

Lack of exercise-induced hypoalgesia to repetitive back movement in people with chronic low back pain

Kuithan, Pauline; Heneghan, Nicola R; Rushton, Alison; Sanderson, Andy; Falla, Deborah

DOI:

[10.1111/papr.12804](https://doi.org/10.1111/papr.12804)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Kuithan, P, Heneghan, NR, Rushton, A, Sanderson, A & Falla, D 2019, 'Lack of exercise-induced hypoalgesia to repetitive back movement in people with chronic low back pain', *Pain Practice*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 740-750.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/papr.12804>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Checked for eligibility: 19/07/2019

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Kuithan, P., Heneghan, N. R., Rushton, A., Sanderson, A. and Falla, D. (2019), Lack of Exercise-Induced Hypoalgesia to Repetitive Back Movement in People with Chronic Low Back Pain. *Pain Pract.* doi:10.1111/papr.12804, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/papr.12804>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1 **LACK OF EXERCISE INDUCED HYPOALGESIA TO REPETITIVE**
2 **BACK MOVEMENT IN PEOPLE WITH CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN**

3
4
5
6 Kuithan, Pauline, MSc.¹, Heneghan, Nicola, R., PhD¹, Rushton, Alison, PhD¹ Sanderson,
7 Andy, BSc¹, Falla, Deborah, PhD¹

8
9 ¹ Centre of Precision Rehabilitation for Spinal Pain (CPR Spine), School of Sport, Exercise
10 and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 **Corresponding author and contact for reprints:**

20 Professor Deborah Falla,
21 Centre of Precision Rehabilitation for Spinal Pain (CPR Spine),
22 School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences,
23 University of Birmingham,
24 Birmingham B15 2TT,
25 United Kingdom
26 Telephone number +44 (0)121 41 47253
27 Email: d.falla@bham.ac.uk

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Purpose:** To investigate whether people with chronic low back pain (LBP) show
3 dysfunctional exercise induced hypoalgesia (EIH) in response to repeated contractions of
4 their back muscles during a lifting task.

5 **Methods:** In this cross-sectional observational study conducted on asymptomatic participants
6 (n=18) and participants with chronic LBP (n=21), quantitative sensory testing (QST) was
7 applied extensively over the lumbar region and a remote area before and after repeated task
8 which involved lifting a 5kg box for ~7 minutes. QST included pressure pain thresholds
9 (PPT), thermal detection and pain thresholds and measures of temporal summation.
10 Topographical maps of the percentage change in PPT detected at 16 locations over the
11 lumbar region were generated to explore regional differences and compared between groups.

12 **Results:** Mean (SD) PPT measured from 16 sites over the lower back, changed significantly
13 in asymptomatic participants (+29.78kPa(41.4)) following task completion indicative of EIH,
14 whereas no significant change was observed for the LBP group (-14.87kPa(61.2)). No
15 changes were detected at the remote site for either group. No changes were revealed for the
16 thermal tests. Temporal summation data revealed decreasing pain sensitivity as the test
17 progressed but the test response did not change after the exercise for either group

18 **Conclusion(s):** Unlike asymptomatic individuals, participants with LBP lacked EIH over the
19 lumbar erector spinae muscles following repeated lifting. Although these results should be
20 considered in relation to the study limitations, particularly the absence of a control group, the
21 findings support impaired EIH in patients with LBP.

22 **Key words:** Exercise Induced Hypoalgesia, Quantitative Sensory Testing, Low Back Pain

23

1 INTRODUCTION

2 The effects of exercise induced hypoalgesia (EIH), a short-term endogenous pain
3 inhibitory response after exercise, are well documented in healthy individuals [1]. The EIH
4 response can be detected with quantitative sensory testing (QST); revealed as a change in
5 pain threshold after exercise. The extent of the EIH response depends on several factors
6 including the type, dosage and intensity of the exercise [2 3].

7 Studies have revealed that EIH can be impaired in different musculoskeletal pain
8 disorders including whiplash, osteoarthritis of the knee or shoulder pain [4-7], which can
9 explain the varied response to exercise and has important implications for exercise
10 prescription. On the contrary, very few studies have examined EIH in people with low back
11 pain (LBP), even though exercise is recommended as a fundamental treatment for the
12 management of LBP in national and international guidelines [8 9]. Two studies evaluated
13 EIH in people with relatively mild LBP and both showed a similar analgesic response in
14 people with LBP compared to a control group following submaximal aerobic exercise on an
15 ergometer for ~30 minutes [10 11]. In contrast, a three-minute repeated lifting task which was
16 designed to target activation of the back muscles, led to higher pain sensitivity to pressure
17 over the lumbar region in participants with mild chronic LBP and no changes in the control
18 group [12] suggesting that EIH to back-specific tasks could be impaired in LBP. However,
19 this task was likely of inadequate intensity to produce EIH, since no change in pain
20 sensitivity occurred in the asymptomatic control group. A further study examined the
21 response to a 2-minute isometric back extension exercise (Biering Soerensen test) and
22 showed evidence of EIH at remote but not local sites [13], however this study was limited to
23 asymptomatic individuals. Further research is therefore needed to fully understand the
24 analgesic response to back-specific exercise and whether this is affected in people with
25 chronic LBP.

1 The aim of this study was to quantify, via QST assessed at local and remote sites,
2 whether asymptomatic people demonstrate EIH in response to repeated movement of the
3 trunk and whether the response is dysfunctional in participants with chronic LBP. Based on
4 the earlier study by [12], we used a task which involved repeated lifting a 5kg box for ~7
5 minutes. This knowledge gained from this study may facilitate a greater understanding of the
6 mechanisms contributing to varied response to exercise in people with LBP (i.e. those that
7 lack EIH) and the exacerbation of symptoms in some people with LBP following repeated
8 mechanical work [14-17].

