

1 **Title:** Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation improved the nociceptive component of
2 low back pain, while presenting no effect on its neuropathic component

3

4 **Authors:**

5 Gabriela Rocha Lauretti, MD, MSc, PhD, FIPP, Associate Professor of Anesthesia and Pain

6 Management, School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto- University of São Paulo, grlauret@fmrp.usp.br

7 Rogerio Costa Franco, Postgraduate Student, School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto- University of São

8 Paulo, rcfranco@gmail.com

9 Marcelo Antunes, MD, Postgraduate Student, School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto- University of São

10 Paulo, dr_antunes@msn.com

11 Veridiana Marques Rebello Zuccolotto, MD, Postgraduate Student, School of Medicine of Ribeirão

12 Preto- University of São Paulo, veri_mrz@yahoo.com.br

13

14

15 Department of Biomechanics, Medicine and Rehabilitation of Locomotor Members of the

16 School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto- University of São Paulo, Brazil.

17

18 The work was conducted at the Center for Pain Treatment of the Teaching Hospital of the

19 School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto- University of São Paul, Brazil.

20

21

22 **Corresponding Author:**

23 Gabriela Rocha Lauretti, MD, MSc, PhD, FIPP

24 Address: Rua Maestro Joaquim Rangel 644

25 Ribeirão Preto- São Paulo – Brazil ZIP 14025-610

26 Tel and Fax (55)(16) 36022211 Email: grlauret@fmrp.usp.br

27

1 **ABSTRACT**2 **Transcutaneous electrical stimulation improved the nociceptive component of low back**
3 **pain, while presenting no effect on its neuropathic component**

4

5 **Purpose:** The objective of this study was to evaluate the efficacy of transcutaneous electrical
6 neurostimulation portable device in patients with chronic nociceptive and neuropathic low
7 back pain. **Subjects and Methods:** Twenty-four patients with nociceptive and neuropathic
8 lumbar pain were prospectively assigned to apply the active device at the lower back twice
9 daily for 30-min, during 14 days in the morning and at night. Efficacy was evaluated by: 1)
10 pretreatment and post treatment VAS pain scores, 2) type of pain (nociceptive or
11 neuropathic), 3) capacity of performing routine physical activities, 4) quality of sleep, and 5)
12 daily analgesic rescue medication consumption. **Results:** Nociceptive pain improved ($p<0.05$)
13 whilst neuropathic pain was maintained ($p>0.05$). The device decreased pain VAS by day-5th
14 ($p<0.05$) up to day-14th ($p<0.02$). Rescue analgesics decreased ($p<0.05$) and quality of sleep
15 improved ($p<0.05$). Prior to device, patients referred 2(1-2) (mean (25%-75%)) arousals
16 during night compared to none on day-5th forward ($p<0.05$). 17 patients classified as
17 improved capacity during the first 3-hours in the morning ($p<0.05$). There were no adverse
18 effects. **Conclusions:** The device did not improve neuropathic pain while improved
19 nociceptive pain, decreased the number of rescue analgesics, resulted in better sleep pattern,
20 and enriched physical function in the morning.

21 **Key-words:** transcutaneous electrical neurostimulation, lumbar neuropathic pain, nociceptive
22 pain.

23

1 **Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation improved the nociceptive component of low**
2 **back pain, while presenting no effect on its neuropathic component**

3

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 The data in the literature about transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS)
6 utility in Low Back Pain (LBP) is conflicting [1,2]. Most studies did not differentiate between
7 the types of pain in a suffering patient. Either facet related pain (nociceptive somatic pain) or
8 referred neuropathic pain may contribute to LBP [3]. The most common symptom for
9 degenerative articular facet pain includes localized pain at the back, generally without
10 radiation to the calf and foot, often more intense at bedtime; while conversely, neuropathic
11 pain will frequently radiate in one or more lumbar or sacral dermatomes and improve with
12 rest. Not uncommonly, patients may refer both types of pain, presenting nociceptive articular
13 pain, more evident at night-time, whilst neuropathic pain will increase its intensity during the
14 day-time [3]. The objective of the study was to compare the effectiveness of TENS device for
15 management of both nociceptive and neuropathic components of LBP.

