Distress is positively associated with induced secondary hyperalgesia in people with suppressed HIV

Luyanduthando Mqadi[1]

Email: luyanduthando.mqadi [at] gmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0003-0542-2221.

Gillian J. Bedwell[1]

Email: gillbedwell [at] gmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0003-4522-5679.

Ncumisa Msolo[1]

Email: ncumisamsolo [at] gmail.com. ORCID: 0009-0000-1339-8060.

Gwendoline Arendse[1]

Email: gwen.arendse [at] uct.ac.za. ORCID: 0009-0008-5668-193X.

Maia Lesosky[2]

Email: m.lesosky [at] imperial.ac.uk. ORCID: 0000-0002-2026-958X.

Peter R. Kamerman[3]

Email: peter.kamerman [at] wits.ac.za. ORCID: 0000-0002-3103-5295.

Mark R. Hutchinson[4,5]

Email: mark.hutchinson [at] adelaide.edu.au. ORCID: 0000-0003-2154-5950.

Andrew Schrepf[6]

Email: aschrepf [at] med.umich.edu

Robert R. Edwards[7]

Email: rredwards [at] bwh.harvard.edu. ORCID: 0000-0003-4873-0443.

John A. Joska[8]

Email: john.joska [at] uct.ac.za. ORCID: 0000-0003-4260-1181.

Romy Parker[1]

Email: romy.parker [at] uct.ac.za. ORCID: 0000-0003-4823-2487.

Victoria J. Madden[1,8]

Corresponding author. Email: torymadden [at] gmail.com. +27 21 650 3683. Postal address: D23 Department of Anaesthesia, Groote Schuur Hospital, Anzio Rd, Observatory, 7925, South Africa. ORCID: 0000-0002-5357-4062.

1. African Pain Research Initiative, Department of Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa
2. National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom.
3. School of Physiology, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
4. School of Biomedicine, University of Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.
5. Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Nanoscale BioPhotonics.
6. Chronic Pain and Fatigue Research Center, Department of Anesthesiology, Michigan Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
7. Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative, and Pain Medicine, Brigham & Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
8. HIV Mental Health Research Unit, Department of Psychiatry and Mental Health, Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

Previous presentation of this work

Preliminary results: Abstract (2022) and poster (2023) presentations at the PainSA Congress.

Page count: 45, **Figure count:** 5, **Table count:** 2.

Abstract

Pain and distress are frequently reported by people with HIV. Although pain is widely acknowledged to contribute to distress, distress may also contribute to pain and its persistence. Facilitation of nociceptive signalling in the spinal dorsal horn is one pathway by which distress could exacerbate pain. The current study investigated the relationships between distress, secondary hyperalgesia (SH), and persistent pain in people with HIV, reporting pain (n=19) or no pain (n=26). We hypothesised that self-reported distress would be positively associated with the surface area (primary measure) and magnitude (secondary measure) of induced SH, and that participants reporting persistent pain would display greater induced SH than those reporting no pain. We found that distress was positively associated with the surface area (p=0.02) and the magnitude (p=0.01) of induced SH. However, participants with persistent pain showed no difference in the surface area of SH compared to pain-free participants (p=0.87), and those with pain displayed a marginally lower magnitude of SH (p=0.05). These findings lay a foundation for testing whether reducing distress also reduces SH, but also raise questions about the relevance of heterotopic spinal facilitation mechanisms to clinical persistent pain, in people with suppressed HIV.

Perspective: Distress is prospectively and positively associated with the surface area and magnitude of induced secondary hyperalgesia in people with suppressed HIV.

Keywords: distress; HIV; secondary hyperalgesia, pain-free, persistent pain

Introduction

Pain is frequently reported by people with HIV, and is closely linked to distress. Pain prevalence in people with HIV (25% to 85%) exceeds that in the general population (11% to 50%) [59,92,99]. Even without pain, people with HIV report distress more commonly than their HIV-negative peers [1,76], and living with pain exacerbates these mood problems. People with HIV *and* pain report more mood problems and are twice as likely as their pain-free peers to consider suicide [55,117].

Several psychosocial factors can cause distress for people with HIV and pain. HIV-related factors include diagnosis, changes in sexual behaviour, lack of support, and challenges of chronic illness [4,28,98,124]. Each can contribute to emotional distress. Pain factors include constant pain [88] and uncertainty about its cause, both linked to increased emotional distress, depression, and fear [35,40,88,100,105].

Distress can also worsen pain. Many people with HIV and pain find that depression exacerbates their pain [104]. Distress may increase neuronal responsiveness to nociceptive signals in the central nervous system [29,82,112,130], positioning neuronal responsiveness as a possible link between distress and pain persistence [19,21,33,96,134]. Indeed, clinical tests for hyperalgesia, allodynia, or temporal summation can detect this increased responsiveness.

Observational studies show that distress coexists with increased central nervous system responsiveness in pain-free and clinical groups [46,107,115,132,133]. Investigating this relationship can use experimental inductions of neuronal hyperresponsiveness to determine if distress temporally predicts hyperresponsiveness, thereby providing evidence for a prospective relationship. This approach has shown that lifelong exposure to adversity correlates with greater temporal summation, induced secondary allodynia, and the area of secondary hyperalgesia in healthy adults [107,115,132,133].

As evidence links distress to neuronal hyperresponsiveness, precision is needed. First, a person's response to stressors likely determines outcomes more than the events themselves [12,118]; which highlights the importance of assessing individual response. The current study uses distress to represent this response, through self-reported symptoms indicative of depression and anxiety. Second, we clarify *how* distress affects neuronal responsiveness. Known connections exist between the brain's corticolimbic regions, particularly the amygdala and anterior cingulate cortex which are pivotal to distress [5,38,52,122], and areas involved in modulating nociceptive signalling [13,89]. This study tests if distress facilitates afferent nociception after a neural challenge that simulates tissue injury: high-frequency electrical stimulation. Third, given that most work on induced SH has been done in healthy controls, we test whether neuronal hyperresponsiveness differs between people with and without persistent pain.

This study aimed to clarify the relationship of induced secondary hyperalgesia (SH) to distress and persistent pain status, in people with HIV. It tested two hypotheses: (i) that the magnitude of self-reported distress is prospectively and positively associated with induced SH (*primary hypothesis*), and (ii) that people with HIV reporting persistent pain display greater induced SH than people with HIV reporting no pain (*secondary hypothesis*).

Methods

Overview

The cross-sectional data used here were collected as part of a larger study focused on psychological distress, inflammatory reactivity, induced SH, and persistent pain in people with HIV (protocol published at [75]). In brief, participants with well controlled HIV, who reported either no pain or persistent pain, who had completed the distress self-report questionnaire, and who were eligible to undergo electrical stimulation, were invited to attend a separate session where SH was induced and assessed.

Ethical approval was granted by the Faculty of Health Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Cape Town (764/2019) and the local health authority (ref: 24699). The larger study was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04757987). The current study was preregistered along with a preliminary version of the analysis script developed using pilot data, at Open Science Framework (posted on 30 March 2022). An updated analysis plan was locked on 7 April 2022 before data were processed, and a record of blinded analysis and interpretation was locked on 16 November 2022, before unblinding of the analyst (LM). [link to pre-registration: https://osf.io/2hdpy/?view_only=c26d1a3e4e0a4506a836972262a9468f].

Participants

We enrolled people with HIV who were virally suppressed (< 50 copies/ml) and reported either persistent pain or no pain. Participants who reported persistent pain had to report pain on most days for more than three months [15]. Participants were eligible if they were aged 18 to 65 years, fluent in English or isiXhosa, and living with HIV, with recent evidence of viral suppression (viral load < 50 copies/ml within the preceding three months). Exclusion criteria included pregnancy or suspected pregnancy; electrical or metal implants in the forearm to be tested; known neurological, cardiovascular, or acute psychiatric conditions; sensation problems or tattoos on the forearm to be tested; or advice from a medical practitioner to avoid stressful situations. The community from which participants were recruited has high rates of unemployment (38%) and informal housing (55%) [111]. Unemployment and informal housing have been linked to distress, which aligns with the focus of this study [32,41,45,135].

Participant pain status was determined using questions adapted from the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) self-report measure [26], which has been translated and validated in isiXhosa and used in people with HIV in South Africa [91]. The opening statement to the screening questions was: "*Throughout our lives, most of us have had pain from time to time*

(such as minor headaches, sprains, and toothaches). This statement was followed by three screening questions on pain frequency and duration: (i) *"Do you have pain other than these kinds of pain today?"* (ii) "*Other than those day-to-day kinds of pain, do you have pain in part of your body on most days?"* (iii) *"Have you had that pain on most days for more than 3 months?"* Participants who answered 'yes' to all three questions were included in the 'pain' group, whereas those who answered 'no' to all the questions were included in the 'pain-free' group. Participants who answered 'yes' to questions (i) and (ii), but 'no' to question (iii) were excluded because they were deemed to have acute pain. Participants who completed the SH procedure were compensated ZAR 150 (~USD 9.72) for their time in addition to the larger study compensation, whereas those who withdrew during the procedure received *pro rata* compensation.

Outcomes

Independent variable: psychological distress

Psychological distress was self-reported using the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 (HSCL-25) [123], which consists of 25 items that estimate symptoms of depression (15 items) and anxiety (10 items). Participants rate how much each symptom (e.g., 'poor appetite', 'feeling lonely', 'trembling', 'feeling fearful', etc.) applied to them in the past month on a four-point scale (1 = 'not at all' to 4 = 'extremely'). The final score (and the study measure of distress) was the arithmetic mean of all the item scores and lies between 1.00 and 4.00. The HSCL-25 has been used in South Africa [56], including with people with HIV [57].The HSCL-25 was translated into isiXhosa using a forward-and-back-translation process to ensure the language was locally relevant [18].