9 **METHODS**

10 *Study design and setting*

11 This observational cross-sectional study was approved by the Ethics committee of the
12 University of Birmingham (ERN_16-1389) and was conducted according to the Declaration
13 of Helsinki. All tests were conducted in a single session by the same two investigators (PK
14 and AS) between July 2017 and March 2018. This report follows the STROBE statement for
15 observational studies [18].

16 *Participants*

17 Participants with chronic LBP and asymptomatic controls were recruited from the
18 University staff and student population. All participants gave written consent prior to data
19 collection. Inclusion criteria for both groups were age between 18 and 65 years, not being
20 pregnant and able to communicate in English. Participants were considered asymptomatic if
21 they had no previous history of back or lower limb pain which warranted treatment from a
22 health care practitioner and no neurological disorders.

23 Inclusion criteria for the participants with chronic LBP were back pain lasting more
24 than three months, and pain experienced on more than 90 days out of the past six months. A
25 history of spinal fractures or spinal stenosis and radiating leg pain were exclusion criteria as

1 were concurrent systemic, rheumatic, or neurological disorders which may have confounded
2 testing. They should not have been undergoing active management for chronic LBP or on
3 higher doses of pain medication (> 30 mg of morphine equivalent dose).

4 *Questionnaires*

5 A custom designed questionnaire was firstly completed by the LBP participants to
6 assess their average of the last 24hrs, during their latest episode, as well as their current pain
7 intensity, all rated on an 11-item Numerical Rating Scale (NRS), with 0 for no pain and 10
8 for the worst pain imaginable [19]. LBP participants were also asked to rate their perceived
9 disability with the Oswestry Disability Index (ODI) [20]. In addition, the following
10 established questionnaires were used to describe the study population: The International
11 Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) [21]; perception of health and wellbeing (SF-36v2),
12 comprising of the Physical and Mental Component Scale [22]; the 21-item depression,
13 anxiety and stress scale (DASS-21) [23], the fear avoidance beliefs questionnaire
14 (FABQ)[24]; and pain catastrophizing scale (PCS) [25].

15 *Quantitative Sensory Testing (QST)*

16 QST was performed in a consistent order which was pressure pain threshold (PPT)
17 testing followed by thermal detection and thermal pain threshold testing starting at the
18 periphery and finishing at the back. Temporal summation of repeated thermal stimuli was
19 performed last. The tests were chosen based on previous studies and pilot testing [12 26 27].
20 Reliability of QST has been demonstrated previously and it is an established method to
21 evaluate EIH [1 28-31].

22 *Pressure Pain Thresholds (PPTs)*

23 After a familiarisation period, PPTs were measured with an algometer (1 cm² probe,
24 30kPa/sec) (Somedic Production, Stockholm, Sweden). Firstly, PPT were tested over the

1 thenar eminence on the right side for the asymptomatic group, and on the most painful side
2 for the LBP participants. In the case of bilateral and symmetrical pain, the right side was
3 selected. A grid, orientated on the spinous process of the 5th lumbar vertebrae, was used to
4 mark 16 testing locations over the lumbar region (Fig. 1) to explore regional differences in
5 PPT changes following the exercise. This was based on a similar approach used previously
6 [12] but applied bilaterally, with two vertical rows of four points on each side. The medial
7 row was directly placed over the erector spinae muscles. Testing was alternated across
8 participants in four different patterns. For all PPT tests, the participants were instructed to
9 push a button as soon as they perceived that the sensation of pressure had turned to one of
10 pain. The mean of two consecutive readings over each site was used for data analysis.
11 Topographical maps of the percentage change in PPT for each location were generated as
12 previously described (Falla et al., 2014).

13

14 *Thermal detection and pain thresholds*

15 A Thermal analyser TSA-II (Medoc, Israel) with a 30x30mm Peltier thermode was
16 applied over the thenar eminence on the right or most painful side as described above, after a
17 demonstration on the contralateral side. Three randomised stimuli of either warm or cold
18 were applied for the detection threshold and then for the pain threshold. Baseline temperature
19 was set at 32°C, and the temperature increased or decreased by 1°C and returned with a rate
20 of 8°C/s with a 5 seconds inter-stimulus interval. For the pain threshold an increase / decrease
21 of 1.5°C/s and return of 8°C/s with 10 seconds interval was chosen to avoid temporal
22 summation. The minimum temperature was set to 0°C and the maximum to 50°C. The same
23 test was then conducted for both groups over the back on the right side corresponding to the
24 PPT locations 11-16 (Fig. 1). For analysis the mean of three measurements was taken for
25 each site.

1 *Temporal summation*

2 Firstly, a familiarisation test was performed on the contralateral side with five stimuli
3 of 46°C with the same thermal tester described above. Participants were asked to rate their
4 perceived pain on an NRS from 0-100 for each of the stimuli with 0 for no pain and 100 as
5 worst pain imaginable. Then the thermode was placed under the volar mid-forearm on the
6 right or most painful side. Ten consecutive stimuli were applied starting at a baseline
7 temperature of 40°C increasing within 8°C/s to 48°C, and at the same rate to return to
8 baseline. Inter stimulus interval was set as 2.5s adapted from a protocol by Owens et al. [26].

9 *Repeated lifting task*

10 Measurements of the sternomanubrial joint line for the top shelves, and the height of
11 the lateral epicondyle of the femur for the lower shelves, and the length from the acromion to
12 the head of the ulna for distance from the feet to the shelves were taken to determine the set-
13 up for the lifting task (Fig. 2A).

