S, van der Velde G, Haldeman S, Holm LW, Carragee EJ, et al. Course and
356 prognostic factors for neck pain in the general population: results of the Bone and Joint Decade
357 2000-2010 Task Force on Neck Pain and Its Associated Disorders. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2008 Feb
358 15;33(4 Suppl):S75-82.
- 359 4. Childs JD, Cleland JA, Elliott JM, Teyhen DS, Wainner RS, Whitman JM, et al. Neck pain: Clinical
360 practice guidelines linked to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health
361 from the Orthopedic Section of the American Physical Therapy Association. *J Orthop Sports Phys
362 Ther*. 2008 Sep;38(9):A1-34.
- 363 5. Bot SDM, van der Waal JM, Terwee CB, van der Windt DAWM, Scholten RJPM, Bouter LM, et al.
364 Predictors of outcome in neck and shoulder symptoms: a cohort study in general practice. *Spine
365 (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2005 Aug 15;30(16):E459-470.
- 366 6. Borghouts JAJ, Koes BW, Bouter LM. The clinical course and prognostic factors of non-specific neck
367 pain: a systematic review. *Pain*. 1998 Jul;77(1):1-13.
- 368 7. Coulter ID, Crawford C, Vernon H, Hurwitz EL, Khorsan R, Booth MS, et al. Manipulation and
369 Mobilization for Treating Chronic Nonspecific Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis for
370 an Appropriateness Panel. *Pain Physician*. 2019 Mar;22(2):E55-70.
- 371 8. Gross A, Langevin P, Burnie SJ, Bédard-Brochu MS, Empey B, Dugas E, et al. Manipulation and
372 mobilisation for neck pain contrasted against an inactive control or another active treatment.
373 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015 Sep 23;(9):CD004249.
- 374 9. Paris SV. Mobilization of the spine. *Phys Ther*. 1979 Aug;59(8):988-95.
- 375 10. Zusman M. Spinal manipulative therapy: review of some proposed mechanisms, and a new
376 hypothesis. *Aust J Physiother*. 1986;32(2):89-99.
- 377 11. Melzack R, Wall PD. Pain mechanisms: a new theory. *Science*. 1965 Nov 19;150(3699):971-9.
- 378 12. Bialosky JE, Bishop MD, Price DD, Robinson ME, George SZ. The Mechanisms of Manual Therapy in
379 the Treatment of Musculoskeletal Pain: A Comprehensive Model. *Man Ther*. 2009 Oct;14(5):531-8.

- 380 13. Vardeh D, Mannion RJ, Woolf CJ. Toward a Mechanism-Based Approach to Pain Diagnosis. *J Pain*.
381 2016 Sep;17(9 Suppl):T50-69.
- 382 14. Chua NHL, Timmerman H, Vissers KC, Oh WS. Multi-modal Quantitative Sensory Testing in Patients
383 with Unilateral Chronic Neck Pain: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Musculoskeletal Pain*. 2012
384 Dec;20(4):292–9.
- 385 15. Xie Y, Jun D, Thomas L, Coombes BK, Johnston V. Comparing Central Pain Processing in Individuals
386 With Non-Traumatic Neck Pain and Healthy Individuals: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
387 *The Journal of Pain*. 2020 Nov;21(11–12):1101–24.
- 388 16. Zabala Mata J, Lascurain-Aguirrebeña I, Dominguez López E, Azkue JJ. Enhanced Pronociceptive and
389 Disrupted Antinociceptive Mechanisms in Nonspecific Chronic Neck Pain. *Physical Therapy*. 2021
390 Mar 3;101(3):pzaa223.
- 391 17. Woolf CJ, Salter MW. Neuronal plasticity: increasing the gain in pain. *Science*. 2000 Jun
392 9;288(5472):1765–9.
- 393 18. Biurrun Manresa JA, Neziri AY, Curatolo M, Arendt-Nielsen L, Andersen OK. Reflex receptive fields
394 are enlarged in patients with musculoskeletal low back and neck pain. *Pain*. 2013 Aug;154(8):1318–
395 24.
- 396 19. Voogt L, de Vries J, Meeus M, Struyf F, Meuffels D, Nijs J. Analgesic effects of manual therapy in
397 patients with musculoskeletal pain: a systematic review. *Man Ther*. 2015 Apr;20(2):250–6.
- 398 20. Guzmán Pavón MJ, Cavero Redondo I, Martínez Vizcaíno V, Ferri Morales A, Lorenzo García P,
399 Álvarez Bueno C. Comparative Effectiveness of Manual Therapy Interventions on Pain and Pressure
400 Pain Threshold in Patients With Myofascial Trigger Points: A Network Meta-analysis. *Clin J Pain*.
401 2022 Dec 1;38(12):749–60.
- 402 21. Aspinall SL, Leboeuf-Yde C, Etherington SJ, Walker BF. Manipulation-induced hypoalgesia in
403 musculoskeletal pain populations: a systematic critical review and meta-analysis. *Chiropr Man
404 Therap*. 2019;27:7.
- 405 22. Coronado RA, Gay CW, Bialosky JE, Carnaby GD, Bishop MD, George SZ. Changes in pain sensitivity
406 following spinal manipulation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*. 2012
407 Oct;22(5):752–67.
- 408 23. Lyng KD, Thorsen JBB, Larsen DB, Petersen KK. The Modulatory Effect of Quantitative Sensory
409 Testing in Shoulder Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Pain Med*. 2022 Apr 8;23(4):733–
410 44.
- 411 24. Arendt-Nielsen L, Yarnitsky D. Experimental and clinical applications of quantitative sensory testing
412 applied to skin, muscles and viscera. *J Pain*. 2009 Jun;10(6):556–72.
- 413 25. Arribas-Romano A, Fernández-Carnero J, Molina-Rueda F, Angulo-Díaz-Parreño S, Navarro-Santana
414 MJ. Efficacy of Physical Therapy on Nociceptive Pain Processing Alterations in Patients with Chronic