Dependent variable: secondary hyperalgesia

To capture the increase in central nervous system facilitation after a barrage of afferent nociception, we chose a human surrogate model of SH for direct *in vivo* characterisation of the aspects of the response that are thought to rely on central (rather than peripheral)

changes [62,63]. In short, the induction protocol involved the delivery of controlled electrical stimulation to the skin of the forearm (Figure 1). Hyperalgesia to pinprick stimulation of the skin develops in the area surrounding the induction stimulus within 20-30 minutes after the induction. We quantified SH using two measures: surface area (primary measure) and magnitude (secondary measure).

Primary measure of SH: surface area

The surface area of SH was estimated using the 8-radial-lines method [3,66], which identifies the boundary between hypersensitive and normosensitive skin by using repeated stimuli along 8 radial lines that transect the site of stimulation at 45° angles. We used the method previously reported in [11], except that we used a 128mN Von Frey filament (Marstock nervtest, Germany), as in [25]. The surface area was assessed 30, 45, and 60 minutes after the induction.

Secondary outcome: magnitude of SH

Participants gave Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) ratings of pain to two punctate mechanical stimuli (128 mN and 256 mN; PINPRICK, MRC systems, Heidelberg, Germany) applied for ~1 s, at three different points within 1 cm of the electrode. The scale was a touch-based, electronic, vertical VAS, anchored with 0 for “no pain” at the bottom and 100 for “pain as bad as you can imagine” at the top (anchors translated for isiXhosa-speaking participants). Participants selected their rating by swiping a stylus pen across the vertical scale on the screen, prompting the bar to fill up with red to the level of the rating. This rating was recorded electronically as a number between 0 and 100. The vertical VAS is a valid and reliable measure that is easy to use, requires less reliance on numeracy concepts and is suitable for different adult populations [17,54,74,81]. This assessment was performed three times immediately before the induction and at 35, 50, and 65 minutes after the induction.

Exploratory variables

Recognising that high frequency electrical stimulation (HFS) is commonly reported to be painful and that the relationship between HFS painfulness and SH is controversial [97], we assessed the painfulness of the induction trains. Participants rated each train of HFS using the electronic VAS. The results of this assessment were reported descriptively, and we planned to include this variable as a covariate.

Given accumulating, but conflicting data, on the relationship between social support and reduced responsiveness to nociceptive signalling [23,34,36,53,67,79,86,87,101], we made a *post hoc* decision to test whether social support moderated the relationship between distress and SH outcomes, using data from the Medical Outcomes Study Social Support Survey (MOS-SSS) [106]. Due to a technical error, MOS-SSS items 17 (from the subscale for positive social interaction), 18 (subscale for emotional support), and 19 (subscale for affectionate support) had not been presented to participants. Therefore, the overall survey score was a mean of 16 items rather than 19.

** Figure 1 approximately here**

Procedure

Informed consent and participant orientation

Participants had the option to communicate in English or isiXhosa. An assessor screened participants for eligibility and facilitated the written informed consent process, during which participants were informed that their participation was voluntary, with no impact on their clinical care. Participants were free to withdraw without negative consequences. The assessor then administered the battery of self-report questionnaires (including the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 and BPI), drew two blood samples (results not reported here), and scheduled the participant's SH induction session.

A second assessor (LM), who was blinded to the results of the first assessor, conducted the SH induction and related assessments. The assessor settled the participant on a seat facing her across a table, with the designated pain-free arm resting on the table and a touch monitor facing the participant, to one side. Following a standardised script for consistency, the assessor orientated the participant to the study equipment and procedures. Participants were allowed to ask questions, and then verbally confirmed their previously written consent. The assessor marked the participant's forearm for the electrode location and the radial lines and calibrated the electrical current for each participant (see Calibration of electrical current). The assessor then demonstrated how to use the electronic touch-based VAS, and participants received an opportunity to practice rating each sensory modality. All practice ratings were recorded but excluded from the analysis.

Calibration of electrical current

The individual detection threshold for a single electrical stimulus was used to determine the current for HFS and subsequent assessment of primary hyperalgesia (not reported here). We used an adaptive staircase procedure to calibrate the electrical [116]. First, the current was gradually increased from 0 mA in 0.10 mA increments until the participant reported feeling the stimulus. Second, the current was reduced in 0.5 mA increments until the participant no longer felt the stimulus. Third, the current was increased in 0.2 mA increments until the participant could once again perceive the stimulus. The final current detected in the last step represented the participant's threshold for detecting a single electrical stimulus and was multiplied by 10 and used for the stimulation intensity for both inducing SH and administering single electrical stimuli during sensory testing, as seen in other studies [62].

Baseline tests

Three rounds of baseline tests each used five sensory modalities: 128mN, 256mN, single electrical stimulus, brush and VFF (last three not reported here). The three rounds of baseline tests were completed in approximately six minutes. Next, temporal summation was assessed (results not reported here).

SH induction

Secondary hyperalgesia was induced by applying HFS to a pain-free area of the forearm, using a circular cathode with 10 blunt steel pins against the anterior forearm and an anode around the upper arm. We chose the forearm that had not undergone venepuncture for blood collection in the primary study because venepuncture can cause local sensitivity, which could interfere with SH assessment. If both arms had undergone venepuncture or the venepuncture-spared arm had a contraindication to HFS (e.g., metal implant), SH induction and assessment were conducted on the forearm used for venepuncture seven days after venepuncture. The HFS consisted of five one-second trains, separated by 9-second breaks, at a current of 10 times the individual's detection threshold for a single electrical stimulus [64]. The study assessments were programmed in Affect5 [110]. A constant current electrical stimulator (DS7A; Digitimer Limited, Hertfordshire, UK) was used to deliver the electrical stimulation. The settings for the electrical stimulation were a voltage of 400V, a pulse width of 2000μs, and a square pulse shape. The effect of HFS is typically centred around the cathode. The participant received five trains of HFS and rated each one on the VAS. Thus, the induction yielded one VAS rating for each of the five HFS trains from each participant.

Follow-up tests

A 30-minute waiting time allowed for the development of SH [14,22], which typically becomes apparent within 20-30 minutes after induction using HFS [95,97]. Therefore, we started testing 30 minutes after the first HFS train to capture the peak effect of SH. During the waiting time, participants were provided with popular reading materials with content unrelated to the study. The surface area of SH was assessed 30, 45, and 60 minutes after the induction (Figure 1). The 5 sensory tests were re-administered 35, 50, and 65 minutes after the induction (Figure 1).

Blinding

Two assessors collected study data. The first assessor collected self-reported distress and pain status. The second assessor induced SH using HFS and assessed its surface area and magnitude. Participants were blinded to the study hypotheses; the first assessor was blinded to the study aims and hypotheses; the second assessor was blinded to participant distress self-report and study group (pain or pain-free); the data analyst for hypothesis 2 (people with HIV reporting persistent pain would display greater induced SH than people with HIV reporting no pain) was blinded to the study group.

To support the blinding of participants to the study aims and hypotheses, we withheld information on the study aims and hypotheses, including that participants were being grouped by pain status. Participants completed a blinding assessment after the procedure: they were asked to guess the purpose of the study, and their response was recorded. We applied conservative criteria to assess whether participants remained blinded to the study's aims and hypotheses.

After the SH assessments, the blinding assessments were completed, first by the assessor, and then by the participant. The assessor had to guess each participant's study group and rate her confidence in her guess on a five-point Likert scale of "not at all confident", "not confident", "confident", and "extremely confident" (the planned 'neutral option was omitted by technical error – protocol deviation 1 of 4). Finally, the assessor asked the participant for feedback on her communication and the general experience of the procedure. The second assessor also conducted the preliminary data analysis; therefore, to maintain blinding to the study group, the study data were assigned a second study ID for each participant and the study groups were recoded as 'a' and 'b' by VJM. The second assessor then conducted the preliminary data analysis and interpretation with this recoding in place, after which the assessor was unblinded to complete the interpretation and write the manuscript.

Data handling and analysis

Participant demographic information, distress and pain status data were recorded using the University of Cape Town's RedCap database [47,48]. The data on SH outcomes were directly recorded into Affect5, and additional procedural notes were manually recorded and later transcribed into an Excel sheet. All data from RedCap, Affect5, and Excel were imported into R for analysis, using R version 4.2.0 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing) and RStudio (Integrated Development Environment for R 2023 version 12.1.402) [114]. The packages used were: tidyverse [125], readxl [126], gridExtra [6], here [85], kableExtra [136], ggstatsplot [94], pracma [16], dplyr [127], readr [128], arsenal [51], bayestestR [77], DescTools [108], rcompanion [78], performance [73], ggrepel [109], formatR [129], magrittr [7], ggeffects [72], lme4 [9], and rlmer [65].

The target sample size was determined pragmatically: given the sourcing of participants from the pool of ~100 participants in the larger study, the more restrictive inclusion criteria for the SH induction, and the likelihood of some attrition. We planned to recruit 60 participants (30/group) to the SH induction. Previous studies of experimentally induced SH using HFS without between-group comparisons had used samples of 7-20 [22,62], and we deemed the 85% power to detect a correlation of r=0.40 (when alpha is 0.05) offered by a sample size of n=53 to be sufficient. To contextualise the statistical power provided by our final sample, a sample size of n=45 would be expected to provide 80% power to detect a correlation of r=0.41 when alpha is 0.05.