14 Participants performed ten cycles lifting a 5kg box (35.5 cm x 29 cm x 13.5 cm) with
15 reinforced handles between six different shelves for approximately seven minutes in total. To
16 the beat of a metronome, the participant lifted the box to the top shelf over 2 seconds and
17 then could rest for 2 seconds with the box on the shelf. Fig. 2B shows the pattern for each
18 cycle. The task was based on a task described in a previous study [12], but was extended to
19 represent a more functional movement by adding rotation using six instead of two shelves.
20 During the task the participant was asked every minute to rate their pain on an NRS from 0-
21 10 and their perceived exhaustion after the lifting task on a printed Borg scale [32]. They
22 were informed that they could end the lifting task at any time.

23 Within 5 minutes of completion of the lifting task, the QST tests were repeated as
24 described above, but in the following order: Lumbar PPTs followed by thermal tests over the

1 lumbar area with the participant in supine. Then the PPTs and thermal measurements were
2 performed over the hand. This sequence was selected for efficiency of testing, to minimise
3 movement of the participant and prioritise testing of the lumbar region. Temporal summation
4 testing was conducted last avoiding any potential interference with the other tests. The
5 duration of the pre-test protocol was slightly longer than the post-test protocol because of the
6 familiarisation period. The entire duration varied between 20 to 30 minutes.

7 *Statistical analysis*

8 Independent t-tests were applied to detect possible differences between the participant
9 characteristics of the two groups, (IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24). Data were analysed for
10 normality and if necessary, outliers were removed from the analysis based on a z-score >3.29
11 and reported as such [33].

12 A mean of the PPT across the 16 locations of their back was calculated for each
13 participant and in addition, the percentage change in PPT was determined for each location.
14 For the thermal testing, if any reading did not meet the pain threshold at 0/50 °C (limit of the
15 equipment), then the data were excluded from further analysis.

16 A two-way repeated measurement analysis of variance (RM-ANOVA) was conducted
17 to evaluate changes in PPT detected over the hand with group (asymptomatic/LBP) and time
18 (pre/post) as factors. A three-way RM-ANOVA was conducted for the lumbar PPT with
19 group, time and location (locations 1-16) as factors. Two-way RM-ANOVAs were also
20 applied for the thermal detection - and pain thresholds with group and time as factors. For
21 temporal summation a three-way RM-ANOVA with group, time, and sequence of heat
22 impulse (1-10) was applied. Significant differences were followed by Student Newman Keuls
23 (SNK) post hoc analyses and Bonferroni corrections (BC) for multiple comparisons.

1 Finally, we tested the correlation of pain, perceived exertion, and change in
2 percentage for the QST measurements using the Pearson correlation coefficient. Significance
3 was set as $P < .05$.

4 **RESULTS**

5 *Participants*

6 Participant characteristics of 18 asymptomatic participants (8 men, 10 women) and 21
7 participants with chronic LBP (9 men, 12 women) are presented in Table 1. One further
8 participant was recruited but only pre QST measurement were taken due to technical issues
9 and this participant was therefore excluded. The ODI indicated minimal disability in the
10 group with LBP and only two participants reported moderate disability. Participants with
11 LBP reported significantly higher scores on the Borg Scale (controls: 11.1, (SD: 2.2), LBP:
12 13.1 (1.7); $P = .005$).

13 In contrast to all asymptomatic participants who successfully completed the full task,
14 three LBP participants terminated the task due to provocation of their LBP during the 4th, 6th
15 and 9th cycle. However, as participants performed the task for as long as they could, their data
16 were retained in the analysis and QST was still performed after their final task cycle.

17 *Pain*

18 Four control participants experienced LBP during the task (peak pain intensity of 2/10
19 reported by 3 participants and 8/10 by one participant, group mean: 0.8(SD: 2.0)). Overall,
20 the reported peak pain intensity during the task was 4.78 (SD: 2.0) for the LBP group and
21 only one LBP participant did not perceive LBP during the task.

22 *PPTs (local and remote)*

23 For PPT collected over the lower back, the overall scores (mean of 16 locations) were
24 pre-test 341.39kPa (SD:116.9) and post-test 371.16kPa (130.4) for asymptomatic (n=18) and

1 320.08kPa (113.7) and 305.20kPa (101.0) for participants with LBP (n=20). This led to a
2 difference of 29.78kPa (41.4) for the asymptomatic participants and -14.87kPa (61.2) for the
3 participants with LBP. The percentage changes in PPT are displayed in Fig. 3 illustrating a
4 mean change for the asymptomatic group of +9.43% (SD: 13.4, CI [2.8, 16.1]) and -2.10%
5 (SD: 18.4, CI [-10.7, 6.5]) for the LBP group.

6 A three-way RM-ANOVA showed significant interactions for location, location and
7 group, and time and location ($F= 1.85 - 10.81, P=.000 - .025$). The significance of location/
8 time and location indicates the heterogeneous response of different test sites over the lumbar
9 area. However, for the purposes of this study, the most relevant finding was a group and time
10 interaction ($F=6.78, P=.001$) and the post hoc analysis revealed a significant increase in PPT
11 after the task but only for the control group (controls: SNK: $P=.019$; LBP: SNK = $P=.228$).
12 However, Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons revealed no significant interaction
13 for time and group (controls: +29.78 (SE: 12.44) $P=.132$ [-5.0, 64.5]; LBP: -14.87(SE: 11.80)
14 $P=1.00$ [CI: -47.8, 18.1]).

15 Topographical maps showing the percent change in PPT between pre- and post-test
16 over the 16 different locations over the lumbar spine are presented in Figure 4. Based on
17 observation of the topographical maps, we undertook further analysis to evaluate changes
18 only within the cranial half of the map. There was an interaction of time and group ($F=10.23,$
19 $P=.003$; SNK: controls: $P=.002$, LBP: $P=.265$). Correction for multiple comparisons
20 confirmed changes for the asymptomatic group only (controls: +43.05 (SE: 13.03) $P=.132$
21 [CI: 6.69, 79.42]).

