Characterization of perceptual and electrophysiological responses to high-speed robot-controlled pinprick stimulation

Authors: Sofía POUX, Abed YOUSSIF, Emanuel N. VAN DEN BROEKE, Ulf BAUMGÄRTNER, José A. BIURRUN MANRESA, Christian A. MISTA

Clinical trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov (identifier: NCT06183593)

Funding sources: National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET, Argentina) – German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD, Germany)

Conflict of interest: All authors have no conflict of interest to report.

***Corresponding Author:** Christian A. MISTA, Route 11 km. 10, Oro Verde, Entre Ríos, Argentina. E-mail: christian.mista@uner.edu.ar

ABSTRACT

Objective: Mechanical pinprick stimuli delivered via robotic systems have been applied using parameters derived from studies using handheld stimulators. This work evaluates the effects of stimulus force and duration on neurophysiological responses and subjective perception.

Methods: Twenty-seven healthy volunteers received pinprick stimuli on the right volar forearm using different combinations of force and duration that configured three stimulus intensities: low, medium and high impulse. The robotic system recorded stimulus force and duration in real-time, and participants rated the perceived intensity after each stimulus on a numerical rating scale (NRS). The peak amplitudes and latencies of the pinprick evoked potentials (PEPs) were compared for the stimulation impulse intensities. The NRS ratings were analysed using linear mixed models, and the PEP features were evaluated through spatio-temporal cluster permutation tests.

Results: The NRS ratings were 2.5 [7.0] for low, 16.4 [18.0] for medium, and 28.5 [31.1] for high impulse stimuli. Differences in brain activity were found when comparing all impulse intensities. Peak N2 latency was longer for high compared to low and for medium compared to low. P2 latency showed no differences across impulse intensities. N2 was more negative for high vs. low and for medium vs. low, with no significant difference between high and medium impulses.

Conclusions: Both cortical and subjective responses depend on the applied impulse intensity. Stimulation parameters should be selected based on the specific effect under investigation, as a range of peripheral afferents may be activated by mechanical stimuli.

33 **Keywords**: Mechanical nociception, somatosensory processing, Aδ fibers

Introduction

Several pathological conditions result in small fiber neuropathy (SFN), which affects both peripheral nerve fibers with thin myelin sheaths (Aδ fibers) and those without myelin (C fibers) (Pál et al., 2020). To diagnose SFN, clinicians examine a range of clinical signs, including increased pinprick sensation (Devigili et al., 2020). The assessment of responses of Aδ fiber to mechanical stimulation represents a valuable tool for evaluating sensory pathways. Perceptual responses are usually quantified using numerical rating scales (NRS) and questionnaires, whereas brain responses can be assessed through functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) or electroencephalography (EEG). In particular, electrophysiological responses to time-locked mechanical stimuli are known as pinprick evoked potentials (PEPs). These potentials are transmitted through the spinothalamic pathways and serve as a tool for assessing the excitability of the nociceptive system in experimental and clinical conditions (Madsen et al., 2014).

The first reports on PEPs employed handheld pinprick devices with calibrated weights and electronic trigger systems to detect the contact of the needle with the skin (Iannetti et al., 2013; van den Broeke et al., 2015). The forces applied in these studies ranged from 16 to 512 mN in multiples of two, following the existing sets of pinpricks with calibrated forces routinely used for quantitative sensory tests (Baumgärtner et al., 2002; Chan et al., 1992; Rolke et al., 2006). These and later studies showed that the 64 mN pinprick demonstrated good sensitivity to show changes due to experimental interventions to modulate the excitability of the nociceptive system (van den Broeke et al., 2015, 2017, 2019). In time, PEP reliability has only been investigated using a force of 256 mN, and the results showed substantial variability in the amplitudes and latencies of the signals (Rosner et al., 2020).