Demographic data were presented in tables and reported descriptively. Frequencies and proportions are reported for categorical variables and median (IQR) for numerical variables. In all box-and-whisker plots, individual participant scores are represented by dots, while horizontal lines show the 25th, 50th (median), and 75th percentiles. The whiskers of the boxplots indicate the spread of the data beyond the IQR: the upper whisker extends from Q3

to reach the maximum data point that falls within 1.5 times the IQR, whereas the lower whisker extends from Q1 to reach the minimum data point that falls within 1.5 times the IQR.

Primary and secondary measures

Both hypotheses were tested together, using one model for each measure of SH. The dependent variable was the surface area (primary measure) or magnitude (secondary measure) of SH.

For surface area, the within-participant area was the sum of the areas of the 8 triangles formed by the transition points on the radial lines, resulting in one estimate of surface area for each of the three post-induction time points. In the protocol, we planned to sum the area across the three time points for each participant, using the 'area under the line' for both surface area and magnitude of SH. However, given that the area under the line can yield unreliable estimates when few replicates are available, we opted to include all three assessments, clustered as repeated measurements within each participant, in a linear mixed model in R (protocol deviation 2 of 4).

For magnitude, the mean ratings for the two punctate mechanical weights were calculated for each time point, and the mean rating before induction was subtracted from the mean rating at each post-induction time point. This was protocol deviation 3 of 4: in the protocol, we had planned to express follow-up ratings as a percentage of baseline mean ratings, but we opted for the difference calculation to avoid artificially inflated statistical estimates of effect.

The independent variables were distress and group. A random factor allowed a different intercept for each individual; the three repeated measures were nested within each individual. Unadjusted models were specified, followed by models adjusted by three covariates: the current used for SH induction (calibrated to individual), the within-participant median of the ratings of the HFS induction trains, and the number of days between distress self-report and SH induction. The last covariate was relevant to only a few participants (n=8)

but was included in case the delay led to the distress score poorly representing the participant's state at the time of SH induction and assessment. For only the magnitude models, the within-participant mean of all pinprick ratings (128 mN and 256 mN) for the baseline timepoint was also included as a covariate, to control for baseline differences in sensitivity to pinprick stimulation.

We visualised model assumptions by generating plots to check the following model assumptions: normality of residuals, linearity, homogeneity of variance, influential observations, and collinearity, where applicable. Given that the conventional linear mixed models violated model assumptions, we conducted robust linear regression to account for influential observations. Next, we computed bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals for the robust regression estimates to account for the violations of the normality assumption. Bootstrapping provides a way to assess the stability of the findings by resampling the data and evaluating the variability of the regression estimates across multiple samples to offer a more reliable estimate of model uncertainty [37]. We report effects as estimates bootstrapped from covariate-adjusted robust models including model parameters without bootstrapping. We opted against transforming the data given the nature of the violations of distributional assumptions and to retain interpretability

Blinding analysis

We report the percentage of participants who correctly guessed the aim of the study. We also report the percentage of participants for whom the second assessor correctly guessed group membership. Given that no single method perfectly captures blinding effectiveness, we assessed the blinding of the second assessor using three methods.

First, we used Cohen's Kappa statistic (protocol deviation 4 of 4). Whereas James's Blinding Index, which was planned in the protocol, prioritises a "do not know" response that was not offered in our design [8], Cohen's Kappa is suitable for a two-category forced-choice design like ours ("pain" or "pain-free") [27]. Second, we used Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests to

assess whether the observed distribution of guesses about group membership differed from the expected distribution based on a 50% chance of guessing correctly (which would reflect random guessing and retained blinding) [30]. Third, we also considered the match between correct guesses about group membership and assessor-reported confidence. The availability of confidence ratings allowed us to look more closely at potential unblinding for a subgroup of participants about whose group status the assessor reported feeling confident. Therefore, we drew the data on only those participants for whom the assessor reported confidence of 4 or 5 and conducted a separate chi-square test on the group guess data, comparing the actual frequency of accurate group guesses to the 50% frequency expected under chance conditions (i.e. random guessing; blinding retained). Finally, we repeated the main analyses without participants for whom the second assessor had accurately and confidently guessed group membership, as identified above, to assess the sensitivity of the main findings to potentially broken blinding.

Planned exploratory analyses

We plotted the VAS ratings for the five HFS trains and reported data descriptively. We imputed missing values (which appeared to be missing at random), with the median group rating within the HFS train (1-5) and grouped from the available data. This approach considered potential variations in painfulness between trains and study groups. Medians, being robust to outliers and less reliant on data distribution shape, are well-suited for imputation as they help preserve underlying patterns within groups and across HFS trains [49]. This approach was taken to avoid losing participants in the main regression analyses for whom ratings for the HFS trains were missing.

Post-hoc exploratory analyses

We visually investigated whether withdrawal from the procedure was predicted by distress severity, and planned to follow up any visual indication of a relationship using logistic regression. In addition, we tested whether social support moderated the relationship between distress and SH outcomes by including a term for an interaction between distress

and social support in each model and computed bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals for the effect of this interaction term on SH outcomes. Further, we planned to follow up on any significant result with interaction plots [71].

Results

Data were collected from 9 February 2021 to 24 November 2021.

** Figure 2 approximately here**

Participants

Fifty-six participants, 16 identifying as males and 40 as females, were deemed eligible and enrolled in the study. Five participants withdrew during the procedure; three did not complete the procedure due to technical error; three were identified as ineligible upon demographic data inspection (details in Figure 2). Complete datasets were available for 45 eligible participants (Table 1, pain: n=19; pain-free: n=26). None of the participants reported taking analgesic medication within 24 hours before the induction. For pain *in the past week*, low back pain was the most reported site (n=11) and the most common site of worst pain (n=10). For pain *for the past 3 months*, upper back pain was the most reported site (n=11), whereas the upper back (n=9) was reported as frequently as the low back (n=9) as the site of the worst pain. Data on pain severity (for *pain in the past week* and *pain for the past 3 months*) and interference for all *pain in the past week*, presented only to participants reporting persistent pain are shown in Table 1. The baseline ratings to pinprick stimulation were higher in the pain group (7.50(0.67-22.67)) than in the pain-free group (1.00(0.33-3.38), p=0.05).

Results of HFS induction

The median (IQR) current used for HFS was 0.14 mA (0.09-0.18 mA) and there was no difference in current between groups (Table 1, p=0.9). Nearly half (126 of 255, 49%; pain: 50; pain-free: 73) of the VAS ratings of the HFS trains were missing due to a technical problem. We used the available data to calculate the median (IQR) ratings of the HFS trains for the sample and found 48 (10-82) on a VAS expressed from 0-100. There was no difference in the ratings of HFS trains between the pain (61(13-90)) and pain-free (44(8-73)) groups (p=0.13), but the group-level ratings differed between trains and were non-parametrically distributed. Therefore, for the adjusted models in the main analyses, we imputed the missing ratings for HFS trains by using the group-specific median rating for each train.

The median (IQR) surface area of SH for the sample was 22.27cm^2 (5.66-49.85). Of the 135 surface area data points (three per participant), 12 participants had no SH at T30, eight had no SH at T45, and 10 had no SH at T60. Five (of 45) participants showed hyposensitivity at all post-induction time points. The median (IQR) magnitude of SH for the sample was 1.17 (0-7.67). Of the 135 post-induction data points, hyposensitivity was observed at 21 data points at T35, 22 at T50, and 23 at T65. Eight (of 45) participants showed hyposensitivity at all time points. Both the surface area (p=0.15) and magnitude (p=0.61) of SH were no different between groups.

** Table 1 approximately here**

Participants with persistent pain reported more distress

The median (IQR) distress severity for the sample was 1.48 (1.12-2.24). The pain group reported significantly higher distress severity (2.24 (1.68-2.58)) than the pain-free group (1.38 (1.08-1.60)) (p<0.001, Table 1).

Distress positively predicted induced SH area and magnitude

Figure 3A-D shows the relationship between distress and SH without accounting for the clustered nature of the data. Formal analysis showed that distress severity was positively associated with the surface area of SH in both unadjusted and covariate-adjusted models across conventional (Table S1, model diagnostics Figures S1 and S2) and robust models (Table S2). On average, a 1-unit increase in distress was associated with an average 19.10 cm^2 (Table 2, 95% CI: 2.85-35.34; p=0.02) increase in the surface area of SH, with all other variables held constant.

For the magnitude of SH, distress severity was positively associated with the magnitude of SH in all models except the unadjusted conventional model (Table S1-S2, model diagnostics Figures S3 and S4). On average, a 1-unit increase in distress was associated with an average increase in the magnitude of SH of 6.24 (Table 2, 95% CI: 1.28-11.21; p=0.01) (change in rating on a 0-100 scale).

** Figure 3 approximately here**

** Table 2 approximately here**

Only induced SH magnitude was related to pain status

Figure 4 shows the SH over time between groups. For the surface area of SH, the main effect of group was not statistically significant (p=0.87). For the magnitude of SH, the main effect of group was statistically significant: on average, magnitude was marginally *lower* in participants with pain than in pain-free participants, by 6.92 units (95% CI: -13.70 to -0.13, p = 0.05).