22 By separating the medial and lateral row, a significant change was observed over the
23 medial (PPT test sites 5-12) column only. A significant interaction between time and group
24 was observed ($F= 8.12, P=.007$). The post-hoc analysis showed a significant change only for

1 the asymptomatic group (SNK: controls: $P=.001$, LBP: $P=.643$). Adjustment for multiple
2 comparisons confirmed a significant post-task increase in PPT only for the asymptomatic
3 group (controls: $+46.93$ (SE: 13.5) $P=.008$, [CI: $9.18, 84.68$]).

4 For PPT measured over the thenar eminence, the mean (SD) pre-test values were
5 259.33 kPa (77.8) and post-test values 281.94 kPa (117.4) for the asymptomatic group with a
6 difference of $+22.61$ kPa (93.1). For participants with LBP the mean pre-test value was
7 276.55 kPa (88.84) and 278.50 (72.2) for the post-test with a difference of $+1.95$ kPa (40.2).
8 A two-way RM-ANOVA revealed no significant differences between groups and no
9 significant change over time.

10 There was a significant correlation between change in the PPT percentage over the
11 hand and the back only in asymptomatic participants ($r=.783$, $P=.000$, $n=18$). ~~Furthermore, in~~
12 ~~asymptomatic participants there was a high negative correlation between NRS during lifting~~
13 ~~and PPT change in percentage over the medial columns ($r=-.716$, $P=.001$, $n=18$).~~ However, in
14 both groups there was no significant correlation between baseline PPT and the percent
15 change in PPT indicating that an EIH response was not dependent on baseline sensitivity.

16 *Thermal Testing*

17

18 Results for the cold and warm detection and pain thresholds are presented in Table 2.
19 Two CDT readings from the hand and one from the back were identified as outliers ($z\text{-score} >$
20 3.29) and were removed from the analysis. A two-way RM-ANOVA revealed a significant
21 difference for group ($F=4.18$, $P=.049$) for the CDT detected over the hand yet further post-
22 hoc analysis revealed no further significant differences between groups and there was no
23 effect of time. No significant differences and interactions between group or time were
24 observed for the CDT performed over the lumbar region nor warm detection over the hand
25 and the lumbar area.

1 Due to limitations of the device with a safety limit of 0 °C/ 50°C completed data sets
2 were limited in both groups for the CPT. The difference in CPT between pre- and post-tests
3 was +1.6 °C (5.6) for the asymptomatic participants and a +2.5°C (4.9) for LBP group. A
4 two-way RM-ANOVA showed a significant change over time ($F=5.31$, $P=.028$) for both
5 groups but there were no differences between groups.

6 For the lumbar area a RM-ANOVA showed no significant group difference, although
7 the overall change between pre- and post-task measures across both groups was close to
8 significant ($F=4.24$, $P=.054$). Imputing 0°C for the missed scores did not affect the result.

9 For the thenar WPT the overall difference between pre- and post-test was -1.2°C (2.5)
10 for the asymptomatic group and -1.1°C (2.7) for those with LBP. A two-way RM-ANOVA
11 showed a significant interaction between group and time ($F=8.739$, $P=.006$) with the post-hoc
12 analysis confirming a reduction of the WPT for the asymptomatic group only (SNK: $P=.037$).
13 However, correction for multiple comparisons showed no significance (BC: $P=.144$). There
14 was no significant change in WPT measured over the lumbar region for either group.

15 *Temporal summation*

16 TS data was obtained from 15 asymptomatic and 18 participants with LBP. Overall, a
17 reduction in pain sensitivity to the same stimulus was found over time (Fig. 5). A three-way
18 RM-ANOVA revealed interactions for sequence only ($F= 22.69$, $P=.000$) with the post hoc
19 analysis revealing significant changes between the 1st and 3-10th stimulus (SNK: $P< .034$).
20 No differences were observed between groups and there was no effect of the task on temporal
21 summation.

22

23

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 This is the first study to rigorously utilise different quantitative sensory measures to
3 evaluate whether a repeated lifting exercise induces EIH and whether this effect differs in
4 people with chronic LBP. Our findings confirmed that the hypoalgesic effect gained from
5 back-specific exercise induced by repeated lifting is impaired in participants with chronic
6 LBP which has important implications for those performing repeated lifting in an
7 occupational setting.

8 The study population comprised mainly people with minimal disability due to their
9 LBP ($ODI \leq 20$). At baseline, we did not observe any consistent differences in any of the QST
10 measures between groups indicating that our sample of people with LBP did not show
11 obvious signs of peripheral or central sensitisation. This is in contrast with previous work
12 using multiple PPT over the lumbar region which showed lower PPT for people with LBP in
13 a comparable population [12 34]. The high inter-individual differences and the relatively low
14 levels of pain and disability in our sample could explain this. Moreover, we did not observe a
15 correlation between baseline PPT and changes in PPT post-task in our study population,
16 indicating that the extent of EIH was independent of baseline sensitivity.

17 The task was perceived by the participants as easy to moderate exercise according to
18 the Borg Scale. This is in contrast to most other studies which have examined EIH in
19 response to more demanding exercise [1 35]. Yet the current study clearly demonstrated an
20 EIH response for the asymptomatic population as seen by the significant increase in lumbar
21 PPT measured after completion of the repetitive task.

22 Furthermore, our results are in contrast to previous studies that did not find evidence
23 of impaired EIH in people with LBP, however no other study has examined the response to
24 exercise specifically targeting the back muscles [10 11]. In a study which evaluated changes

1 in PPT following a lifting task albeit of shorter duration and only lifting in the sagittal plane
2 [12], a significant local decrease in PPT over the lumbar area was shown in people with LBP.
3 The trend was shown in our study. However, changes were not statistically significant.