Furthermore, the optimal stimulation duration for eliciting PEPs has not been thoroughly investigated. While some studies have designed their experimental paradigms to apply the stimulus as rapidly as possible (Iannetti et al., 2013), others opted for a sustained stimulation of approximately 1-s duration to prevent inertial effects (Rosner et al., 2020; van den Broeke et al., 2015, 2016, 2017). Recent studies employed robotic systems (Gousset et al., 2023; Jaltare, Manresa, et al., 2024; Jaltare, Meyers, et al., 2024; van den Broeke et al., 2019, 2020), avoiding the manual application of the stimulus and thus reducing the variability of the force applied (Leone et al., 2025; Valentini & Schulz, 2020). Although stimulus parameters were conservatively maintained (same weights and duration), it was suggested that further adjustments are still required (van den Broeke et al., 2020). However, there is scarce information on how the interaction between force and duration, i.e. the mechanical impulse, impacts the response to pinprick stimulation, which might be relevant to untangle the contribution of nociceptive and non-nociceptive fibers to PEPs (Nagi et al., 2019). Our hypothesis is that perceived stimulation intensity and amplitude of the evoked responses are associated with the intensity of the stimulus impulse. Thus, the objective of the study is to characterize the perceptual and electrophysiological responses to pinprick stimulus with different combinations of force and duration using a high-speed robot-controlled stimulator.

Materials and Methods

Study design

Study preregistration, including original hypothesis and the description of primary and secondary outcomes, are available at ClinicalTrials.gov (identifier: NCT06183593). A single-group, crossover design was employed in this descriptive study, in which participants were presented with successive trials of pinprick stimulation using three combinations of force and speed that configured three types of stimuli of mechanical impulse (low, medium, high), in random order. Written informed consent was obtained from all volunteers before participation. All experimental procedures were approved by the local ethics committee (approval number IS004486) and were conducted according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Sample size considerations

Since this is a descriptive study, sample size was estimated in terms of precision for the main outcome, which was the latency of the N2 peak of the PEP. Previous studies reported that pinprick stimuli applied to the fingertip with a force of 256 mN resulted in N2 latencies of 89 ± 25.8 ms (mean and standard deviation) (Rosner et al, 2020). Based on these values, at least 25 subjects are required to obtain a precision of 10 ms (i.e., the width of the 95% confidence intervals to each side of the mean) in the estimation of the N2 peak.

Participants

Healthy volunteers aged between 18 and 60 were included in the study. Exclusion criteria were pregnancy, history of chronic pain or neuromuscular disorders, or any disease affecting the

nociceptive system that would prevent normal evaluation, mental illnesses, fever, tuberculosis, malignant tumors, infectious processes, or acute inflammatory processes also disqualifies participation. The use of analgesics or excessive alcohol intake within 24 hours before the experiment and lack of sleep (less than 6 hours) the night before the experiment, were also considered as exclusion criteria.

Pinprick stimulation

A custom-made robot-controlled mechanical stimulator was used to deliver the pinprick stimuli. The stimulator consists of a linear actuator (EPCO-16-50-3P, Festo SE & Co. KG, Germany) solidary to a stainless-steel spring (stiffness k_{sp} = 49 N/m), a stainless-steel blunt tip (diameter d = 0.36 mm), and a load cell to measure the applied force in real-time during stimulation. The force recording was used to detect the moment when the probe contacts the skin, enabling synchronization with the EEG recordings. The magnitude of the applied force during stimulation is directly proportional to the travel distance of the tip and the combined stiffness of the spring (k_{sp}) and skin (k_{sk}). When the travel distance is fixed, the force is not constant, but it allows estimating the stiffness of the skin using a simple model of springs in series based on Hooke's law.

Different combinations of force and speed provide different levels of mechanical impulse, defined as $I = \int F(t)\,dt$. With this setup, we tested three different types of stimuli: low, medium and high impulse (Fig. 1). For all these levels, the travel distance of the tip was set to 30 mm and the tip speed was set to 125 mm/s. Low impulse stimulation was achieved by positioning the tip 25 mm away from the skin of the volar forearm, moving the tip towards the skin at its maximum speed and removing the tip immediately after the predefined travel distance was reached.

Medium impulse stimulation was achieved by positioning the tip 10 mm away from the skin, moving the tip towards the skin at its maximum speed and removing the tip immediately after the predefined travel distance was reached. High impulse stimulation was achieved by positioning the tip 10 mm away from the skin, moving the tip towards the skin at its maximum speed until the predefined travel distance was reached, maintaining the force on the skin for 1 s, and then removing the tip. Stimulation was repeated 40 times for each level, with an inter-stimulus interval ranging from 12 to 18 seconds. The order of the levels was randomized across volunteers.