** Figure 4 approximately here**

The distress-SH relationship was stronger for people with pain, on one measure

Given that Figures 3C and 3D suggested that the strength of the associations between distress and the two SH measures might differ between groups, we included an exploratory analysis of the interaction between distress and group in each covariate-adjusted robust regression model (Table S3). For the surface area of SH, there was no interaction between distress and group and surface area (Table S3, bootstrapped coefficient: 17.63; 95% CI: -14.48-49.75; p=0.28). For the magnitude of SH, there was a significant interaction between magnitude and group (Table S3, bootstrapped coefficient: 13.13; 95% CI: 4.04-22.21; p<0.01): the relationship between distress and magnitude was greater in the group with pain than in the pain-free group.

Blinding check

None of the participants correctly guessed the aim of the study. The assessor correctly guessed the group membership of 20 out of 45 participants (44%). Cohen's Kappa estimate was -0.13 (95% CI: -0.42-0.16), indicating no meaningful agreement between the assessor's guesses and the actual group memberships. The Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests confirmed no relationship between the actual group and the assessor's guess of the group (pain: X^2=1.3; p=0.3; pain-free: X^2=0.03, p=0.8). There were 4 instances of correct group guesses with confidence rated 4 or 5 (pain: n=2; pain-free: n=2), and 11 instances of incorrect group guesses with confidence rated 4 or 5 (pain: n=6; pain-free: n=5). The Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests on these data confirmed no relationship between the actual group and the assessor's guess of the group (pain: X^2=2; p=0.2; pain-free: X^2=0.5, p=0.5). Together, these assessments suggest that participant and assessor blinding was maintained throughout the procedure. Nevertheless, as planned, we excluded instances where blinding might have been compromised (n=4) and reran the main analyses. The main effects of distress on the

surface area (p=0.03) and magnitude (p=0.04) of SH remained significant. However, the between-group difference in magnitude of SH was no longer statistically significant (p=0.30).

Post-hoc exploratory analyses

There was no significant difference in distress between participants who withdrew (n=5, median HSCL-25 score: 1.44; IQR: 1.20-1.80) and those who completed the study procedure (n=45, median: 1.48; IQR: 1.12-2.24; p=0.6). Social support did not moderate the relationships between distress and either measure of SH (interaction term coefficients: surface area 0.99; 95% CI: -15.73-13.75; p=0.89; magnitude -1.81; 95% CI: -6.93-3.31; p=0.49).

Discussion

The current study aimed to clarify the relationship of induced secondary hyperalgesia (SH) to distress and persistent pain status, in people with HIV. The primary hypothesis was that self-reported distress would prospectively predict the surface area and magnitude of induced SH. This hypothesis was upheld: distress was positively associated with both the surface area and the magnitude of induced SH. The secondary hypothesis was that individuals reporting persistent pain would display greater induced SH than those reporting no pain. This hypothesis was not upheld: participants with persistent pain showed no difference in the surface area of SH compared to pain-free participants, and although those with pain displayed a marginally lower magnitude of SH, we interpret this relationship as possibly spurious because there was no evidence to reject the null hypothesis once unblinded participants were excluded from the analysis.

The strength of the relationship between distress and induced SH in this sample suggests this relationship is worthy of attention. To support interpretation of the size of this relationship, figure 5 visualises the average increase in SH surface area that was associated

with a 1-unit increase in distress, at the extremes observed in this study (0-19cm² and 99-118cm²). In contrast, a 6-unit increase in SH magnitude per 1-unit change in distress is important when considering the common smallest threshold for a clinically significant change in pain rating of ~20mm on a 100mm scale [37]. However, HFS likely falls short of modelling the total nociceptive load initiated by clinical tissue injury, given that HFS does not recruit the peripheral sensitisation that would be recruited by actual tissue injury [62,120]. Unlike clinical SH, experimental SH is short-lived and the experimental context of HFS also lacks other cues for threat value that would likely enhance signalling in real-life scenarios of tissue injury [11]. Therefore, under real-life conditions, distress may support a greater increase in central neuronal responsiveness than that observed in this study, although this possibility remains to be tested.

** Figure 5 approximately here**

Our results both support and extend previous work showing that distressing events, and interventions to ameliorate the lasting consequences of distressing events, influence neuronal hyperresponsiveness related to pain. Healthy adults with higher adversity scores show greater temporal summation than those with lower adversity scores [84], and women with higher counts of stressful life events display larger areas of capsaicin-induced SH than peers with lower counts [130]. Distress-focused interventions can also influence SH: in women with a history of trauma, an emotional disclosure intervention initially increased, but later reduced, experimental SH along with negative affect and pain-induced negative emotions (at 1 day vs 1 month) [131]. Similarly, cognitive training to reduce pain catastrophising and improve pain coping resulted in less SH than non-pain-focused training [102], and handholding or passive support from a romantic partner has been shown to reduce induced SH [34,53]. Our findings extend this literature by confirming the relationship between psychological state (rather than event exposure) and central neuronal hyperresponsiveness. While this does not confirm causality—distress could arise secondary to or in parallel with nociceptive responsiveness—considering our findings alongside the

larger body of work on psychosocial factors and SH suggests that it may be beneficial to address both distress and pain when they present together in the clinical context.

Our secondary hypothesis was that participants with persistent pain would show greater induced central neuronal hyperresponsiveness than participants without pain. Surprisingly, our data did not support this, despite reports of central neuronal hyperresponsiveness in other persistent pain conditions, including fibromyalgia [20,33], chronic whiplash [121], unilateral shoulder pain [103], chronic pelvic pain [60], rheumatoid arthritis [80], and osteoarthritis [69]. Spinal long-term potentiation is one of the mechanisms proposed for these findings (alongside impaired descending inhibitory control) [62,64,119]. HFS has been shown to induce similar behavioural changes in humans and rodents, and to cause spinal long-term potentiation-like changes in the rodents [93]. Although this evidence supports the suitability of the HFS model, we did not find more HFS-induced SH in people with persistent pain than in people with no pain. Previous work on central neuronal hyperresponsiveness in people with HIV is limited to homotopic sensitisation and has demonstrated links between temporal summation of painful stimuli and either viral suppression [43] or persistent pain status [90] – although the latter was found in a predominantly male sample with mixed levels of viral suppression. Homotopic and heterotopic processes seem to rely on different substrates, as shown by the lack of association between temporal summation and the area or magnitude of HFS-induced SH in healthy humans [93]. The current findings suggest that heterotopic spinal LTP-like processes are unlikely to distinguish between people with HIV based on persistent pain status, and suggest that future comparisons of central neuronal hyperresponsiveness between people with and without persistent pain should control for distress as a potential confounder.

There are three possible alternative explanations for our finding that participants with HIV and persistent pain did not display greater neuronal responsiveness than pain-free participants. The first possibility is that a difference in neuronal responsiveness between

people with and without persistent pain differences in inhibition. However, inhibitory processes were not the focus of the current study, and there is evidence that the response to high-frequency electrical stimulation captures both facilitatory and inhibitory activity [98]. The second possibility is that neuronal hyperresponsiveness is somatotopically localised to synapses receiving information from the specific body site(s) where clinical pain occurs [70]. Although we induced SH at a standardised, pain-free site to detect globally increased neuronal responsiveness such as that commonly hypothesised to underpin widespread pain [50], we would have missed any somatotopically localised hyperresponsiveness. However, a recent study relating susceptibility to induced SH to post-thoracotomy pain also used the forearm as an induction site and did confirm a relationship, suggesting hyperresponsiveness was not somatotopically localised – although the analysis did not control for distress [44]. The third possibility is that our between-group comparison of SH may have been underpowered to detect a difference because our sample size was pragmatically determined.

Our finding that self-reported distress prospectively predicts greater induced SH has potential implications for clinical care. Although our findings require replication in other groups and could be specific to people with virally suppressed HIV, this seems unlikely in light of the known links between distress and pain in other groups [24,42,113]. That distress may heighten facilitation after noxious challenge suggests that distressed individuals may be vulnerable to worse outcomes following real-life noxious events such as surgery. This aligns with evidence linking distress and distress-related factors to elevated risk of poor postoperative outcomes including acute post-operative pain, increased opioid use and delayed recovery from surgery [61,68]. That heterotopic LTP-like processes may partly underpin this relationship paves the way for mechanistically targeted interventions to address distress in patients approaching a predictable painful insult, such as surgery [85,140]. Further work could test whether prospectively managing distress before such predictable insults diminishes post-event SH. Although certain non-pharmacological

interventions show significant promise for reducing preoperative anxiety (e.g., reasonable evidence proposes music as a promising intervention [2]), greater clarity on the mechanistic pathways targeted by these interventions would support optimised selection and clinical delivery, and insight into their relevance to pain. Indeed, the limited benefits of directly targeting SH reinforces the need to identify and target upstream contributors to SH [10].

The current study has three relevant limitations. First, our method of screening for the surface area of SH could have missed areas of SH on the lateral or medial sides of the forearm. We screened along the proximal-distal axis based on the findings of previous studies reporting either a greater surface area along the proximal-distal axis than the medial-lateral axis [39], or no differences [31]; indeed, some studies assess along only the proximal-distal axis [83]. Given that our piloting of various assessment methods has revealed an overestimation of surface area when no screening is used before radial line stimulation, we prioritised specificity, but we acknowledge that we could have missed unusual anatomical distributions of SH. Second, many ratings of HFS trains were not recorded by our system, which compromised our exploratory analysis of the painfulness of the HFS induction. Third, the study was conducted in people with HIV, and therefore needs replication in the general population. However, it is important to note that HIV is so prevalent in South Africa that people with HIV are not easily distinguished and are reasonably representative of the general population [58]. An important strength of this study is that we induced SH in a clinical population, not just pain-free controls, which is an important translational step towards clarifying the clinical relevance of induced SH. The execution of this study also enacted principles of transparent science: we published the study protocol, locked the analysis plan, reported deviations from the protocol, made analysis scripts publicly available, and openly discussed model assumptions and actions taken to address any violations.