16 **EXPERIMENTAL SECTION**

17 The local Ethics Committee approved the study protocol, and informed consent was
18 obtained. This prospective study evaluated the clinical utility of a new, very small and light,
19 high frequency TENS device in 24 patients suffering from LBP with both neuropathic and
20 nociceptive somatic pain components.

21 Patients aged between 20 and 45-year-old, with no other pathology apart from LBP for
22 more than three months, with both characteristics of nociceptive somatic articular facetary
23 pain and chronic neuropathic radicular pain were included to participate in this prospective
24 study. For the final inclusion of 24 patients, the total of 31 consecutive patients were
25 interviewed always by the same author to clarify whether they could clearly differentiate

1 between their nociceptive and neuropathic pain. During the interview, it was demonstrated to
2 the patient how to use the TENS device. The capacity to recognize both types of pain and to
3 self-apply the TENS was double-checked by a second author who was not present during the
4 first interview.

5 Patients included presented only nociceptive and neuropathic pain for more than 3
6 months, and did not present any acute radiculopathy, which by definition is accompanied of
7 sensory or motor loss. All patients graded pain on average ≥ 4 cm on a visual analog scale
8 (VAS), taking no other drugs apart analgesics such as metamizol or paracetamol, recruited at
9 the Center for Pain Treatment- Teaching Hospital were potentially eligible for inclusion.
10 Diagnosis of both neuropathic and nociceptive somatic pain was confirmed based on the
11 clinical history and examination combined with lumbar magnetic resonance to exclude any
12 pathologies. Patients were ineligible for the study if they had undergone surgery for
13 radiculopathy within the last 3 months; if they had been previously treated with TENS, if they
14 used non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for the last 14-day prior to entrance into the study
15 protocol; if any surgery was planned within the next 6 months; if they had a pacemaker; if
16 they were naive of non-pharmacological treatments including physiotherapy, acupuncture,
17 mesotherapy, manipulations, wearing a corset, or psychological support; if they had copper
18 intrauterine dispositive device [4], if their LBP was symptomatic of another condition (i.e.,
19 compression fractures or progressive inflammatory, neoplastic or infectious conditions); if the
20 physician had estimated their life expectancy to be less than 3 months; and finally if articular,
21 median branches, epidural, foraminal and facetary articular median branch blocks were
22 planned during the study period, or if the patient was involved in an ongoing medico-legal
23 dispute.

24 The TENS device was applied by the patient at the lower back (perpendicular to the
25 vertebrae canal, at the level of the 5th lumbar vertebrae). In each patient it was applied twice

1 daily, during 14 days: 1) in the morning, during 30-min before getting out the bed, and 2) at
2 night, for 30-min just after going to bed. The TENS device (Tanyx®) produced a
3 conventional TENS characterized by continuous stimulation at high frequency (85 Hz), wave
4 duration of 75 μ s and intensity of up to 30 mA, potentially achieving painless paresthesia in
5 the lumbar region or tingling sensation. Oral metamizol (500 mg) up to three times daily,
6 minimal of 6-hour interval, but with the last intake no more than 6 pm, was used as rescue
7 analgesic if necessary for pain control, in order to keep pain VAS less than 4 cm. If necessary,
8 500 mg oral paracetamol was also available at a minimum of 6-hour interval. Efficacy was
9 evaluated by: 1) pretreatment and post treatment VAS pain scores, 2) type of pain
10 (nociceptive or neuropathic) that changed characteristic for maintained, improved or
11 worsened, 3) capacity of performing routine physical activities, defined as maintained,
12 improved, or worsened, 4) quality of sleep also defined as maintained, improved or worsened,
13 as well as number of night arousals; and 5) analgesic rescue medication daily consumption.

14 Each patient was given a personal diary which contained detailed instructions on self-
15 administering the TENS treatment twice daily, including a silhouette showing the correct
16 placement of the electrodes, as well as space for making notes of daily metamizol intake,
17 daily lumbar VAS assessments before and after each TENS application, impression related
18 routine physical activity and quality of sleep, and any adverse event experienced during the
19 period of study. All patients had clearly the concept about the two types of pain they were
20 supposed to evaluate. The articular somatic pain was defined as well localized at the lumbar
21 back, with no reflection to limbs, and that occurred mainly after rest such as standing up after
22 a time being seated and at arousal in the morning. The neuropathic type of pain was defined
23 as the pain radiated to the lower limb that improved with rest but increased intensity with the
24 time, being worst at the end of the day. Follow-up visits at the pain clinic were scheduled at
25 7th- and 14th-day.