Figure 1: Schematic representation of the experimental setup. (Left): Stimulated area on the volar side of the right arm. (Right): The solid lines represent the average force exerted for three stimulation levels: low, medium, and high. Dashed lines indicate the theoretical displacement of

the actuator tip over time, starting from the moment of skin contact (onset). The initial position corresponds to the actuator tip's distance from the skin before contact.

EEG and force recordings

Continuous EEG signals and the force signal were recorded together using a wireless EEG amplifier (Cyton, OpenBCI, USA) from seven electrodes mounted in an elastic cap. The electrode positions followed the international 10–20 system (Fp1, F3, Fz, F4, C3, Cz, C4), with A1 and A2 as reference and ground respectively. EEG and force signals were amplified and digitized using a sampling rate of 250 Hz.

Self-reported perceived intensity and quality

Volunteers were asked to rate the intensity of the pinprick sensation perceived after each stimulus using a numerical rating scale (NRS), ranging from 0 (no perception) to 100 (feeling as if the skin was pierced by a needle). Following each block, the quality of perception was assessed using appropriate dimensions of the Spanish Questionnaire based on the McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ-SV) for this types of stimuli (Lázaro et al., 1994). Selected dimensions were *Localization I*, *Punctuate pressure*, *Tactile sensitivity*, and *Evaluative category*.

Experimental setup

Volunteers sat in a chair with an adjustable arm rest to regulate the arm position for stimulation. To reduce artifacts given by muscular and ocular movements, they were instructed to keep their eyes open, fixate on a specific point, and remain relaxed during testing. During the stimulation

blocks, volunteers listen to white noise via headphones to mask the sound generated by the pinprick stimulator. The volunteers were instructed to focus on the stimulus during testing; participants rated the perceived intensity on the NRS after each stimulus and filled out the MPQ-SV after each block.

Data analysis

The stimulus onset was defined as the point at which the force reached 5% of the maximum peak force for each block and subject. Subsequently, the onset was visually inspected to corroborate the correct detection. Mechanical impulse was calculated as the time integral of the average force during the stimulation period for each stimulus type using the `trapz` function in Python. To determine the applied force for each impulse stimulus, peak force values are reported for low and medium impulse, whereas the average force during the stimulus application is reported for the high impulse. The EEG signals were analyzed using MNE-Python (Gramfort et al., 2013). EEG signals were band-pass filtered between 0.5 and 30 Hz with a zero-phase Butterworth filter. Then, signals were cut into 3-s epochs, starting 1 s before the stimulus onset. EEG epochs were visually inspected, and artifact-contaminated epochs (e.g., with eye blinks) were discarded. Pinprick evoked potentials (PEPs) were computed by averaging all epochs within each subject and stimulus type. PEP features (peak amplitudes and latencies) were measured at the negative peak (N2 peak) between 0 and 200 ms after the stimulus onset and between 150 and 400 ms for the positive peak (P2 peak). The criteria for peak detection were based on Gousset et al. (2023) and corroborated through visual inspection of individual evoked responses.

Statistics

Data are expressed as mean ± standard deviation for normally distributed variables and median [interquartile range] for non-normally distributed variables. Statistical analyses were performed using Jamovi v. 2.2.28 and Python v. 3.11.5. A non-parametric Friedman test was conducted to establish whether there were differences between the perceived intensity due to stimulus impulse intensity and Durbin-Conover tests were employed to test for post-hoc pairwise comparisons. Differences in EEG features (amplitudes and latencies) due to stimulus type were analysed using a linear mixed model with random intercepts per subject. EEG waveforms were compared using a spatiotemporal cluster permutation test, implemented with the *spatio_temporal_cluster_1samp_test()* function from MNE Python's stats library. A threshold corresponding to a p-value of 0.05 was applied, and a total of 1,000 permutations were used to correct for multiple comparisons.

Results

Twenty-seven healthy volunteers (11 females) aged between 20 and 52 (31 ± 8.1 years old) participated in the experiment. Sample characteristics are reported in Table 1. Due to hardware issues during acquisition, force recordings were discarded for different subjects in each intensity level. The specific cases where the sample differs from the total are clarified for each result. Quality descriptors of one volunteer were missing.