Conclusion

In this study, distress prospectively and positively predicted both the surface area and magnitude of induced SH in people with suppressed HIV, and this was consistent across participants with persistent pain and participants with no pain. Alongside the evidence that heightened SH reflects enhanced nociceptive responsiveness and arguments that heightened nociceptive responsiveness may predispose people to problematic pain, our findings suggest that distress could be a worthy target of interventions in people approaching painful events such as surgery. Although there is little basis to think this finding is specific to people with HIV, its relevance to people without HIV is yet to be tested.

Acknowledgements

We thank Mathijs Franssen for research support, Kessie Govender for making the electrodes, Nomvula Mdwaba and Andiswa Siyoko for recruiting participants, and Andiswa Gidana and Yoliswa Mtingeni for collecting self-reported data. We are grateful to those who participated in this study. The de-identified study data are available for selective sharing, subject to review of individual data requests, the use of secure computer platforms, formal use agreements, and compliance with the institutional human research ethics policies. Data use is limited to research purposes, on secure computer servers. The principal investigator (VJM) is the contact person for requests to share data.

Author contributions were as follows: VJM conceived, designed, initiated, and supervised the study; LM led the execution, data collection, analysis, and manuscript preparation. GJB, RRE, JJ, RR, and RP contributed to study design. GJB, NM, JJ, and RP contributed to study execution. All authors critically revised and approved the manuscript.

Financial support: This work was funded by NIH award K43TW011442 to VJM. LM received financial support through a postgraduate scholarship from the University of Cape Town and the National Research Foundation (NRF South Africa). GJB was supported by postgraduate scholarships from PainSA, the NRF, and the Oppenheimer Memorial Trust. MRH receives funding from the Australian Research Council, the National Health and Medical Research Council, and the Defence Science and Technology Group. RRE is partially supported by NIH Award K24 NS126570.

Disclosures: GJB receives speakers' fees for talks on pain and rehabilitation. MRH receives payments from the Department of Education and Department of Science, Industry and Resources; serves as the Chair of the Safeguarding Australia through Biotechnology Response and Engagement Alliance steering committee and the Australian Pain Solutions Research Alliance board; and is a Member of the Prime Minister's National Science and

Technology Council. JAJ has received consultancy fees for research from the University of Maryland and the University of Bern. RP receives payment for lectures on pain and rehabilitation and is an unpaid director of the not-for-profit organisation, Train Pain Academy. VJM also receives payment for lectures on pain and rehabilitation and is an unpaid associate director of the not-for-profit organisation, Train Pain Academy. All other authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this work.

Figure captions

Figure 1: Study procedure. The green box indicates self-reported assessments, and the white box indicates secondary hyperalgesia (SH) induction and assessments. The self-reported assessments were separated from the SH induction and assessments by either a short break or up to 7 days. The five red blocks indicate the high frequency electrical stimulation trains. The red circle centrally located on the radial lines on the forearm indicates the cathode, with each of the 8 lines on the skin spaced 45 degrees apart and the black dots forming the lines 1cm apart (not drawn to scale). The area shaded in orange shows the surface area of SH.

Figure 2: Flowchart of participants enrolled and taken to the analysis.

Figure 3: Scatterplots (A-D) overlain with the best-fitting straight line (ribbon = 95% CI), not the regression model. Each dot represents a participant's score at one of three time points. Panels A and B show relationships between distress and secondary hyperalgesia (SH) surface area for the whole sample (n = 45; primary hypothesis) and stratified by group, respectively. Panels C and D show relationships between distress and SH magnitude for the whole sample and stratified by group, respectively. Magnitude is expressed as the change in rating from the mean of the three baseline assessments to each follow-up assessment. The horizontal red dotted line indicates no SH.

Figure 4: The surface area (A) and magnitude (B) of secondary hyperalgesia (SH) over time. Each dot represents a participant's score at one of three time points. Magnitude is expressed as the change in rating from the mean of the three baseline assessments to each follow-up assessment. The horizontal red dotted line indicates no SH.

Figure 5: Represents 19cm^2 increases at the two extremes of surface area observed, to illustrate the estimated effect of a 1-point increase in distress on surface area secondary hyperalgesia (SH). (A) shows a difference between 0 and 19cm^2 (left to right); (B) shows a

difference between 99 and 118cm^2 (left to right). The areas shaded in blue and green show the mapped surface area of SH. Coloured dots mark areas with distinct changes in sensation, and the red circle indicates the cathode's position. Figure not drawn to scale.

Table captions

Table 1: Descriptive data (n=45). The group with persistent pain reported higher distress severity, and higher baseline ratings to pinprick stimulation (not reported) than the pain-free group. After imputation, between-group comparison of ratings of HFS trains showed a difference that was not present in the data before imputation. No other significant differences were noted between the groups. HSCL-25: Hopkins 25-item symptom checklist; MOS-SSS: Medical Outcomes Survey Social Support Scale; BPI: Brief Pain Inventory; NA: Not Applicable.

Table 2: Bootstrapped covariate-adjusted robust models predicting surface area and magnitude of secondary hyperalgesia (SH). pid: individual participant code.

References

[1] Adewuya AO, Afolabi MO, Ola BA, Ogundele OA, Ajibare AO, Oladipo BF. Psychiatric disorders among the HIV-positive population in Nigeria: A control study. J Psychosom Res 2007;63(2):203-206.

[2] Agüero-Millan B, Abajas-Bustillo R, Ortego-Maté C. Efficacy of nonpharmacologic interventions in preoperative anxiety: A systematic review of systematic reviews. J Clin Nurs 2023;32(17-18):6229-6242.

[3] Andersen OK, Felsby S, Nicolaisen L, Bjerring P, Jensen TS, Arendt-Nielsen L. The effect of Ketamine on stimulation of primary and secondary hyperalgesic areas induced by capsaicin--a double-blind, placebo-controlled, human experimental study. Pain 1996;66(1):51-62.

[4] Arias-Colmenero T, Pérez-Morente MÁ, Ramos-Morcillo AJ, Capilla-Díaz C, Ruzafa-Martínez M, Hueso-Montoro C. Experiences and Attitudes of People with HIV/AIDS: A Systematic Review of Qualitative Studies. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2020;17(2):639.

[5] Arnold JF, Zwiers MP, Fitzgerald DA, van Eijndhoven P, Becker ES, Rinck M, Fernández G, Speckens AEM, Tendolkar I. Fronto-limbic microstructure and structural connectivity in remission from major depression. Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging 2012;204(1):40-48.

[6] Auguie B, Antonov A. gridExtra: miscellaneous functions for “grid” graphics. R package version 2017;2(1).

[7] Bache SM, Wickham H. magrittr: A Forward-Pipe Operator for R. R package version 2.0. 3, 2022.

[8] Bang H, Ni L, Davis CE. Assessment of blinding in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials 2004;25(2):143-156.

[9] Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. J Stat Softw 2015;67(1):1 - 48.

[10] Bedwell GJ, Chikezie PC, Siboza FT, Mqadi L, Rice ASC, Kamerman PR, Parker R, Madden VJ. A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Non-pharmacological Methods to Manipulate Experimentally Induced Secondary Hypersensitivity. J Pain 2023;24(10):1759-1797.

[11] Bedwell GJ, Louw C, Parker R, van den Broeke E, Vlaeyen JW, Moseley GL, Madden VJ. The influence of a manipulation of threat on experimentally-induced secondary hyperalgesia. PeerJ 2022;10:e13512.

[12] Bedwell GJ, Mqadi L, Kamerman PR, Hutchinson MR, Parker R, Madden VJ. Inflammatory reactivity is unrelated to childhood adversity or provoked modulation of nociception. medRxiv 2025.

[13] Bingel U, Schoell E, Büchel C. Imaging pain modulation in health and disease. Curr Opin Neurol 2007;20(4).

[14] Biurrun Manresa J, Kæseler Andersen O, Mouraux A, van den Broeke EN. High frequency electrical stimulation induces a long-lasting enhancement of event-related potentials but does not change the perception elicited by intra-epidermal electrical stimuli delivered to the area of increased mechanical pinprick sensitivity. PloS one 2018;13(9):e0203365.

[15] Blyth FM, March LM, Brnabic AJM, Jorm LR, Williamson M, Cousins MJ. Chronic pain in Australia: a prevalence study. PAIN 2001;89(2).

[16] Borchers HW. Pracma: practical numerical math functions. R package version 2019;2(9):519.

[17] Breivik EK, Skoglund LA. Comparison of present pain intensity assessments on horizontally and vertically oriented visual analogue scales. Methods Find Exp Clin Pharmacol 1998;20(8):719-724.

[18] Brislin RW. Back-Translation for Cross-Cultural Research. J Cross Cult Psychol 1970;1(3):185-216.

[19] Burstein R, Jakubowski M. Analgesic triptan action in an animal model of intracranial pain: a race against the development of central sensitization. Ann Neurol 2004;55(1):27-36.