- 415 Musculoskeletal Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Pain Medicine*. 2020 Oct
416 1;21(10):2502–17.
- 417 26. Fernández-Carnero J, Sierra-Silvestre E, Beltran-Alacreu H, Gil-Martínez A, La Touche R. Neural
418 Tension Technique Improves Immediate Conditioned Pain Modulation in Patients with Chronic Neck
419 Pain: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Pain Medicine*. 2019 Jun 1;20(6):1227–35.
- 420 27. Ortego G, Lluch E, Herrero P, Boudreau SA, Doménech-García V. Profiling and Association over Time
421 between Disability and Pain Features in Patients with Chronic Nonspecific Neck Pain: A Longitudinal
422 Study. *JCM*. 2022 Feb 28;11(5):1346.
- 423 28. Tejera D, Beltran-Alacreu H, Cano-de-la-Cuerda R, Leon Hernández JV, Martín-Pintado-Zugasti A,
424 Calvo-Lobo C, et al. Effects of Virtual Reality versus Exercise on Pain, Functional, Somatosensory and
425 Psychosocial Outcomes in Patients with Non-specific Chronic Neck Pain: A Randomized Clinical Trial.
426 *IJERPH*. 2020 Aug 16;17(16):5950.
- 427 29. Lascurain-Aguirrebeña I, Newham D, Critchley DJ. Mechanism of Action of Spinal Mobilizations: A
428 Systematic Review. *SPINE*. 2016 Jan;41(2):159–72.
- 429 30. Coronado RA, Bialosky JE, Bishop MD, Riley JL, Robinson ME, Michener LA, et al. The comparative
430 effects of spinal and peripheral thrust manipulation and exercise on pain sensitivity and the relation
431 to clinical outcome: a mechanistic trial using a shoulder pain model. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2015
432 Apr;45(4):252–64.
- 433 31. Nim CG, Kawchuk GN, Schiøttz-Christensen B, O’Neill S. Changes in pain sensitivity and spinal
434 stiffness in relation to responder status following spinal manipulative therapy in chronic low Back
435 pain: a secondary explorative analysis of a randomized trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2021 Jan
436 6;22(1):23.
- 437 32. MacDermid JC, Walton DM, Avery S, Blanchard A, Etruw E, McAlpine C, et al. Measurement
438 properties of the neck disability index: a systematic review. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2009
439 May;39(5):400–17.
- 440 33. Osman A, Barrios FX, Gutierrez PM, Kopper BA, Merrifield T, Grittmann L. The Pain Catastrophizing
441 Scale: further psychometric evaluation with adult samples. *J Behav Med*. 2000 Aug;23(4):351–65.
- 442 34. Walton D, Elliott JM. A higher-order analysis supports use of the 11-item version of the tampa scale
443 for kinesiophobia in people with neck pain. *Phys Ther*. 2013 Jan;93(1):60–8.
- 444 35. Stratford PW, Binkley J, Solomon P, Gill C, Finch E. Assessing change over time in patients with low
445 back pain. *Phys Ther*. 1994 Jun;74(6):528–33.
- 446 36. Griswold D, Learman K, Kolber MJ, O’Halloran B, Cleland JA. Pragmatically Applied Cervical and
447 Thoracic Nonthrust Manipulation Versus Thrust Manipulation for Patients With Mechanical Neck
448 Pain: A Multicenter Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy*
449 [Internet]. 2018 Feb 28 [cited 2021 Dec 16]; Available from:
450 <https://www.jospt.org/doi/abs/10.2519/jospt.2018.7738>