1 **Statistics**

2 Each patient acted as his/her own control related to the types of pain. The sample size
3 of the study was based on preliminary data conducted with 4 patients based on general VAS
4 pain reduction. It was hypothesized that the TENS device would result in expected mean 3 cm
5 and expected standard deviation 1.5 cm at 14th-day evaluation. The single tailored unpaired t-
6 test was used with the level of significance 2.5% and the power of 80%. These assumptions
7 would require at least 14 patients. Data was compared between the same group by Wilcoxon
8 test or Friedman test when evaluating more than one data, and chi-squared test or Fisher's
9 exact test for qualitative variables. Tukey honest significance was used after Friedman if
10 necessary. $P < 0.05$ was considered significant.

11

1 **RESULTS**

2 Twenty one patients with LBP with both neuropathic and nociceptive somatic pain
3 components completed the study and could clearly differentiate their nociceptive and
4 neuropathic pain. Exclusion were due to incomplete data (2 patients), while the third patient
5 felt sleep while using TENS at bed-time, and had no idea about how much time it was kept
6 on, although there were no complains of adverse effects. Demographics of patients are
7 represented in Table 1. The 21 patients classified the nociceptive pain as “improved” when
8 comparing day-1st to days-5th-10th ($p<0.05$); or day-1st to days-11th-14th ($p<0.02$) , whilst
9 19 patient classified neuropathic pain as “maintained” and 2 patients classified as “worsened”
10 ($p>0.05$).

11 Regarding the VAS pain score for the neuropathic type of pain, it did not improve
12 after TENS use, as pre- and post-treatment pain scores were similar for all days of the study
13 compared to previous pain score values before treatment ($p>0.05$; Fig. 1). However,
14 concerning VAS pain score for the nociceptive type of pain, it decreased when comparing
15 day-1st to days-5th-10th ($p<0.05$); or day 1st to days 11th-14th ($p<0.02$; Figure 1).

16 Pre- and post-treatment daily rescue metamizol consumption decreased when
17 comparing day-1st to day-14th ($p<0.05$, Table 1) (mean (25%-75%): 1(1-2) and mean 2 (2-3)
18 to day-1st and day-14thm, respectively (Table I; $p>0.05$). Prior to TENS treatment, 17
19 patients were taking 1000 mg metamizol while 4 of the patients were taking 1500 mg
20 metamizol plus oral 500 mg paracetamol (500 mg). Sixteen patients took daily 500 mg oral
21 metamizol, while 5 patients took 1000 mg daily metamizol ($p<0.05$; Table 1). No adverse
22 effects were observed.

23 The TENS device decreased the pain VAS intensity of LBP for nociceptive pain in a
24 strictly segmental manner for all 21 patients by the day-5th ($p<0.05$), improving up to the
25 day-12th of evaluation and maintained up to the 14-day evaluation ($p<0.02$) (Fig. 1). There

1 was a statistically significant drop in mean pain score (VAS) from pretreatment to post-
2 treatment for the nociceptive facetary articular pain (day-1st compared to day-14th, $p<0.05$).
3 Consequently, the quality of sleep improved for all 21 patients, and the number of arousals
4 due to pain secondary to change of position in bed steadily decreased from day-5th to day-
5 14th, when compared to the sleep time previous to the TENS application. Prior to TENS
6 application, all patients referred 2(1-2) (mean (25%-75%)) arousals during night time
7 compared to none on day-5th forward ($p<0.05$).

8 Related to capacity of performing routine physical activity, it was considered
9 improved during the first 3 hours in the morning just after arousal from the bed by 17 of 21
10 patients from day-4th, resulting in facility of getting off the bed, and for routine activities
11 ($p<0.05$), while 4 patients defined as maintained. There were no other complains of adverse
12 effects.