[20] Cagnie B, Coppieters I, Denecker S, Six J, Danneels L, Meeus M. Central sensitization in fibromyalgia? A systematic review on structural and functional brain MRI. Semin Arthritis Rheum 2014;44(1):68-75.

[21] Campbell JN, Meyer RA. Mechanisms of neuropathic pain. Neuron 2006;52(1):77-92.

[22] Cayrol T, Pitance L, Roussel N, Mouraux A, van den Broeke EN. No evidence of widespread mechanical pressure hyperalgesia after experimentally induced central sensitization through skin nociceptors. Pain Rep 2018;3(6):e691-e691.

[23] Che X, Cash R, Chung S, Fitzgerald PB, Fitzgibbon BM. Investigating the influence of social support on experimental pain and related physiological arousal: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 2018;92:437-452.

[24] Chen ML, Chang HK, Yeh CH. Anxiety and depression in Taiwanese cancer patients with and without pain. J Adv Nurs 2000;32(4):944-951.

[25] Chu LF, Cun T, Ngai LK, Kim JE, Zamora AK, Young CA, Angst MS, Clark DJ. Modulation of remifentanil-induced postinfusion hyperalgesia by the β-blocker propranolol in humans. Pain 2012;153(5):974-981.

[26] Cleeland CS, Ryan KM. Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. Annals of the Academy of Medicine, Singapore 1994;23(2):129-138.

[27] Cohen J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and psychological measurement 1960;20(1):37-46.

[28] Da W, Li X, Qiao S, Zhou Y, Shen Z. Changes in sexual behaviors following diagnosis with HIV: patterns and correlates among people living with HIV (PLHIV) in China. AIDS Care 2019;31(2):238-242.

[29] Dahmani D, Taik FZ, Berrichi I, Fourtassi M, Abourazzak FE. Impact of central sensitization on pain, disability and psychological distress in patients with knee osteoarthritis and chronic low back pain. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2023;24(1):877.

[30] DasGupta A. Chi-square Tests for Goodness of Fit. In: A DasGupta, editor. Asympt. Theory Statist. Probab. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2008. pp. 441-450.

[31] Della Porta D, Vilz M-L, Kuzminova A, Filbrich L, Mouraux A, Legrain V. No evidence for an effect of selective spatial attention on the development of secondary hyperalgesia: A replication study. fnhum 2022;16.

[32] Deshmukh NN, Borkar AM, Deshmukh JS. Depression and its associated factors among people living with HIV/AIDS: Can it affect their quality of life? J Family Med Prim Care 2017;6(3):549-553.

[33] Desmeules JA, Cedraschi C, Rapiti E, Baumgartner E, Finckh A, Cohen P, Dayer P, Vischer TL. Neurophysiologic evidence for a central sensitization in patients with fibromyalgia. Arthritis Rheum 2003;48(5):1420-1429.

[34] Duschek S, Nassauer L, Montoro CI, Bair A, Montoya P. Dispositional empathy is associated with experimental pain reduction during provision of social support by romantic partners. Scand J Pain 2019;20:205 - 209.

[35] Edwards RR, Dworkin RH, Sullivan MD, Turk DC, Wasan AD. The Role of Psychosocial Processes in the Development and Maintenance of Chronic Pain. J Pain 2016;17(9 Suppl):T70-92.

[36] Ellingsen D-M, Isenburg K, Jung C, Lee J, Gerber J, Mawla I, Sclocco R, Grahl A, Anzolin A, Edwards RR, Kelley JM, Kirsch I, Kaptchuk TJ, Napadow V. Brain-to-brain mechanisms underlying pain empathy and social modulation of pain in the patient-clinician interaction. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2023;120.

[37] Endo T, Watanabe T, Yamamoto A. Confidence interval estimation by bootstrap method for uncertainty quantification using random sampling method. J Nucl Sci Technol 2015;52(7-8):993-999.

[38] Fang P, Zeng LL, Shen H, Wang L, Li B, Liu L, Hu D. Increased cortical-limbic anatomical network connectivity in major depression revealed by diffusion tensor imaging. PloS one 2012;7(9):e45972.

[39] Filbrich L, van den Broeke EN, Legrain V, Mouraux A. The focus of spatial attention during the induction of central sensitization can modulate the subsequent development of secondary hyperalgesia. Cortex 2020;124:193-203.

[40] Geisser ME, Roth RS. Knowledge of and agreement with chronic pain diagnosis: Relation to affective distress, pain beliefs and coping, pain intensity, and disability. J Occup Rehabil 1998;8:73-88.

[41] Gibbs A, Govender K, Jewkes R. An exploratory analysis of factors associated with depression in a vulnerable group of young people living in informal settlements in South Africa. Glob Public Health 2018;13(7):788-803.

[42] Glover J, Dibble SL, Dodd MJ, Miaskowski C. Mood states of oncology outpatients: does pain make a difference? J Pain Symptom Manage 1995;10(2):120-128.

[43] Goodin BR, Owens MA, Yessick LR, Rainey RL, Okunbor JI, White DM, Mushatt KA, Harmon OA, Heath SL, Merlin JS. Detectable Viral Load May Be Associated with Increased Pain Sensitivity in Persons Living with HIV: Preliminary Findings. Pain Med 2017;18(12):2289-2295.

[44] Gousset S, Cappe M, Lenoir C, Steyaert A, Lavand'homme P, Mouraux A, Lacroix V, van den Broeke EN. Preoperative susceptibility to developing secondary hyperalgesia is associated with post-thoracotomy pain at 2 months. Eur J Pain 2025;29(1):e4768.

[45] Halpern D. More Than Bricks and Mortar?: Mental Health and the Planned Environment: Taylor & Francis, 1995.

[46] Han SM, Kim KM, Cho SJ, Yang KI, Kim D, Yun CH, Chu MK. Prevalence and characteristics of cutaneous allodynia in probable migraine. Sci Rep 2021;11(1):2467.

[47] Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, McLeod L, Delacqua G, Delacqua F, Kirby J, Duda SN. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. J Biomed Inform 2019;95:103208.

[48] Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform 2009;42(2):377-381.

[49] Hartwig FP, Davey Smith G, Schmidt AF, Sterne JAC, Higgins JPT, Bowden J. The median and the mode as robust meta-analysis estimators in the presence of small-study effects and outliers. Res Synth Methods 2020;11(3):397-412.

[50] Häuser W, Perrot S, Sommer C, Shir Y, Fitzcharles MA. Diagnostic confounders of chronic widespread pain: not always fibromyalgia. Pain Rep 2017;2(3):e598.

[51] Heinzen E, Sinnwell J, Atkinson E, Gunderson T, Dougherty G. arsenal: An Arsenal of 'R' Functions for Large-Scale Statistical Summaries, 2021.

[52] Hu P, Lu Y, Pan BX, Zhang WH. New Insights into the Pivotal Role of the Amygdala in Inflammation-Related Depression and Anxiety Disorder. Int J Mol Sci 2022;23(19).

[53] Jaltare KP, Vanderijst L, Karos K, Torta DM. The impact of the social context on the development of secondary hyperalgesia: an experimental study. Pain 2023;164(12):2711-2724.

[54] Jensen M. Pain assessment in clinical trials. In: HM Wittink, DB Carr, editors. Pain Management: Evidence, Outcomes, and Quality of Life: A Sourcebook. China: Elsevier, 2008. pp. 57-82.

[55] Joseph V, Jones A, Canidate S, Mannes Z, Lu H, Ennis N, Ibanez G, Somboonwit C, Cook R. Factors associated with current and severe pain among people living with HIV: results from a statewide sample. BMC Public Health 2020;20(1):1424.

[56] Kagee A. Symptoms of distress and posttraumatic stress among South African former political detainees. Ethn Health 2005;10(2):169-179.

[57] Kagee A, Saal W, Bantjes J. Distress, depression and anxiety among persons seeking HIV testing. AIDS care 2017;29(3):280-284.

[58] Kamerman PR. Chronic pain is no more prevalent in people living with HIV than in their uninfected counterparts in South Africa. Eur J Pain 2023;27(10):1266-1271.

[59] Kamerman PR, Bradshaw D, Laubscher R, Pillay-van Wyk V, Gray GE, Mitchell D, Chetty S. Almost 1 in 5 South African adults have chronic pain: a prevalence study conducted in a large nationally representative sample. Pain 2020;161(7):1629-1635.

[60] Kaya S, Hermans L, Willems T, Roussel N, Meeus M. Central sensitization in urogynecological chronic pelvic pain: a systematic literature review. Pain Physician 2013;16(4):291-308.

[61] Kjølhede P, Borendal Wodlin N, Nilsson L, Fredrikson M, Wijma K. Impact of stress coping capacity on recovery from abdominal hysterectomy in a fast-track programme: a prospective longitudinal study. Bjog 2012;119(8):998-1006; discussion 1006-1007.

[62] Klein T, Magerl W, Hopf HC, Sandkühler J, Treede RD. Perceptual correlates of nociceptive long-term potentiation and long-term depression in humans. J Neurosci 2004;24(4):964-971.

[63] Klein T, Magerl W, Rolke R, Treede RD. Human surrogate models of neuropathic pain. Pain 2005;115(3):227-233.

[64] Klein T, Stahn S, Magerl W, Treede RD. The role of heterosynaptic facilitation in long-term potentiation (LTP) of human pain sensation. Pain 2008;139(3):507-519.

[65] Koller M. robustlmm: An R Package for Robust Estimation of Linear Mixed-Effects Models. J Stat Softw 2016;75(6):1 - 24.