4 Differences were observed for the change in PPT between medial and lateral testing
5 sites in the asymptomatic group with significant changes observed only for medial sites. This
6 is likely because the lateral column was located to a lesser extent over the erector spinae, i.e.
7 the iliocostalis lumborum, which were engaged in the task [36]. Moreover, EIH was more
8 evident at cranial sites. This underlines the importance of topographical PPT mapping, as
9 changes might not be depicted if only a single test site is used.

10 The absence of EIH in our cohort of people with LBP does not necessarily imply that
11 the people with LBP lacked descending pain inhibition. It rather could be caused by their
12 erector spinae muscles becoming sensitised after the task due to localised muscle fatigue.
13 Especially since studies indicate that the erector spinae are more fatigable in people with LBP
14 and changes in muscles activity were found with fatigue or pain [37-39].

15 Research on changes in pain sensitivity over the lumbar region after exercise is
16 limited. Comparing our results with the findings from Gajjar et al. [13], we found similar
17 baseline scores and changes in lumbar PPT (absolute change: men: 34.2 kPa: women: 18.9
18 kPa from Gajjar et al [13]). However, in the study by Gajjar et al.[13], the increase in PPT
19 over the lower back after exercise did not reach statistical significance, unlike our current
20 findings. The isometric back extension task used in this previous study also engages the hip
21 extensor muscles, over which they found a significant increase in PPT. Additionally, Gajjar
22 et al.[13] examined the PPT at only one site over the lumbar region (adjacent to L3). Our
23 findings indicate that test site has a significant influence on outcome and that testing sites
24 directly over the muscle belly are more likely to demonstrate a change.

1 We did not identify a significant change in pressure pain sensitivity measured at a
2 remote site (hand), likely because of the low intensity and duration of the task since remote
3 changes are typically seen after excessive or vigorous exercise [2 3].

4 In contrast to pressure testing, the sensitivity to thermal stimuli did not show a clear
5 pattern and was restricted by the temperature range of the equipment used. In line with our
6 study, most other studies have used PPT as an outcome measurement for EIH which seems
7 more responsive as an outcome measurement [1]. This is likely because mechanical pressure
8 stimulates receptors within an exercised muscle, whereas the thermal stimuli stimulate
9 superficial receptors of the skin. Changes in temperature pain thresholds may be caused by
10 exercise-induced changes in skin or body temperature rather than inhibitory pain mechanisms
11 [1]. Furthermore, the randomisation of stimuli might have affected the results [40].

12 The temporal summation of heat stimuli did not differ between groups and did not
13 change pre- and post- exercise but did decrease over the series of stimuli. These results are in
14 contrast to a similar protocol in a similar population without an exercise intervention [26].
15 Other studies also showed an increase in pain intensity using different protocols [41 42].
16 However, consistent with our findings, a reverse effect of temporal summation has been
17 reported in other studies as a reduced wind-up or habituation in healthy controls [43 44]. We
18 therefore cannot infer any changes in temporal summation as the protocol we used did not
19 induce temporal summation.

20 It is worthwhile to note that there was large variability in QST responses. Some
21 participants with chronic LBP did show increased PPT after the task reflecting the large
22 variability in presentation found in any chronic LBP cohort [45]. However, our findings
23 highlight that even people experiencing chronic symptoms of low severity and normal
24 baseline sensitivity can lack an EIH response. It is relevant in future research to investigate if

1 the absence of EIH is associated with poorer outcome to exercise interventions in people with
2 LBP. Potentially, the response to a short bout of back-specific exercise could be used to
3 understand whether or not a patient is likely to have a positive analgesic response to an
4 exercise programme targeting their back muscles. Although, subgrouping based on EIH
5 response needs to be fully investigated in future work.

6

7 **Strengths and Limitations**

8 This is the first study to assess the effects of repetitive lifting on pain sensitivity with
9 an extensive QST test battery including tests of sensitivity to both mechanical and thermal
10 stimuli. Nevertheless, there are some methodological considerations that should be noted. An
11 a priori sample size was not determined and it is therefore possible that the sample size
12 prevented some differences from reaching statistical significance. It could be argued that the
13 average change in PPT measured from the 16 sites over the lower back for the asymptomatic
14 participants (i.e. +29.78kPa) is low and although statistically significant, is not a relevant
15 change. Moreover, based on the RM-ANOVA there was no interaction at the remote test site
16 for time (controls: +22.61kPa/ LBP: +1.95kPa), even though change in the asymptomatic
17 group is somewhat similar to the change over the lumbar region. Nevertheless, it should be
18 noted that the average change in PPT for the LBP group was in the opposite direction (i.e. -
19 14.87kPa) suggesting a real and relevant difference in response between groups.

20 No control condition was included in this study; thus, it is uncertain whether the
21 changes in PPT are actually due to the exercise performed. The change in PPT at the back
22 could be partially attributed to habituation, due to induction of pain itself from the extensive
23 psychophysical testing or even expectation effects. We verbally encouraged and instructed
24 participants to lift with their back. Therefore, changes in QST might be influenced by

1 underlying biomechanical or muscular activations pattern which weren't considered in this
2 study. We recruited participants from a University environment and therefore our data cannot
3 be generalised to other LBP populations including those exposed to manual labour and heavy
4 lifting or to people with more severe LBP.

5 Even in the control group, the task produced mild back pain in some participants. This
6 suggests firstly that the task targeted the right region. On the other hand, the duration and
7 intensity of the task might not have been extensive enough to produce high levels of EIH,
8 especially indications of a systemic effect measured at the remote site.

9 Missing data were due to technical limitations of the equipment used but were
10 relatively even between groups and thus this did not likely have a significant effect on the
11 results. The order of QST was the same for both groups and cannot explain group differences.
12 However, we cannot out rule that different test modalities have an effect on the subsequent
13 test. Finally, the full QST was completed within 30 minutes, which has been indicated as the
14 minimum persistence of EIH [1]. As thermal tests were performed last, any effects might
15 have been disappeared by that time. Although we do not know how long the effects were
16 maintained and this should be explored in future studies.