13

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 TENS was introduced more than 35 years ago as an adjunct to pharmacologic pain
3 management for LBP. However, despite its widespread use, evidence for its efficacy as an
4 isolated intervention in the management of chronic LBP is limited and inconsistent [5,6]. The
5 results of the actual study demonstrated that the two types of pain could be clearly
6 differentiated by each patient, named nociceptive somatic pain and neuropathic pain. The
7 results demonstrated that neuropathic radicular pain did not alter with high-frequency TENS
8 use twice daily, in accordance to otherS [1-3],. However, the nociceptive somatic pain was
9 clearly improved by the use of the TENS device twice daily, in accordance to otherS [7], who
10 also applied 30-min TENS, and patients decreased the amount of daily rescue analgesics.
11 Recently, a group of LBP patients who used TENS compared with a matched group without
12 TENS at 1-year follow-up had significantly fewer hospital and clinic visits, used less
13 diagnostic imaging, had fewer physical therapy visits, and required less back surgery,
14 associated to a lower total annual costs[8].

15 In this actual study a high frequency TENS device was used. It is generally believed
16 that high frequency TENS analgesia is caused mainly by differentially blocking the activation
17 of large diameter primary afferents from deep somatic tissues, but not superficial cutaneous
18 afferents [9], and also to mediated analgesia through the periaqueductal gray that sends
19 projections through the rostroventralmedial medulla to the spinal cord to produce an opioid-
20 mediated analgesia through δ -receptors [10]. Hyperalgesia through central sensitization was
21 also demonstrated to be ameliorated in rats, as the application of high frequency TENS to the
22 contralateral paw reversed the hyperalgesia of the inflamed paw [11]. High frequency TENS
23 was also capable of inducing analgesia, most likely related to increased serum serotonin
24 release, apart from blockade of the adverse cardiovascular and respiratory changes induced by
25 pain [12], what could justify the analgesic effect upon the nociceptive type of pain.

1 However, neuropathic pain in the model used in this actual study (chronic
2 neuropathic) was not affected by high frequency TENS. In accordance, TENS was
3 demonstrated to be effective in the inflammation model, while it did not reveal significant
4 analgesic effects in the neuropathic pain rodent model [13]. Recent results in mice suggested
5 that the application of early TENS (it means on the first day of neural injury) relieved
6 hyperalgesia in a model of neuropathic pain and inhibited: a) glial activation, b) mitogen-
7 activated kinase activation, protein kinase C- γ , c) phosphorylated anti-phospho-cyclic AMP
8 response element-binding protein expression; d) the proinflammatory cytokines expression; as
9 well as kept maintenance of spinal opioid receptors [13]. However, the same study
10 demonstrated that the analgesic effects were only present if the TENS was started on day one
11 after the nerve injury, but had no results when starting on 7th-day or 14th-day after the injury
12 [14], what is also in accordance to our results.

13 Other studies indicate that direct stimulation of the spinal cord releases substance P,
14 serotonin, noradrenaline and gamma aminobutyric acid (GABA) in the dorsal horns, and
15 activation of the GABA-B receptor may be linked to a decrease in the release of glutamate
16 and other excitatory amino acids, resulting in a decrease of neuropathic pain [15]. In fact, only
17 intracutaneous electrical stimulation (but not transcutaneous) attenuated both neuropathic and
18 inflammatory-induced pain behaviors [13]. While electroacupuncture stimulation was
19 demonstrated to effectively down-regulate serum inflammatory factors interleukin-1 β and
20 tumoral necrosis factor- α levels; to upregulate anti-inflammatory factor interleukin-2 level in
21 rats [16]; and to attenuate systemic inflammatory responses through activation of muscarinic
22 receptors in the central nervous system [17], high frequency TENS had no effect on serotonin
23 induced inflammation [18].

24 Anti-inflammatory drugs were not included as part of the protocol, as they could
25 interfere with the course of the disease, and not only masking the pain sensation, what could

1 lead to misinterpretation of the data. Because high frequency TENS was previously described
2 to be related to anti-inflammatory mechanism of action [11.13], it was decided to use
3 metamizol as rescue analgesic, a drug established as central and peripheral analgesic with no
4 clinical anti-inflammatory action [19]. In addition, it is free of charge for all patients as it is
5 donated by the government for pain control, under prescription, as much as paracetamol.
6 Indeed, the action of TENS on inflammation remains to be clarified.