Table 1: Sample characteristics. Values are expressed as mean ± SD. R, right; L, left.

Variable	Female	Male
n (%)	11 (40.7)	16 (59.3)
Age (years)	34.9 ± 8.6	28.3 ± 6.7
Weight (kg)	63.8 ± 7.6	82.8 ± 12.3

Height (cm)	162 ± 3.93	177 ± 5.52
Dominant arm (R/L)	10/1	16/0

Pinprick stimulation

The peak force recorded for low and the medium impulse was 135 (67) mN and 327 (141) mN, respectively. For high impulse, the force recorded was 444 (255) mN (average force during stimulation). The corresponding impulse values were 505.7 ± 313.5 mN·s for the high, 56.7 ± 25.6 mN·s for the medium, and 13.5 ± 9.26 mN·s for the low impulse. The profile for each stimulus is depicted in figure 2.



Figure 2: Time courses of force recordings for each impulse. Gray traces represent the subject-wise average. Coloured traces indicate the grand-average force across all subjects for low (orange, N=26), medium (green, N=20), and high (blue, N=23) impulse.

Self-reported perceived intensity and quality

Perceived intensity ratings for each stimulus are shown in Fig. 3. The ratings for each stimulus type were 2.5 [7.0] for low, 16.4 [18.0] for medium, and 28.5 [31.1] for high impulse stimuli. A difference between type stimulus was observed ($\chi^2(2)=40.2, p<0.001$). Post hoc tests revealed

significant differences in all pairwise comparisons between intensities: low vs. medium impulse ($T=8.72$, $p<0.001$), low vs. high impulse ($T=11.9$, $p<0.001$), and medium vs. high impulse ($T=3.17$, $p=0.003$).

The frequency of descriptors used to characterize pain quality following each stimulus is presented in Table 3. The most frequently reported descriptors were "well-defined" (bien delimitado) and "pricking" (como un pinchazo), and these remained consistent across all stimulus intensities.



FIGURE 3 – Comparison of Numerical Rating Scale (NRS) ratings across stimulus impulse intensities. Individual points represent each volunteer's median NRS ratings (n = 27) and

stimulus type. Grey lines depict repeated measures across participants. Boxes show the median and interquartile range (25th to 75th percentiles), while whiskers represent the 5th and 95th percentiles of the total ratings across all subjects.

TABLE 3 – Frequency of selection for descriptors of pain quality of the McGill Pain-Spanish Version Questionnaire after each stimulus type.

Subscale	Translation	low (N | %)		medium (N | %)		high (N | %)	
Localization I	Imprecise (Impreciso)	5	19,23	1	3,85	5	18,52
	Well-defined (Bien delimitado)	21	80,77	23	88,46	18	66,67
	Extensive (Extenso)	-	-	2	7,69	3	11,11
	None of the above (Ninguna de las anteriores)	-	-	-	-	1	3,70
Punctuate pressure	Pricking (Como un pinchazo)	15	57,69	14	53,85	9	33,33
	Boring (Como agujas)	-	-	3	11,54	5	18,52
	Drilling (Como un clavo)	-	-	-	-	1	3,70
	Stabbing (Punzante)	1	3,85	7	26,92	8	29,63
	Lancinating (Perforante)	-	-	1	3,85	3	11,11
	None of the above (Ninguna de las anteriores)	10	38,46	1	3,85	1	3,70
Tactile sensitivity	As if rubbing (Como si rozara)	14	53,85	3	11,54	1	3,70
	Like a tingling (Como un hormigueo)	3	11,54	4	15,38	3	11,11
	As if scratching (Como si arañara)	-	-	1	3,85	-	-
	As if scraping (Como si raspara)	-	-	2	7,69	4	14,81
	As if stinging (Como un escozor)	-	-	2	7,69	-	-
	Itchy (Como un picor)	5	19,23	7	26,92	8	29,63
	None of the above (Ninguna de las anteriores)	4	15,38	7	26,92	11	40,74
Evaluative category	Weak (Débil)	23	88,46	12	46,15	4	14,81
	Tolerable (Soportable)	3	11,54	11	42,31	15	55,56
	Intense (Intenso)	-	-	2	7,69	7	25,93
	Terribly annoying (Terriblemente molesto)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	None of the above (Ninguna de las anteriores)	-	-	1	3,85	1	3,70

*Note: The descriptors from the English version of the McGill Pain Questionnaire and the McGill Pain Questionnaire-Spanish Version (MPQ-SV) are dissimilar, we decided to report the translation and not the equivalent descriptors as in the original version.