17 **Conclusion**

18 Asymptomatic people responded favourably to a short repeated lifting task displaying
19 evidence of EIH as revealed by a significant reduction in pressure pain sensitivity over the
20 erector spinae. In contrast, this phenomenon was absent in participants with chronic LBP,
21 even though they presented with low severity pain and disability.

22

23

1 **Declaration of interest**

2 All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

3 **Funding**

4 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
5 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Naugle KM, Fillingim RB, Riley JL, 3rd. A meta-analytic review of the hypoalgesic
3 effects of exercise. *J Pain* 2012;**13**(12):1139-50 doi:
4 10.1016/j.jpain.2012.09.006[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 5 2. Micalos PS, Arendt-Nielsen L. Differential pain response at local and remote muscle sites
6 following aerobic cycling exercise at mild and moderate intensity. *Springerplus*
7 2016;**5**:91 doi: 10.1186/s40064-016-1721-8[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 8 3. Naugle KM, Naugle KE, Fillingim RB, Samuels B, Riley JL, 3rd. Intensity thresholds for
9 aerobic exercise-induced hypoalgesia. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2014;**46**(4):817-25 doi:
10 10.1249/MSS.000000000000143[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 11 4. Kuppens K, Struyf F, Nijs J, et al. Exercise- and Stress-Induced Hypoalgesia in Musicians
12 with and without Shoulder Pain: A Randomized Controlled Crossover Study. *Pain*
13 *Physician* 2016;**19**(2):59-68
- 14 5. Ludvigsson ML, Peterson G, Dederig A, Falla D, Peolsson A. Factors associated with
15 pain and disability reduction following exercise interventions in chronic whiplash.
16 *Eur J Pain* 2016;**20**(2):307-15 doi: 10.1002/ejp.729[published Online First: Epub
17 Date]].
- 18 6. Vaegter HB, Handberg G, Graven-Nielsen T. Hypoalgesia After Exercise and the Cold
19 Pressor Test is Reduced in Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain Patients With High Pain
20 Sensitivity. *Clin J Pain* 2016;**32**(1):58-69 doi:
21 10.1097/AJP.000000000000223[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 22 7. Wideman TH, Finan PH, Edwards RR, et al. Increased sensitivity to physical activity
23 among individuals with knee osteoarthritis: relation to pain outcomes, psychological
24 factors, and responses to quantitative sensory testing. *Pain* 2014;**155**(4):703-11 doi:
25 10.1016/j.pain.2013.12.028[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 26 8. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence N. NICE guideline 59. Low back pain
27 and sciatica in over 16s: assessment and management. Secondary NICE guideline 59.
28 Low back pain and sciatica in over 16s: assessment and management. 2019.
29 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng59#>.
- 30 9. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, Forcica MA, Clinical Guidelines Committee of the
31 American College of P. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic
32 Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of
33 Physicians. *Ann Intern Med* 2017;**166**(7):514-30 doi: 10.7326/M16-2367[published
34 Online First: Epub Date]].
- 35 10. Hoffmann MD, Shepanski MA, MacKenzie SP, Clifford PS. Experimentally-induced
36 pain perception is acutely reduced by aerobic exercise in persons with chronic low
37 back pain. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development* 2005;**42**(2):183-90
- 38 11. Meeus M, Roussel NA, Truijen S, Nijs J. Reduced pressure pain thresholds in response to
39 exercise in chronic fatigue syndrome but not in chronic low back pain: an
40 experimental study. *J Rehabil Med* 2010;**42**(9):884-90 doi: 10.2340/16501977-
41 0595[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 42 12. Falla D, Gizzi L, Tschapek M, Erlenwein J, Petzke F. Reduced task-induced variations in
43 the distribution of activity across back muscle regions in individuals with low back
44 pain. *Pain* 2014;**155**(5):944-53 doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2014.01.027[published Online
45 First: Epub Date]].
- 46 13. Gajjar H, Titze C, Hasenbring MI, Vaegter HB. Isometric Back Exercise Has Different
47 Effect on Pressure Pain Thresholds in Healthy Men and Women. *Pain Med*
48 2017;**18**(5):917-23 doi: 10.1093/pm/pnw176[published Online First: Epub Date]].