7 Related to sleep comfort, all patients noticed improvement in sleep pattern, decreased
8 arousals at night time achieving complete night of sleep from day-5th, and no patients took
9 metamizol as rescue analgesic at night time, compared to previous data before starting the
10 study protocol, in accordance to our previous study [20], nevertheless in a different
11 population.

12 In addition, 17 of the patients referred improvement in morning physical activities
13 during the first 3-hours. Others have likewise demonstrated improvement in fibromyalgic
14 patients after high frequency TENS, with relevant improvement of pain, work performance,
15 fatigue, stiffness, anxiety and depression compared to those not receiving TENS [21]. The
16 utility of TENS was correspondingly described in computer workers. Apart from pain relief,
17 patients also reported improved social relationships, social support, sexual activity and mental
18 health. After treatment a significant increase in the flexion of lower back was observed in the
19 majority of patients. No significant correlations between the quality of life and the intensity of
20 pain and the flexion of lower back before and after treatment were found [22].

21

22

1 CONCLUSIONS

2 As conclusions, TENS application twice daily did not improve chronic neuropathic
3 pain, and in accordance to others, TENS was not considered useful for neuropathic radicular
4 pain [1-3]. Nevertheless, TENS application improved the nociceptive somatic type of pain,
5 decreased the number of arousals at night time, resulted in better sleep pattern, and improved
6 physical function in the morning, suggesting its applicability for LBP when the nociceptive
7 somatic component such as degenerative articular facet is present.

8

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2 The authors thank MedecellBrasil -Brazil for Tanyx and placebo donations. Other costs of the
3 study were supported by the Center for Pain Management- HC- FMRP-USP. Teaching
4 Hospital, School of Medicine of Ribeirão Preto, University of São Paulo, Brazil.

5 CS Sharma; RK Nema; SN Meyyanathan, *Academic J. Cancer Res.*, **2009**, 2(1), 19-24.

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2 1. Khadilkar A, Odebiyi DO, Brosseau L, et al: Transcutaneous electrical nerve
3 stimulation (TENS) versus placebo for chronic low-back pain. *Cochrane Database*
4 *Sys. Rev.*, **2008**, 4, CD003008.
- 5 2. Dubinsky RM, Miyasaki J: Assessment: efficacy of transcutaneous electric nerve
6 stimulation in the treatment of pain in neurologic disorders (an evidence-based
7 review): report of the Therapeutics and Technology Assessment Subcommittee of the
8 American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology*, **2010** ,12, 173-176.
- 9 3. Buchmuller A, Navez M, Milletre-Bernardin MP, et al: Value of TENS for relief of
10 chronic low back pain with or without radicular pain. *Eur. J. Pain*, **2012**, 16, 656-665.
- 11 4. Zhou HH, Lu F, Chen SD, et al: Effect of electroacupuncture on serum copper, zinc,
12 calcium and magnesium levels in the depression rats. *J. Tradit. Chin. Med.*, **2011**, 31,
13 112-114.
- 14 5. Khadilkar A, Milne S, Brosseau L, et al: Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation
15 for the treatment of chronic low back pain: a systematic review. *Spine (Phila. Pa.*
16 *1976)*, **2005**, 30, 2657-2666.
- 17 6. van Middelkoop M, Rubinstein SM, Kuijpers T, et al: A systematic review on the
18 effectiveness of physical and rehabilitation interventions for chronic non-specific low
19 back pain. *Eur. Spine J.*, **2011**, 20, 9-39.
- 20 7. Itoh K, Itoh S, Katsumi Y, Kitakoji H: A pilot study on using acupuncture and
21 transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation to treat chronic non-specific low back pain.
22 *Complement Ther. Clin. Pract.*, **2009**, 15, 22-25.
- 23 8. Pivec R, Stokes M, Chitnis AS, et al: Clinical and economic impact of TENS in
24 patients with chronic low back pain: analysis of a nationwide database. *Orthopedics*,
25 **2013**, 36, 922-928.