Pinprick evoked potentials

The average number of trials used to derive the PEPs was 38 (3) for the low impulse, 39 (3) for medium impulse, and 38 (4) for high impulse. The cluster for the difference between intensities are represented in the figure 4, for each pair of intensities (High vs Medium, High vs Low, Low vs Medium). In the high vs. low impulse comparison, clusters were found between 80–252 ms (p = 0.048) and 476–1276 ms (p = 0.001). In the high vs. medium impulse comparison, a significant cluster was observed from 200 to 1343 ms (p = 0.001). Finally, in the low vs. medium impulse comparison, a significant cluster was detected between 84–192 ms (p = 0.038).



FIGURE 4 – A) Pinprick evoked potentials for different stimulus intensities. (Top) Cluster found for the different intensities comparison in the channels C3, Cz and C4. The colored regions represent the found clusters. **B)** Group-level grand-average evoked potentials measured from Cz against A1A2. Shading indicates the standard deviation. **C)** Difference waveforms

obtained by subtracting one intensity from another. Vertical dashed lines indicate the stimulus onset.

The N2 peak had an average latency of 114.5 ± 29.8 ms for the high impulse, while the P2 peak occurred at 277.5 ± 39.2 ms. For the medium impulse, N2 latency was shorter, averaging 104 ± 28.9 ms, with the P2 peak at 284 ± 33.6 ms. The shortest latencies were observed for the low impulse, where the N2 peak occurred at 75.3 ± 44.3 ms and the P2 peak at 264.3 ± 49 ms. Post hoc comparisons revealed that N2 latency was longer for the high impulse compared to the low impulse (114.5 ± 29.8 vs 75.3 ± 44.3 ms, $p < 0.001$, Fig. 5.) and for the medium impulse compared to the low impulse (104 ± 28.9 vs 75.3 ± 44.3 ms, $p = 0.001$). No difference was found between high and medium impulse ($p = .195$). P2 latency showed no differences across impulse intensities.

In terms of amplitude, N2 was more negative in the comparison of high vs. low (-11.86 ± 6.9 μV vs. -8.23 ± 4.18 μV, $p < 0.001$), as well as medium vs low (-11.97 ± 6.78 μV vs. -8.23 ± 4.18 μV, $p < 0.001$), with no significant difference between high and medium impulse ($p = .900$). For P2 amplitude, significant differences were found among all stimulus: high vs. low (11.06 ± 6.08 μV vs. 13.17 ± 6.11 μV, $p = .020$), medium vs. low (15.58 ± 6.53 μV vs. 13.17 ± 6.11 μV, $p = .017$), and high vs. medium (11.06 ± 6.08 μV vs. 15.58 ± 6.53 μV, $p < .001$).



FIGURE 5 – Latencies (up) and amplitudes (bottom) of N2 and P2 from pinprick evoked potentials recorded in Cz position, across all impulse: low (orange), medium (green) and high (blue). Individual points show values for each subject (N=27).

Discussion

This study characterizes the changes in cortical responses and subjective perceptions elicited by different impulse intensities of pinprick stimuli using a high-speed robot-controlled stimulator. Stimuli with larger impulse (i.e., greater force and longer duration) resulted in larger perceived intensity of the stimuli. The impulse intensities factors also affected the resulting evoked potentials, as pointed out by differences in the cluster results.

Applied force and subjective response

The dermal collagen and elastic fiber network primarily determine the skin's mechanical properties, like tensile strength, while the subcutaneous fat layer provides cushioning (Kolarsick et al., 2011). Variability in these structures, influenced by factors such as age, UV radiation exposure, and hydration levels, has been shown to affect the mechanical impedance and deformation of the skin. Age-related changes, for instance, include a reduction in collagen content, alterations in collagen fiber organization, and decreased dermal hydration, which further reduce the skin's mechanical stability and elasticity (Cua et al., 1990). Variability in tissue properties is a key factor when studying pinprick evoked potentials, as the reliability of the cortical responses depends on the body region to which the stimuli were applied (Rosner et al., 2020). Structural differences among individuals may directly affect the deformation of tissues during stimulation, altering the distance covered by the stimulator and, consequently, the applied stimulus intensity.