- 1 14. Gerhardt A, Eich W, Janke S, Leisner S, Treede RD, Tesarz J. Chronic Widespread Back
2 Pain is Distinct From Chronic Local Back Pain: Evidence From Quantitative Sensory
3 Testing, Pain Drawings, and Psychometrics. *Clin J Pain* 2016;**32**(7):568-79 doi:
4 10.1097/AJP.0000000000000300[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 5 15. Hubscher M, Moloney N, Rebeck T, Traeger A, Refshauge KM. Contributions of mood,
6 pain catastrophizing, and cold hyperalgesia in acute and chronic low back pain: a
7 comparison with pain-free controls. *Clin J Pain* 2014;**30**(10):886-93 doi:
8 10.1097/AJP.0000000000000045[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 9 16. Puta C, Schulz B, Schoeler S, et al. Somatosensory abnormalities for painful and
10 innocuous stimuli at the back and at a site distinct from the region of pain in chronic
11 back pain patients. *PLoS One* 2013;**8**(3):e58885 doi:
12 10.1371/journal.pone.0058885[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 13 17. Roussel NA, Nijs J, Meeus M, Mylius V, Fayt C, Oostendorp R. Central sensitization and
14 altered central pain processing in chronic low back pain: fact or myth? *Clin J Pain*
15 2013;**29**(7):625-38 doi: 10.1097/AJP.0b013e31826f9a71[published Online First:
16 Epub Date]].
- 17 18. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of
18 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for
19 reporting observational studies. *Int J Surg* 2014;**12**(12):1495-9 doi:
20 10.1016/j.ijisu.2014.07.013[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 21 19. Breivik H, Borchgrevink PC, Allen SM, et al. Assessment of pain. *Br J Anaesth*
22 2008;**101**(1):17-24 doi: 10.1093/bja/aen103[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 23 20. Fairbank JC, Pynsent PB. The Oswestry Disability Index. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*
24 2000;**25**(22):2940-52; discussion 52
- 25 21. Craig CL, Marshall AL, Sjoström M, et al. International physical activity questionnaire:
26 12-country reliability and validity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2003;**35**(8):1381-95 doi:
27 10.1249/01.MSS.0000078924.61453.FB[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 28 22. Scoggins JF, Patrick DL. The use of patient-reported outcomes instruments in registered
29 clinical trials: evidence from ClinicalTrials.gov. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2009;**30**(4):289-
30 92 doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2009.02.005[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 31 23. Henry JD, Crawford JR. The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales
32 (DASS-21): construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *Br J*
33 *Clin Psychol* 2005;**44**(Pt 2):227-39 doi: 10.1348/014466505X29657[published Online
34 First: Epub Date]].
- 35 24. Osman A, Barrios FX, Gutierrez PM, Kopper BA, Merrifield T, Grittmann L. The Pain
36 Catastrophizing Scale: further psychometric evaluation with adult samples. *J Behav*
37 *Med* 2000;**23**(4):351-65
- 38 25. Waddell G, Newton M, Henderson I, Somerville D, Main CJ. A Fear-Avoidance Beliefs
39 Questionnaire (FABQ) and the role of fear-avoidance beliefs in chronic low back pain
40 and disability. *Pain* 1993;**52**(2):157-68
- 41 26. Owens MA, Bulls HW, Trost Z, et al. An Examination of Pain Catastrophizing and
42 Endogenous Pain Modulatory Processes in Adults with Chronic Low Back Pain. *Pain*
43 *Med* 2016;**17**(8):1452-64 doi: 10.1093/pm/pnv074[published Online First: Epub
44 Date]].
- 45 27. Rolke R, Baron R, Maier C, et al. Quantitative sensory testing in the German Research
46 Network on Neuropathic Pain (DFNS): standardized protocol and reference values.
47 *Pain* 2006;**123**(3):231-43 doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2006.01.041[published Online First:
48 Epub Date]].
- 49 28. Balaguier R, Madeleine P, Vuillerme N. Intra-session absolute and relative reliability of
50 pressure pain thresholds in the low back region of vine-workers: effect of the number

- 1 of trials. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2016;**17**(1):350 doi: 10.1186/s12891-016-1212-
2 7[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 3 29. Knutti IA, Suter MR, Opsommer E. Test-retest reliability of thermal quantitative sensory
4 testing on two sites within the L5 dermatome of the lumbar spine and lower
5 extremity. Neurosci Lett 2014;**579**:157-62 doi:
6 10.1016/j.neulet.2014.07.023[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 7 30. Moloney NA, Hall TM, Doody CM. Reliability of thermal quantitative sensory testing: a
8 systematic review. J Rehabil Res Dev 2012;**49**(2):191-207
- 9 31. Vuilleumier PH, Biurrun Manresa JA, Ghamri Y, et al. Reliability of Quantitative
10 Sensory Tests in a Low Back Pain Population. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2015;**40**(6):665-
11 73 doi: 10.1097/AAP.0000000000000289[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 12 32. Borg GA. Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion. Med Sci Sports Exerc
13 1982;**14**(5):377-81
- 14 33. Field A. Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. ProQuest Ebook Central: SAGE
15 Publications, 2007.
- 16 34. O'Neill S, Larsen JB, Nim C, Arendt-Nielsen L. Topographic mapping of pain sensitivity
17 of the lower back - a comparison of healthy controls and patients with chronic non-
18 specific low back pain. Scand J Pain 2019;**19**(1):25-37 doi: 10.1515/sjpain-2018-
19 0113[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 20 35. Vaegter HB, Handberg G, Graven-Nielsen T. Isometric exercises reduce temporal
21 summation of pressure pain in humans. Eur J Pain 2015;**19**(7):973-83 doi:
22 10.1002/ejp.623[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 23 36. Bodgduk N. *Clinical anatomy of the lumbar spine and sacrum*. Edinburgh:
24 Elsevier/Churchill Livingstone, 2005.
- 25 37. Abboud J, Nougrou F, Page I, Cantin V, Massicotte D, Descarreaux M. Trunk motor
26 variability in patients with non-specific chronic low back pain. Eur J Appl Physiol
27 2014;**114**(12):2645-54 doi: 10.1007/s00421-014-2985-8[published Online First: Epub
28 Date]].
- 29 38. Boucher JA, Abboud J, Nougrou F, Normand MC, Descarreaux M. The Effects of
30 Vibration and Muscle Fatigue on Trunk Sensorimotor Control in Low Back Pain
31 Patients. PLoS One 2015;**10**(8):e0135838 doi:
32 10.1371/journal.pone.0135838[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 33 39. Sanderson A, Martinez-Valdes E, Heneghan NR, Murillo C, Rushton A, Falla D.
34 Variation in the spatial distribution of erector spinae activity during a lumbar
35 endurance task in people with low back pain. J Anat 2019 doi:
36 10.1111/joa.12935[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 37 40. Heldestad V, Linder J, Sellersjo L, Nordh E. Reproducibility and influence of test
38 modality order on thermal perception and thermal pain thresholds in quantitative
39 sensory testing. Clin Neurophysiol 2010;**121**(11):1878-85 doi:
40 10.1016/j.clinph.2010.03.055[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 41 41. Brellenthin AG, Crombie KM, Cook DB, Sehgal N, Koltyn KF. Psychosocial Influences
42 on Exercise-Induced Hypoalgesia. Pain Med 2017;**18**(3):538-50 doi:
43 10.1093/pm/pnw275[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 44 42. Reynolds WS, Brown ET, Danford J, et al. Temporal summation to thermal stimuli is
45 elevated in women with overactive bladder syndrome. NeuroUrol Urodyn 2016 doi:
46 10.1002/nau.23059[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 47 43. Staud R, Robinson ME, Price DD. Isometric exercise has opposite effects on central pain
48 mechanisms in fibromyalgia patients compared to normal controls. Pain 2005;**118**(1-
49 2):176-84 doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2005.08.007[published Online First: Epub Date]].