- 451 37. Fischer AA. Pressure algometry over normal muscles. Standard values, validity and reproducibility of
452 pressure threshold. *Pain*. 1987 Jul;30(1):115–26.
- 453 38. Walton DM, Macdermid JC, Nielson W, Teasell RW, Chiasson M, Brown L. Reliability, standard error,
454 and minimum detectable change of clinical pressure pain threshold testing in people with and
455 without acute neck pain. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2011 Sep;41(9):644–50.
- 456 39. Arendt-Nielsen L, Brennum J, Sindrup S, Bak P. Electrophysiological and psychophysical
457 quantification of temporal summation in the human nociceptive system. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup*
458 *Physiol*. 1994;68(3):266–73.
- 459 40. Rolke R, Baron R, Maier C, Tölle TR, Treede -D. R., Beyer A, et al. Quantitative sensory testing in the
460 German Research Network on Neuropathic Pain (DFNS): standardized protocol and reference
461 values. *Pain*. 2006 Aug;123(3):231–43.
- 462 41. Pedersen JL, Andersen OK, Arendt-Nielsen L, Kehlet H. Hyperalgesia and temporal summation of
463 pain after heat injury in man. *Pain*. 1998 Feb;74(2–3):189–97.
- 464 42. Pud D, Granovsky Y, Yarnitsky D. The methodology of experimentally induced diffuse noxious
465 inhibitory control (DNIC)-like effect in humans. *Pain*. 2009 Jul;144(1–2):16–9.
- 466 43. Kennedy DL, Kemp HI, Ridout D, Yarnitsky D, Rice ASC. Reliability of conditioned pain modulation: a
467 systematic review. *Pain*. 2016 Nov;157(11):2410–9.
- 468 44. Cleland JA, Childs JD, McRae M, Palmer JA, Stowell T. Immediate effects of thoracic manipulation in
469 patients with neck pain: a randomized clinical trial. *Man Ther*. 2005 May;10(2):127–35.
- 470 45. Di Fabio RP. Manipulation of the cervical spine: risks and benefits. *Phys Ther*. 1999 Jan;79(1):50–65.
- 471 46. Cerezo-Téllez E, Torres-Lacomba M, Mayoral-Del Moral O, Sánchez-Sánchez B, Dommerholt J,
472 Gutiérrez-Ortega C. Prevalence of Myofascial Pain Syndrome in Chronic Non-Specific Neck Pain: A
473 Population-Based Cross-Sectional Descriptive Study. *Pain Med*. 2016 Dec;17(12):2369–77.
- 474 47. Rue H, Martino S, Chopin N. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using
475 integrated nested Laplace approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*
476 *(Statistical Methodology)*. 2009;71(2):319–92.
- 477 48. Rue H, Riebler A, Sørbye SH, Illian JB, Simpson DP, Lindgren FK. Bayesian Computing with INLA: A
478 Review. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*. 2017;4(1):395–421.
- 479 49. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 15]. Available from:
480 <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 481 50. R-INLA Project [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 15]. Available from: <https://www.r-inla.org/>
- 482 51. Bishop MD, Beneciuk JM, George SZ. Immediate reduction in temporal sensory summation after
483 thoracic spinal manipulation. *Spine J*. 2011 May;11(5):440–6.