Regarding perceived stimulus intensity, our results are consistent with studies that used robots for delivering the stimulation (van den Broeke et al., 2020). In contrast, we found higher values compared to studies that applied stimulation manually, i.e., by holding the stimulator in their hand (Iannetti et al., 2013; Rosner et al., 2020). This suggests that perceived intensity is influenced by the stimulation method used. Additionally, our study identified differences in reported ratings, implying that the temporal characteristics of the stimulus also play a crucial role in shaping perceived intensity. Overall, our findings highlight the importance of considering both force and duration of mechanical stimuli when targeting a specific stimulus intensity.

Pinprick evoked potentials

The evoked responses presented a N2-P2 morphology and N2 latencies consistent with previous reports (Iannetti et al., 2013; Rosner et al., 2020; van den Broeke et al., 2020). The mean latencies for medium and high impulse stimuli were around 104 ms and 114.5 ms, respectively. Previous studies using a similar paradigm reported a mean latency of 111 ± 7.8 ms (Iannetti et al., 2013), although slightly longer N2 latencies (136 ± 25 ms) were reported using robot-controlled systems (van den Broeke et al., 2020). The dissimilarity with the previously reported latencies may be attributed to differences in the stimulation parameters. In particular, the velocity for stimulation is nearly 4 times faster than the others (125 mm/s vs 33 mm/s), which may elicit a more synchronized activation of the nociceptors. Conversely, slower stimulation rates may reduce synchronization of the afferent fibers, resulting in wider and delayed cortical responses.

In addition, the type of stimuli were perceived differently, and consequently they may activate different types of sensory fibers. In line with this, there is an ongoing debate about the dichotomous classification of mechanical sensory afferents into fibres populations. Aδ and C afferents are associated with conduction of nociception, whereas Aβ afferents are believed to exclusively signal the discriminative aspects of non-nociceptive stimulus (Basbaum et al., 2009; Löken et al., 2009; Wellnitz et al., 2010). However, recent findings challenge this classification. Evidence from research in rodents has described circumferential high-threshold mechanoreceptors (Circ-HTMRs) with morphologies typical of touch neurons, yet functioning as nociceptors (Ghitani et al., 2017). Likewise, studies with humans have identified A-fiber high-threshold mechanoreceptors (A-HTMRs) with conduction velocities comparable to Aβ fibers, capable of encoding noxious mechanical stimuli (Nagi et al., 2019). On one hand, this challenges the dichotomous classification of afferents into nociceptive and non-nociceptive fibres. On the

other hand, it also highlights the relevance of mechanical stimulation as a complementary tool among other physical agents in the study of pain.

The low impulse showed shorter N2 latency compared to the rest of the stimulus intensities. The latencies observed for this stimulus are more comparable to the peripheral conduction velocities of low-threshold mechanoreceptors rather than nociceptors. However, we cannot rule out the activation of afferent fibres, particularly A-delta fibres, as some nociceptors may also exhibit short latencies (Nagi et al., 2019). Interestingly, participants predominantly described the perception as pricking, despite latencies consistent with Aβ fibers. These findings highlight the complex nature of processing such stimuli and suggest the involvement of a range of peripheral afferents, possibly including C-fibers, A-delta fibers, and low-threshold mechanoreceptors (Slugg et al., 2000, 2004).

Strengths and limitations.

To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to provide real-time recordings of the force exerted by a pinprick stimulator, and to report the mechanical impulse (a combination of force and duration). These findings show the critical role of individual differences in tissue and skin properties when designing stimulation protocols. Moving forward, a force-controlled system could enhance the precision and consistency of pinprick stimuli by ensuring the reliability of the applied force and measuring the distance covered by the stimulator. EEG has a low signal to noise ratio and therefore the robotic system may introduce some electrical noise into the recordings. However, this was minimized in the experimental setup and accounted for in the interpretation of the findings.