[66] Koltzenburg M, Lundberg LER, Torebjörk EH. Dynamic and static components of mechanical hyperalgesia in human hairy skin. Pain 1992;51(2):207-219.

[67] Krahé C, Springer A, Weinman J, Fotopoulou A. The Social Modulation of Pain: Others as Predictive Signals of Salience – a Systematic Review. fnhum 2013;7.

[68] Linn BS, Linn MW, Klimas NG. Effects of psychophysical stress on surgical outcome. Psychosom Med 1988;50(3):230-244.

[69] Lluch E, Torres R, Nijs J, Van Oosterwijck J. Evidence for central sensitization in patients with osteoarthritis pain: a systematic literature review. Eur J Pain 2014;18(10):1367-1375.

[70] Loggia ML, Chonde DB, Akeju O, Arabasz G, Catana C, Edwards RR, Hill E, Hsu S, Izquierdo-Garcia D, Ji R-R, Riley M, Wasan AD, Zürcher NR, Albrecht DS, Vangel MG, Rosen BR, Napadow V, Hooker JM. Evidence for brain glial activation in chronic pain patients. Brain 2015;138(3):604-615.

[71] Long JA. interactions: Comprehensive, User-Friendly Toolkit for Probing Interactions, 2019.

[72] Lüdecke D. ggeffects: Tidy data frames of marginal effects from regression models. J Open Source Softw 2018;3(26):772.

[73] Lüdecke D, Ben-Shachar MS, Patil I, Waggoner P, Makowski D. performance: An R package for assessment, comparison and testing of statistical models. Journal of Open Source Software 2021;6(60).

[74] Lundqvist C, Benth J, Grande R, Aaseth K, Russell M. A Vertical VAS is a Valid Instrument for Monitoring Headache Pain Intensity. Cephalalgia 2009;29(10):1034-1041.

[75] Madden VJ, Msolo N, Mqadi L, Lesosky M, Bedwell GJ, Hutchinson MR, Peter JG, Parker R, Schrepf A, Edwards RR. Study protocol: an observational study of distress, immune function and persistent pain in HIV. BMJ open 2022;12(6):e059723.

[76] Maj M, Janssen R, Starace F, Zaudig M, Satz P, Sughondhabirom B, Luabeya MA-K, Riedel R, Ndetei D, Calil HM, Bing EG, Louis M, St., Sartorius N. WHO Neuropsychiatric AIDS Study, Cross-sectional Phase I: Study Design and Psychiatric Findings. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1994;51(1):39-49.

[77] Makowski D, Ben-Shachar MS, Lüdecke D. bayestestR: Describing effects and their uncertainty, existence and significance within the Bayesian framework. Journal of Open Source Software 2019;4(40):1541.

[78] Mangiafico S. rcompanion: Functions to Support Extension Education Program Evaluation, Vol. 2022, 2022.

[79] McClelland LE, McCubbin JA. Social influence and pain response in women and men. J Behav Med 2008;31:413-420.

[80] Meeus M, Vervisch S, De Clerck LS, Moorkens G, Hans G, Nijs J. Central sensitization in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a systematic literature review. Semin Arthritis Rheum 2012;41(4):556-567.

[81] Melzack R, Katz J. Wall and Melzack's Textbook of Pain. Pain assessment in adult patients, Vol. 5. London: Elsevier, 2006. pp. 291-304.

[82] Merskey H, Bogduk N. Part III: Pain Terms, A Current List with Definitions and Notes on Usage. In: H Merskey, N Bogduk, editors. Classification of Chronic Pain, Second Edition: IASP Press, 1994. pp. 209-214.

[83] Meyers E, Vlaeyen JWS, van den Broeke EN, von Leupoldt A, Palmer AJ, Torta DM. The effect of high versus low cognitive load on the development of nociceptive hypersensitivity: The roles of sympathetic arousal, sex and pain-related fear. Eur J Pain 2023;27(6):682-698.

[84] Morris MC, Goodin BR, Bruehl S, Myers H, Rao U, Karlson C, Huber FA, Nag S, Carter C, Kinney K, Dickens H. Adversity type and timing predict temporal summation of pain in African-American adults. J Behav Med 2023;46(6):996-1009.

[85] Müller K. Here: A simpler way to find your files, 2017.

[86] Neumann I, Andreatta M, Pauli P, Käthner I, Studienwerk E. Social support of virtual characters reduces pain perception. Eur J Pain 2023;28:806 - 820.

[87] Neumann I, Käthner I, Gromer D, Pauli P. Impact of perceived social support on pain perception in virtual reality. Comput Hum Behav 2022;139:107490.

[88] Neville A, Jordan A, Beveridge JK, Pincus T, Noel M. Diagnostic Uncertainty in Youth With Chronic Pain and Their Parents. J Pain 2019;20(9):1080-1090.

[89] Ossipov MH, Dussor GO, Porreca F. Central modulation of pain. J Clin Invest 2010;120(11):3779-3787.

[90] Owens MA, Parker R, Rainey RL, Gonzalez CE, White DM, Ata AE, Okunbor JI, Heath SL, Merlin JS, Goodin BR. Enhanced facilitation and diminished inhibition characterizes the pronociceptive endogenous pain modulatory balance of persons living with HIV and chronic pain. J Neurovirol 2019;25(1):57-71.

[91] Parker R, Jelsma J, Stein DJ. Pain in amaXhosa women living with HIV/AIDS: a cross-sectional study of ambulant outpatients. BMC Women's Health 2017;17(1):31.

[92] Parker R, Stein DJ, Jelsma J. Pain in people living with HIV/AIDS: a systematic review. Journal of the International AIDS Society 2014;17(1):18719.

[93] Patel R, Taylor JL, Dickenson AH, McMahon SB, Bannister K. A back-translational study of descending interactions with the induction of hyperalgesia by high-frequency electrical stimulation in rats and humans. Pain 2024;165(9):1978-1989.

[94] Patil I. Visualizations with statistical details: The'ggstatsplot'approach. Journal of Open Source Software 2021;6(61):3167.

[95] Pfau DB, Klein T, Putzer D, Pogatzki-Zahn EM, Treede RD, Magerl W. Analysis of hyperalgesia time courses in humans after painful electrical high-frequency stimulation identifies a possible transition from early to late LTP-like pain plasticity. Pain 2011;152(7):1532-1539.

[96] Price DD, Zhou Q, Moshiree B, Robinson ME, Verne GN. Peripheral and central contributions to hyperalgesia in irritable bowel syndrome. J Pain 2006;7(8):529-535.

[97] Quesada C, Kostenko A, Ho I, Leone C, Nochi Z, Stouffs A, Wittayer M, Caspani O, Brix Finnerup N, Mouraux A. Human surrogate models of central sensitization: A critical review and practical guide. Eur J Pain 2021;25(7):1389-1428.

[98] Ramirez-Avila L, Regan S, Giddy J, Chetty S, Ross D, Katz JN, Freedberg KA, Walensky RP, Losina E, Bassett IV. Depressive Symptoms and Their Impact on Health-seeking Behaviors in Newly-diagnosed HIV-infected Patients in Durban, South Africa. AIDS Behav 2012;16(8):2226-2235.

[99] Rauf W-uN, Meyer HP, Marcus TS, Becker PJ. The impact of chronic pain on the quality of life of patients attending primary healthcare clinics. SAJAA 2014;20(2):122-126.

[100] Reesor KA, Craig KD. Medically incongruent chronic back pain: physical limitations, suffering, and ineffective coping. Pain 1988;32(1):35-45.

[101] Roberts MH, Klatzkin RR, Mechlin B. Social Support Attenuates Physiological Stress Responses and Experimental Pain Sensitivity to Cold Pressor Pain. Ann Behav Med 2015;49:557-569.

[102] Salomons TV, Moayedi M, Erpelding N, Davis KD. A brief cognitive-behavioural intervention for pain reduces secondary hyperalgesia. Pain 2014;155(8):1446-1452.

[103] Sanchis MN, Lluch E, Nijs J, Struyf F, Kangasperko M. The role of central sensitization in shoulder pain: A systematic literature review. Semin Arthritis Rheum 2015;44(6):710-716.

[104] Scott W, Arkuter C, Kioskli K, Kemp H, McCracken LM, Rice ASC, de CWAC. Psychosocial factors associated with persistent pain in people with HIV: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Pain 2018;159(12):2461-2476.

[105] Serbic D, Pincus T, Fife-Schaw C, Dawson H. Diagnostic uncertainty, guilt, mood, and disability in back pain. Health Psychology 2016;35(1):50.

[106] Sherbourne CD, Stewart AL. The MOS social support survey. Soc Sci Med 1991;32(6):705-714.

[107] Sherman AL, Morris MC, Bruehl S, Westbrook TD, Walker LS. Heightened Temporal Summation of Pain in Patients with Functional Gastrointestinal Disorders and History of Trauma. Ann Behav Med 2015;49(6):785-792.

[108] Signorell A. DescTools: Tools for descriptive statistics. R package version 099 2024;28:17.

[109] Slowikowski K. ggrepel: Automatically Position Non-Overlapping Text Labels with 'ggplot2', 2021.

[110] Spruyt A, Clarysse J, Vansteenwegen D, Baeyens F, Hermans D. Affect 4.0. Experimental psychology 2009;57:36-45.

[111] Statistics S. City of Cape Town – 2011 Census Suburb Khayelitsha. Cape Town, SA: Strategic Development Information and GIS Department (SDI and GIS), 2011. pp. 1-7.