- 1 44. Penza CW, Horn ME, George SZ, Bishop MD. Comparison of 2 Lumbar Manual
2 Therapies on Temporal Summation of Pain in Healthy Volunteers. *J Pain*
3 2017;**18**(11):1397-408 doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2017.07.007[published Online First: Epub
4 Date]].
- 5 45. Falla D, Hodges PW. Individualized Exercise Interventions for Spinal Pain. *Exerc Sport*
6 *Sci Rev* 2017;**45**(2):105-15 doi: 10.1249/JES.000000000000103[published Online
7 First: Epub Date]].

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1 **TABLES**

2

3 **Table 1** Demographic characteristics of the study population

4

Characteristic/Questionnaire	Asymptomatic		LBP		Group Difference <i>P</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Age	28.2	12.5	31.7	13.3	= .406
BMI	23.3	4.0	25.4	3.4	= .084
DASS21 (Range: 0 to 126)	9.4	10.1	19.3	22.5	= .095
FABQ (0 to 96)	2.6	5.7	27.2	11.6	< .001*
PCS (0 to 52)	5.7	6.9	14.9	9.2	< .001*
Peak Pain Lifting (0 to 10)	0.8	2.0	4.8	2.0	< .001*
Borg Scale Lifting (6 to 20)	11.1	2.2	13.1	1.7	=.004*
SF36-PCS	58.43	3.9	49.36	5.3	< .001*
SF36-MCS	51.82	4.4	46.51	13.0	= .091
IPAQ	14 high, 4 med.		18 high, 4 med.		=.0525
ODI (0 to100; ≤20% = minimal disability)			16.0	6.8	
Pain last 24hrs			3.9	2.1	
Pain before task			3.1	2.0	
Pain episode			4.9	1.9	

5

6 Diff. =Difference, BMI=Body Mass Index, DASS21= Depression Anxiety Stress Scales,

7 FABQ= Fear Avoidance Believe Questionnaire, PCS= *Pain* Catastrophizing Scale, SF36-

- 1 PCS= Short Form Health Survey Physical component score, SF36-MCS= Short Form Health
- 2 Survey Mental Component Scale; all independent t-test, except Kruskal-Wallis for IPAQ
- 3

1
2
3
4

Table 2 Results for thermal detection and pain threshold testing.

Test	Site	Asymptomatic			LBP		
		N	Mean (°C)	SD	N	Mean (°C)	SD
CDT pre	Hand	17	30.2	1.0	20	30.5	0.6
CDT post			29.9	1.1		30.5	0.6
WDT pre		18	33.9	1.1	21	34.1	0.9
WDT post			33.8	0.8		33.9	0.6
CPT pre		16	14.0	7.5	18	15.4	7.0
CPT post			15.8	8.5		17.8	6.2
WPT pre		14	43.0	2.9	21	43.5	3.9
WPT post			41.2	3.7		42.4	2.5
CDT pre	Lumbar	18	29.6	2.0	20	29.8	1.3
CDT post			29.7	2.0		29.3	2.0
WDT pre		18	35.3	1.3	21	35.5	1.1
WDT post			35.0	1.1		35.2	1.4
CPT pre		12	21.5	6.1	8	24.8	4.4
CPT post			19.6	6.8		22.7	6.8
WPT pre		17	43.3	3.9	20	43.7	4.1
WPT post			43.7	3.5		43.5	3.0

19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

CDT= cold detection threshold, WDT= warm detection threshold, CPT= cold pain threshold, WPT= heat pain threshold, pre= pre-test, post= post-test

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1 Schematic representation of the area over the lumbar region for pressure pain threshold testing. The distance between two testing sites was 2.5 cm, and the first sites were 2.5 cm cranial to the spinous process of L5.

Fig. 2 (A) Participant demonstrating the starting position of the lifting task **(B)** Schematic illustration of the lifting sequence.

Fig.3 Boxplot of the percentage change in pressure pain sensitivity measured over the back from pre- to post-test based on the overall mean of 16 locations for each individual within the two groups. A higher percentage change represents signs of exercise induced hypoalgesia. At the group level, the mean change (illustrated by the x) was +9.43% (13.4) for the asymptomatic group and -2.10% (18.4) for the participants with LBP. The lower and upper extreme was -19.80% and 28.20% for asymptomatic compared to -35.95% and 28.13% for the group with LBP.

Fig. 4 Topographical maps showing the percent change in PPT between pre- and post-test over the 16 different locations over the lumbar spine as determined in Fig. 1. The vertical line represents the midline of the spine.

Fig. 5 Results of Temporal Summation. The graph shows pain scores (NRS 0-100) over ten heat pulses (Sequence) in healthy asymptomatic participants and in those with low back pain (LBP) pre- and post- the repetitive lifting task. Asymptomatic participants started with an average pain score of 60.93(SD 26.1) and rated the tenth stimulus as 49.4(21.7) in the pre-test, and respectively 66.67 (21.4) and 50.80(20.2) for the post-test. The LBP group changed from 63.67 (20.0) to 43.28 (21.9), and in the post test from 68.94 (22.3) to 42.33(21.2). There was neither a significant difference between pre- and post-task test nor between the two groups.