Conclusion

Both cortical and subjective responses change due to applied impulse intensity (force and duration) of the pinprick stimuli. High impulse stimuli, characterized by greater force and prolonged contact, elicited higher perceived intensity ratings but resulted in later and reduced cortical responses compare with low impulse. Stimulation parameters should be selected depending on the effect to be study, since a range of peripheral afferents could be activated by mechanical stimuli.

Data Availability

Data is available under request to authors

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We sincerely thank Flavio Lovatto for his assistance in the data collection process.

FUNDING

This research was supported by Biennial Research Projects (PIBAA), Scientific and Technological Research Projects (PICT), the Argentinian National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET), and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

DISCLOSURES

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

346 SUPPLEMENTARY

347



348

349

350

351 **REFERENCES**

Basbaum, A. I., Bautista, D. M., Scherrer, G., & Julius, D. (2009). Cellular and Molecular Mechanisms of Pain. *Cell*, *139*(2), 267–284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2009.09.028

Baumgärtner, U., Magerl, W., Klein, T., Hopf, H. C., & Treede, R.-D. (2002). Neurogenic hyperalgesia versus painful hypoalgesia: Two distinct mechanisms of neuropathic pain. *Pain*, *96*(1), 141–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3959(01)00438-9

Chan, A. W., MacFarlane, I. A., Bowsher, D., & Campbell, J. A. (1992). Weighted needle pinprick sensory thresholds: A simple test of sensory function in diabetic peripheral neuropathy. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, *55*(1), 56–59. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.55.1.56

Cua, A. B., Wilhelm, K.-P., & Maibach, H. I. (1990). Elastic properties of human skin: Relation to age, sex, and anatomical region. *Archives of Dermatological Research*, *282*(5), 283–288. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00375720

Devigili, G., Cazzato, D., & Lauria, G. (2020). Clinical diagnosis and management of small fiber neuropathy: An update on best practice. *Expert Review of Neurotherapeutics*, *20*(9), 967–980. https://doi.org/10.1080/14737175.2020.1794825

Ghitani, N., Barik, A., Szczot, M., Thompson, J. H., Li, C., Pichon, C. E. L., Krashes, M. J., & Chesler, A. T. (2017). Specialized Mechanosensory Nociceptors Mediating Rapid Responses to Hair Pull. *Neuron*, *95*(4), 944-954.e4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.07.024

Gousset, S., Torta, DM., Mouraux, A., Lambert, J., & van den Broeke, E. N. (2023). Pinprick-induced gamma-band oscillations are not a useful electrophysiological marker of pinprick

hypersensitivity in humans. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *153*, 102–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2023.06.018

Gramfort, A., Luessi, M., Larson, E., Engemann, D. A., Strohmeier, D., Brodbeck, C., Goj, R., Jas, M., Brooks, T., Parkkonen, L., & Hämäläinen, M. (2013). MEG and EEG data analysis with MNE-Python. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2013.00267

Iannetti, G. D., Baumgärtner, U., Tracey, I., Treede, R. D., & Magerl, W. (2013). Pinprick-evoked brain potentials: A novel tool to assess central sensitization of nociceptive pathways in humans. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *110*(5), 1107–1116. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00774.2012

Jaltare, K. P., Manresa, J. B., Niwa, S., & Torta, D. M. (2024). Verbal Support From a Stranger Reduces the Development of Mechanical Hypersensitivity: Behavioral and Neurophysiological Evidence. *The Journal of Pain*, *25*(10), 104599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2024.104599

Jaltare, K. P., Meyers, E., & Torta, D. M. (2024). The Role of Pain Expectations in the Development of Secondary Pinprick Hypersensitivity: Behavioral-Neurophysiological Evidence and the Role of Pain-Related Fear. *The Journal of Pain*, *25*(9), 104567. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2024.104567

Kolarsick, P. A. J., Kolarsick, M. A., & Goodwin, C. (2011). Anatomy and Physiology of the Skin. *Journal of the Dermatology Nurses' Association*, *3*(4), 203. https://doi.org/10.1097/JDN.0b013e3182274a98

Leone, C. M., Lenoir, C., & van den Broeke, E. N. (2025). Assessing signs of central sensitization: A critical review of physiological measures in experimentally induced secondary hyperalgesia. *European Journal of Pain*, *29*(3), e4733. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejp.4733