- 484 52. Bialosky JE, Bishop MD, Robinson ME, Zeppieri G, George SZ. Spinal manipulative therapy has an
485 immediate effect on thermal pain sensitivity in people with low back pain: a randomized controlled
486 trial. *Phys Ther.* 2009 Dec;89(12):1292–303.
- 487 53. Bialosky JE, Bishop MD, Price DD, Robinson ME, Vincent KR, George SZ. A randomized sham-
488 controlled trial of a neurodynamic technique in the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Orthop
489 Sports Phys Ther.* 2009 Oct;39(10):709–23.
- 490 54. Heredia-Rizo AM, Petersen KK, Madeleine P, Arendt-Nielsen L. Clinical Outcomes and Central Pain
491 Mechanisms are Improved After Upper Trapezius Eccentric Training in Female Computer Users With
492 Chronic Neck/Shoulder Pain. *Clin J Pain.* 2019 Jan;35(1):65–76.
- 493 55. Wright A, Graven-Nielsen T, Davies II, Arendt-Nielsen L. Temporal summation of pain from skin,
494 muscle and joint following nociceptive ultrasonic stimulation in humans. *Exp Brain Res.* 2002
495 Jun;144(4):475–82.
- 496 56. Pain evoked by polymodal stimulation of hand veins in humans. - PMC [Internet]. [cited 2022 Nov
497 21]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1180163/>
- 498 57. Morales Tejera D, Fernandez-Carnero J, Suso-Martí L, Cano-de-la-Cuerda R, Lerín-Calvo A, Remón-
499 Ramiro L, et al. Comparative study of observed actions, motor imagery and control therapeutic
500 exercise on the conditioned pain modulation in the cervical spine: a randomized controlled trial.
501 *Somatosens Mot Res.* 2020 Sep;37(3):138–48.
- 502 58. Matesanz-García L, Cáceres-Pajuelo JE, Cuenca-Martínez F, La Touche R, Goicoechea-García C,
503 Fernández-Carnero J. Effects of neural mobilizations through movement representation techniques
504 for the improvement of neural mechanosensitivity of the median nerve region: a randomized
505 controlled trial. *Somatosensory & Motor Research.* 2021 Oct 2;38(4):267–76.
- 506 59. Courtney CA, Steffen AD, Fernández-de-Las-Peñas C, Kim J, Chmell SJ. Joint Mobilization Enhances
507 Mechanisms of Conditioned Pain Modulation in Individuals With Osteoarthritis of the Knee. *J
508 Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2016 Mar;46(3):168–76.
- 509 60. Hübscher M, Moloney N, Leaver A, Rebbeck T, McAuley JH, Refshauge KM. Relationship between
510 quantitative sensory testing and pain or disability in people with spinal pain—A systematic review
511 and meta-analysis. *PAIN®.* 2013 Sep 1;154(9):1497–504.
- 512 61. Rampazo ÉP, da Silva VR, de Andrade ALM, Back CGN, Madeleine PM, Arendt-Nielsen L, et al.
513 Sensory, Motor, and Psychosocial Characteristics of Individuals With Chronic Neck Pain: A Case-
514 Control Study. *Phys Ther.* 2021 Mar 26;pzab104.
- 515 62. Trendafilova T, Adhikari K, Schmid AB, Patel R, Polgár E, Chisholm KI, et al. Sodium-calcium
516 exchanger-3 regulates pain “wind-up”: From human psychophysics to spinal mechanisms. *Neuron.*
517 2022 Aug 17;110(16):2571–2587.e13.

- 518 63. Chen K, Yu J, Nie C, Zhu Y, Jiang J, Lei W, et al. Preoperative dynamic quantitative sensory testing in
519 remote pain-free areas is associated with axial pain after posterior cervical spinal surgeries. *BMC*
520 *Musculoskelet Disord.* 2022 Dec;23(1):409.
- 521 64. Izumi M, Petersen KK, Laursen MB, Arendt-Nielsen L, Graven-Nielsen T. Facilitated temporal
522 summation of pain correlates with clinical pain intensity after hip arthroplasty. *Pain.* 2017
523 Feb;158(2):323–32.
- 524 65. O’Leary H, Smart KM, Moloney NA, Blake C, Doody CM. Pain sensitization associated with
525 nonresponse after physiotherapy in people with knee osteoarthritis. *Pain.* 2018 Sep;159(9):1877–
526 86.
- 527 66. Woolf CJ. Central sensitization: implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain. *Pain.* 2011
528 Mar;152(3 Suppl):S2-15.
- 529 67. Woolf CJ. Windup and central sensitization are not equivalent. *Pain.* 1996 Aug;66(2–3):105–8.
- 530 68. Herrero JF, Cervero F. Supraspinal influences on the facilitation of rat nociceptive reflexes induced
531 by carrageenan monoarthritis. *Neurosci Lett.* 1996 May 3;209(1):21–4.
- 532 69. Herrero JF, Laird JM, López-García JA. Wind-up of spinal cord neurones and pain sensation: much
533 ado about something? *Prog Neurobiol.* 2000 Jun;61(2):169–203.
- 534 70. Aira Z, Barrenetxea T, Buesa I, García Del Caño G, Azkue JJ. Dopamine D1-like Receptors Regulate
535 Constitutive, μ -Opioid Receptor-Mediated Repression of Use-Dependent Synaptic Plasticity in Dorsal
536 Horn Neurons: More Harm than Good? *J Neurosci.* 2016 May 18;36(20):5661–73.
- 537 71. Le Bars D, Dickenson AH, Besson JM. Diffuse noxious inhibitory controls (DNIC). I. Effects on dorsal
538 horn convergent neurones in the rat. *Pain.* 1979 Jun;6(3):283–304.
- 539 72. Georgopoulos V, Akin-Akinyosoye K, Zhang W, McWilliams DF, Hendrick P, Walsh DA. Quantitative
540 sensory testing and predicting outcomes for musculoskeletal pain, disability, and negative affect: a
541 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pain.* 2019 Sep;160(9):1920–32.
- 542 73. Xie Y, Thomas L, Barbero M, Falla D, Johnston V, Coombes BK. Heightened pain facilitation rather
543 than impaired pain inhibition distinguishes those with moderate/severe disability in work-related
544 neck pain. *Pain.* 2021 Aug 1;162(8):2225–36.
- 545

Figure 1. CONSORT Flow Diagram



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.26.23297616>; this version posted October 27, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).