- 1 9. Radhakrishnan R, Sluka KA. Deep tissue afferents, but not cutaneous afferents,
2 mediate transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation-Induced antihyperalgesia. *J. Pain*,
3 **2005**, 6, 673-680.
- 4 10. DeSantana JM, Da Silva LF, De Resende MA, et al: Transcutaneous electrical nerve
5 stimulation at both high and low frequencies activates ventrolateral periaqueductal
6 grey to decrease mechanical hyperalgesia in arthritic rats. *Neuroscience*, **2009**,163,
7 1233-1241.
- 8 11. Sabino GS, Santos CM, Francischi JN, et al: Release of endogenous opioids following
9 transcutaneous electric nerve stimulation in an experimental model of acute
10 inflammatory pain. *J. Pain*, **2008**, 9, 157-163.
- 11 12. Santuzzi CH1, Neto Hde A, Pires JG, et al: High-frequency transcutaneous electrical
12 nerve stimulation reduces pain and cardio-respiratory parameters in an animal model
13 of acute pain: participation of peripheral serotonin. *Physiother. Theory Pract.*, **2013**,
14 29, 630-638.
- 15 13. Vera-Portocarrero LP, Cordero T, Billstrom T, et al: Differential Effects of
16 Subcutaneous Electrical Stimulation (SQS) and Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve
17 Stimulation (TENS) in Rodent Models of Chronic Neuropathic or Inflammatory Pain
18 *Neuromodulation*, **2013**, 16, 328-335.
- 19 14. Matsuo H, Uchida K, Nakajima H, et al: Early transcutaneous electrical nerve
20 stimulation reduces hyperalgesia and decreases activation of spinal glial cells in mice
21 with neuropathic pain. *Pain*, **2014**, 155, 1888-1901.
- 22 15. Fukazawa K, Hosokawa T: Spinal cord stimulation. *Masui*, **2009**, 58, 1393-1400.
- 23 16. Li WX, Huang YR, Lei LD, et al: Effects of electroacupuncture and manual
24 acupuncture interventions on contents of serum inflammatory cytokines in rats with
25 chronic adjuvant arthritis. *Zhen. Ci. Yan. Jiu.*, **2012**, 37, 271-276.

- 1 17. Song JG, Li HH, Cao YF, et al: Electroacupuncture improves survival in rats with
2 lethal endotoxemia via the autonomic nervous system. *Anesthesiology*, **2012**, 116,
3 406-414.
- 4 18. Santos CM, Francischi JN, Lima-Paiva P, et al: Effect of transcutaneous electrical
5 stimulation on nociception and edema induced by peripheral serotonin. *Int. J.*
6 *Neurosci.*, **2013**, 123, 507-515.
- 7 19. Serdiuk SE, Gmiro VE: Peripheral acting mediators pain and analgesia potentiate the
8 central analgesic action of fentanyl and dipyrone. *Ross. Fiziol. Zh. Im. I. M.*
9 *Sechenova*, **2012**, 98, 325-330.
- 10 20. Lauretti GR, Chubaci EF, Mattos AL: Efficacy of the use of two simultaneously
11 TENS devices for fibromyalgia pain. *Rheumatol. Int.*, **2013**; 33, 2117-2122
- 12 21. Carbonario F, Matsutani LA, Yuan SL, et al: Effectiveness of high-frequency
13 transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation at tender points as adjuvant therapy for
14 patients with fibromyalgia. *Eur. J. Phys. Rehabil. Med.*, **2013**, 49, 197-204.
- 15 22. Zaniewska R, Okurowska-Zawada B, Kułak W, et al: Analysis of quality of life in
16 patients with low back pain after receiving transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation
17 (TENS). *Med .Pr.*, **2012**, 63, 295-302.

1 **Figure 1.** Visual analog pain scores (0-10 cm) during the 14-days study for description of
2 neuropathic type of pain and somatic type of pain. Pain VAS intensity for nociceptive
3 pain decreased in a strictly segmental manner for all 21 patients by the 5th-day ($p<0.05$),
4 improving up to the 12th-day of evaluation and maintained up to the 14-day evaluation
5 ($p<0.02$).