Löken, L. S., Wessberg, J., Morrison, I., McGlone, F., & Olausson, H. (2009). Coding of pleasant touch by unmyelinated afferents in humans. *Nature Neuroscience*, *12*(5), 547–548. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2312

Madsen, C. S., Finnerup, N. B., & Baumgärtner, U. (2014). Assessment of small fibers using evoked potentials. *Scandinavian Journal of Pain*, *5*(2), 111–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjpain.2013.11.007

Nagi, S. S., Marshall, A. G., Makdani, A., Jarocka, E., Liljencrantz, J., Ridderström, M., Shaikh, S., O'Neill, F., Saade, D., Donkervoort, S., Foley, A. R., Minde, J., Trulsson, M., Cole, J., Bönnemann, C. G., Chesler, A. T., Bushnell, M. C., McGlone, F., & Olausson, H. (2019). An ultrafast system for signaling mechanical pain in human skin. *Science Advances*, *5*(7), eaaw1297. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw1297

Pál, E., Fülöp, K., Tóth, P., Deli, G., Pfund, Z., Janszky, J., & Komoly, S. (2020). Small Fiber Neuropathy: Clinicopathological Correlations. *Behavioural Neurology*, *2020*(1), 8796519. https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8796519

Rolke, R., Magerl, W., Campbell, K. A., Schalber, C., Caspari, S., Birklein, F., & Treede, R.-D. (2006). Quantitative sensory testing: A comprehensive protocol for clinical trials. *European Journal of Pain*, *10*(1), 77–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2005.02.003

Rosner, J., Scheuren, P. S., Stalder, S. A., Curt, A., & Hubli, M. (2020). Pinprick Evoked Potentials—Reliable Acquisition in Healthy Human Volunteers. *Pain Medicine*, *21*(4), 736–746. https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnz126

Slugg, R. M., Campbell, J. N., & Meyer, R. A. (2004). The Population Response of A- and C-Fiber Nociceptors in Monkey Encodes High-Intensity Mechanical Stimuli. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *24*(19), 4649–4656. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0701-04.2004

Slugg, R. M., Meyer, R. A., & Campbell, J. N. (2000). Response of Cutaneous A- and C-Fiber Nociceptors in the Monkey to Controlled-Force Stimuli. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *83*(4), 2179–2191. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.2000.83.4.2179

Valentini, E., & Schulz, E. (2020). Automatised application of pinprick-evoked potentials improves investigation of central sensitisation in humans. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *131*(10), 2482–2483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2020.07.011

van den Broeke, E. N., De hemptinne, P., Mercken, M., Torta, D. M., Lambert, J., & Mouraux, A. (2020). Central sensitization of nociceptive pathways demonstrated by robot-controlled pinprick-evoked brain potentials. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *131*(10), 2491–2498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2020.06.020

van den Broeke, E. N., de Vries, B., Lambert, J., Torta, D. M., & Mouraux, A. (2017). Phase-locked and non-phase-locked EEG responses to pinprick stimulation before and after experimentally-induced secondary hyperalgesia. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *128*(8), 1445–1456. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2017.05.006

435 van den Broeke, E. N., Hartgerink, D. M., Butler, J., Lambert, J., & Mouraux, A. (2019). Central
436 sensitization increases the pupil dilation elicited by mechanical pinprick stimulation.
437 *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *121*(5), 1621–1632. https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00816.2018

438 van den Broeke, E. N., Lambert, J., Huang, G., & Mouraux, A. (2016). Central Sensitization of
439 Mechanical Nociceptive Pathways Is Associated with a Long-Lasting Increase of
440 Pinprick-Evoked Brain Potentials. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *10*.
441 https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00531

442 van den Broeke, E. N., Mouraux, A., Groneberg, A. H., Pfau, D. B., Treede, R.-D., & Klein, T.
443 (2015). Characterizing pinprick-evoked brain potentials before and after experimentally
444 induced secondary hyperalgesia. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *114*(5), 2672–2681.
445 https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00444.2015

446 Wellnitz, S. A., Lesniak, D. R., Gerling, G. J., & Lumpkin, E. A. (2010). The Regularity of
447 Sustained Firing Reveals Two Populations of Slowly Adapting Touch Receptors in
448 Mouse Hairy Skin. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *103*(6), 3378–3388.
449 https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00810.2009

450

451

452