[112] Takeuchi T, Hashimoto K, Koyama A, Asakura K, Hashizume M. The Association of Central Sensitisation with Depression, Anxiety, and Somatic Symptoms: A Cross-Sectional Study of a Mental Health Outpatient Clinic in Japan. Life 2024;14(5):612.

[113] Tavoli A, Montazeri A, Roshan R, Tavoli Z, Melyani M. Depression and quality of life in cancer patients with and without pain: the role of pain beliefs. BMC Cancer 2008;8:177.

[114] Team P. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. Boston, MA: Posit Software, PBC, 2024.

[115] Tesarz J, Eich W, Treede RD, Gerhardt A. Altered pressure pain thresholds and increased wind-up in adult patients with chronic back pain with a history of childhood maltreatment: a quantitative sensory testing study. Pain 2016;157(8):1799-1809.

[116] Treutwein B. Adaptive psychophysical procedures. Vision Research 1995;35(17):2503-2522.

[117] Tsai YT, Padmalatha S, Ku HC, Wu YL, Yu T, Chen MH, Ko NY. Suicidality Among People Living With HIV From 2010 to 2021: A Systematic Review and a Meta-regression. Psychosom Med 2022;84(8):924-939.

[118] Updegraff JA, Taylor SE. From vulnerability to growth: Positive and negative effects of stressful life events. Loss and trauma: Routledge, 2021. pp. 3-28.

[119] Vaegter HB, Graven-Nielsen T. Pain modulatory phenotypes differentiate subgroups with different clinical and experimental pain sensitivity. Pain 2016;157(7):1480-1488.

[120] van den Broeke EN, Lenoir C, Mouraux A. Secondary hyperalgesia is mediated by heat-insensitive A-fibre nociceptors. J Physiol 2016;594(22):6767-6776.

[121] Van Oosterwijck J, Nijs J, Meeus M, Paul L. Evidence for central sensitization in chronic whiplash: A systematic literature review. Eur J Pain 2013;17(3):299-312.

[122] Vasic N, Walter H, Sambataro F, Wolf RC. Aberrant functional connectivity of dorsolateral prefrontal and cingulate networks in patients with major depression during working memory processing. Psychol Med 2009;39(6):977-987.

[123] Ventevogel P, De Vries G, Scholte WF, Shinwari NR, Faiz H, Nassery R, van den Brink W, Olff M. Properties of the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 (HSCL-25) and the Self-Reporting Questionnaire (SRQ-20) as screening instruments used in primary care in Afghanistan. Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology 2007;42(4):328-335.

[124] Weldesenbet AB, Kebede SA, Tusa BS. The Effect of Poor Social Support on Depression among HIV/AIDS Patients in Ethiopia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Depress Res Treat 2020;2020:6633686.

[125] Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan LDA, François R, Grolemund G, Hayes A, Henry L, Hester J. Welcome to the Tidyverse. J Open Source Softw 2019;4(43):1686.

[126] Wickham H, Bryan J, Kalicinski M, Valery K, Leitienne C, Colbert B, Hoerl D, Miller E, Bryan MJ. Package ‘readxl’. Version, 13 2019;1.

[127] Wickham H, François R, Henry L, Müller K. dplyr: A Grammar of Data Manipulation, 2022.

[128] Wickham H, Hester J, Bryan J. Readr: Read rectangular text data, 2022.

[129] Xie Y. formatR: Format R Code Automatically, Vol. 2022, 2022.

[130] You DS, Creech SK, Meagher MW. Enhanced Area of Secondary Hyperalgesia in Women with Multiple Stressful Life Events: A Pilot Study. Pain Med 2016;17(10):1859-1864.

[131] You DS, Creech SK, Vichaya EG, Young EE, Smith JS, Meagher MW. Effect of written emotional disclosure on secondary hyperalgesia in women with trauma history. Psychosom Med 2014;76(5):337-346.

[132] You DS, Meagher MW. Childhood Adversity and Pain Sensitization. Psychosom Med 2016;78(9):1084-1093.

[133] You DS, Meagher MW. Childhood Adversity and Pain Facilitation. Psychosom Med 2018;80(9):869-879.

[134] Yunus MB. Role of central sensitization in symptoms beyond muscle pain, and the evaluation of a patient with widespread pain. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol 2007;21(3):481-497.

[135] Zeng C, Guo Y, Hong YA, Gentz S, Zhang J, Zhang H, Qiao J, Xu Z, Cai W. Differential effects of unemployment on depression in people living with HIV/AIDS: a quantile regression approach. AIDS care 2019;31(11):1412-1419.

[136] Zhu H. KableExtra: Construct complex table with'kable'and pipe syntax. R package version 2019;1(0).

Self-reports

SH induction and assessments






Enrolment
Entered procedure n=56
Data inspection
Datasets inspected n=56
Excluded n=6
n=3: Technical error
n=2: Reported having epilepsy, but inadvertently included by recruiter error
n=1: Received the SH induction on the same arm used for venepuncture without a 7-day waiting period
Analysis
Participants taken to analysis n=50
completed n=45
withdrew n=5
Main analyses n=45 (n=43 assessor blinding assessment; missing confidence level rating n=2)
Exploratory analysis n=50


A
B
C
D
Surface area of SH · cm2
Magnitude of SH (change from baseline ratings)
Distress severity (HSCL-25)
Group
pain
pain-free


A
125
100
75
50
25
0
Surface area of SH · cm2
30
45
60
Time (mins after the induction)
B
60
40
20
0
−20
Magnitude of SH
(change from baseline rating)
35
50
65
Time (mins after the induction)
Group
pain−free
pain

A



B



	Pain (N=19)	Pain-free (N=26)	Total (N=45)	p-value
Age (years)				0.765
Median	43.00	41.00	41.00	
Q1, Q3	36.00, 48.50	34.25, 46.75	35.00, 47.00	
Range	30.00 - 58.00	31.00 - 64.00	30.00 - 64.00	
Mean (95% CI)	43.11	42.92	43.00	
SD	8.65	9.62	9.12	
Sex (n (%))				0.478
female	12 (63.2%)	19 (73.1%)	31 (68.9%)	
male	7 (36.8%)	7 (26.9%)	14 (31.1%)	
Current used for HFS (mA)				0.853
Median	0.12	0.16	0.14	
Q1, Q3	0.08, 0.19	0.09, 0.17	0.09, 0.18	
Range	0.04 - 0.27	0.04 - 0.26	0.04 - 0.27	
Mean (95% CI)	0.14	0.14	0.14	
SD	0.07	0.06	0.06	
Distress severity HSCL-25: mean score 1-4)				< 0.001
Median	2.24	1.38	1.48	
Q1, Q3	1.68, 2.58	1.08, 1.60	1.12, 2.24	
Range	1.08 - 3.36	1.00 - 2.52	1.00 - 3.36	
Mean (95% CI)	2.14	1.46	1.75	
SD	0.64	0.47	0.64	
Social support (MOS-SSS: mean score 1-5)				0.441
Median	4.75	4.88	4.88	
Q1, Q3	3.44, 5.00	4.39, 5.00	3.94, 5.00	
Range	2.00 - 5.00	2.12 - 5.00	2.00 - 5.00	
Mean (95% CI)	4.19	4.47	4.35	
SD	0.97	0.88	0.92	
Pain severity for pain in the past week (BPI mean score 0-10)				
Median	5.25	NA	5.25	
Q1, Q3	4.12, 6.00	NA	4.12, 6.00	
Range	3.00 - 7.50	NA	3.00 - 7.50	
Mean (95% CI)	5.13	NA	5.13	
SD	1.30	NA	1.30	
Pain severity for pain for the past 3 months (BPI				

	Pain (N=19)	Pain-free (N=26)	Total (N=45)	p-value
mean score 0-10)				
Median	5.00	NA	5.00	
Q1, Q3	4.00, 5.88	NA	4.00, 5.88	
Range	3.25 - 8.25	NA	3.25 - 8.25	
Mean (95% CI)	5.21	NA	5.21	
SD	1.53	NA	1.53	
Pain interference for all pain in the past week (BPI mean score 0-10)				
Median	5.00	NA	5.00	
Q1, Q3	3.93, 6.14	NA	3.93, 6.14	
Range	3.00 - 9.43	NA	3.00 - 9.43	
Mean (95% CI)	5.39	NA	5.39	
SD	1.93	NA	1.93	

	Surface area of SH		Magnitude of SH	
Predictors	*Estimates*	*CI*	*Estimates*	*CI*
Intercept	3.98	-30.91 – 38.87	-3.42	-13.93 – 7.09
Distress severity	19.10 *	2.85 – 35.34	6.24 *	1.28 – 11.21
Group (pain)	-1.88	-24.03 – 20.27	-6.92 *	-13.70 – -0.13
Current used for HFS	-117.83	-257.02 – 21.36	-29.36	-71.42 – 12.71
HFS painfulness	0.13	-0.25 – 0.51	0.03	-0.10 – 0.17
Time difference between distress & SH assessments	1.07	-1.06 – 3.20	0.05	-0.60 – 0.71
Baseline mean pinprick ratings			0.25 *	0.02 – 0.48
Random Effects				
σ^2	178.63		2.99	
τ_{00}	737.41 $_{pid}$		71.19 $_{pid}$	
ICC	0.81		0.96	
N	45 $_{pid}$		45 $_{pid}$	
Observations	135		135	
Marginal R^2 / Conditional R^2	0.192 / 0.842		0.240 / 0.969	

** p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001*