Nociceptive laser-evoked brain potentials do not reflect nociceptive-specific neural activity
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ABSTRACT (200 WORDS)

Brief radiant laser pulses can be used to activate cutaneous Aδ and C nociceptors selectively, and elicit a number of transient brain responses (laser-evoked potentials, LEPs) in the ongoing electroencephalogram. LEPs have been used extensively in the past 30 years to gain knowledge about the cortical mechanisms underlying nociception and pain in humans, by assuming that they reflect, at least in part, neural activities uniquely or preferentially involved in processing nociceptive input. Here, by applying a novel blind source separation algorithm (Probabilistic Independent Component Analysis) to 124-channel event-related potentials elicited by a random sequence of nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory, auditory, and visual stimuli, we provide compelling evidence that this assumption is incorrect: LEPs do not reflect nociceptive-specific neural activity. Indeed, our results indicate that LEPs can be entirely explained by a combination of multimodal neural activities (i.e. activities also elicited by stimuli of other sensory modalities) and somatosensory-specific, but not nociceptive-specific neural activities (i.e. activities elicited by both nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli). Regardless of the sensory modality of the eliciting stimulus, the magnitude of multimodal activities correlated with the subjective rating of saliency, suggesting that these multimodal activities are involved in stimulus-triggered mechanisms of arousal or attentional reorientation.
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INTRODUCTION

How does the brain process nociceptive input, and how does this processing lead to the perception of pain? Human electrophysiological studies using electroencephalography (EEG), magnetoencephalography (MEG), or invasive intracerebral recordings, as well as hemodynamic studies using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) or positron emission tomography (PET) have all emphasized the fact that nociceptive stimuli elicit consistent responses in a large array of cortical structures (Bushnell and Apkarian 2005; Garcia-Larrea et al. 2003; Kakigi et al. 2005; Peyron et al. 2002; Peyron et al. 2000; Treede et al. 1999), including primary and secondary somatosensory cortices (SI and SII), the insula, and the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC). Although several investigators have suggested that these responses could be largely unspecific for pain (e.g. Bromm and Lorenz 1998; Carmon et al. 1976; Garcia-Larrea et al. 1997; Iannetti et al. 2008; Kunde and Treede 1993; Mouraux and Plaghki 2006; Peyron et al. 2000; Stowell 1984), this assembly of cortical structures, often referred to as the “pain matrix”, has been repeatedly interpreted as forming a network uniquely or preferentially involved in the perception of pain (Boly et al. 2008; Brooks and Tracey 2005; Cheng et al. 2007; Costantini et al. 2008; Decety et al. 2008; Ducreux et al. 2006; Ingvar 1999; Jones 1998a; Maihofner et al. 2007; Moisset and Bouhassira 2007; Singer et al. 2004; Stern et al. 2006; Valeriani et al. 2008; Whyte 2008). In support of the “pain-specific” interpretation of these responses, two common experimental findings are often brought forward. First, that in most experimental settings the magnitude of activity in the “pain matrix” correlates robustly with the intensity of perceived pain (Coghill et al. 1999; Derbyshire et al. 1997; Iannetti et al. 2005), a finding interpreted as indicating that at least part of the “pain matrix” reflects “neural mechanisms for pain intensity
coding in the human cortex” (Porro 2003). Second, that the top-down cognitive modulation of specific aspects of pain perception can selectively alter the response magnitude in specific subregions of the “pain matrix” (e.g. hypnotic modulation of the intensity of perceived pain could specifically change the response magnitude in SI, while hypnotic modulation of the unpleasantness of perceived pain could specifically change the response magnitude in the ACC; Hofbauer et al. 2001; Rainville et al. 1997), a finding often interpreted as indicating that these subregions serve different functions related to the perception of pain.

Brief radiant laser pulses, by activating cutaneous Aδ and C nociceptors selectively, provide a purely nociceptive input and elicit, in the ongoing EEG, a number of transient brain responses (Carmon et al. 1976), related to the activation of Aδ skin nociceptors (Treede et al. 1995). The larger part of the LEP response is represented by a negative-positive biphasic wave (N2-P2), peaking approximately 200-350 ms after hand stimulation, and maximal at the scalp vertex (Bromm and Treede 1987). This N2-P2 complex is preceded by an earlier response, the N1 wave, peaking at approximately 160 ms, and maximal over the temporal region contralateral to the stimulated side (Treede et al. 1988). Source analysis studies have shown that LEPs can be modelled by a combination of generators located within the so-called “pain matrix” (i.e. SI, SII, the insula, and the ACC; reviewed in Garcia-Larrea et al. 2003), and results obtained from subdural (Lenz et al. 1998a; Lenz et al. 1998b; Ohara et al. 2004) and intracerebral (Frot and Mauguiere 2003; Frot et al. 2008; Frot et al. 1999) recordings in humans have confirmed that nociceptive stimuli elicit responses within these regions.
However, as already pointed-out by Carmon et al. in their seminal work (1976), as well as by Stowell (1984), the fact that the eliciting sensory stimulus is entirely selective for nociceptive peripheral afferents by no means implies that the elicited brain activity is nociceptive-specific. As a matter of fact, non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli (Garcia-Larrea et al. 1995; Goff et al. 1977), auditory stimuli (Naatanen and Picton 1987; Picton et al. 1999), and even visual stimuli (Makeig et al. 1999; Vogel and Luck 2000), may all elicit a large “vertex potential” whose shape, scalp topography and sensitivity to various experimental factors closely resemble those of LEPs (Garcia-Larrea 2004; Garcia-Larrea et al. 2003; Kunde and Treede 1993; Mouraux and Plaghki 2006). Furthermore, we recently showed that laser stimuli perceived as more painful could elicit LEPs of greater magnitude simply because they are more salient (Iannetti et al. 2008). In support of this interpretation, Legrain et al. (2003; 2005) showed that at least part of the activity underlying LEPs is likely to reflect involuntary mechanism of attentional reorientation, rather than nociceptive processing per se (see also Lorenz and Garcia-Larrea 2003 for a review). Taken together, these experimental observations question the appropriateness of assuming that LEPs reflect neuronal activities uniquely or even preferentially involved in processing nociceptive input.

Therefore, to test the validity of the assumption that LEPs reflect neuronal activities uniquely or preferentially involved in processing nociceptive input, we applied a novel blind source separation algorithm (Probabilistic Independent Component Analysis; Beckmann and Smith 2004; Makeig et al. 1997) to event-related potentials (ERPs) recorded using high-density scalp EEG (124 channels). By comparing the ERPs elicited by a random sequence of nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory
stimuli, auditory stimuli, and visual stimuli, we quantified and characterized, at single-subject level, the respective contribution of multimodal neural activities (i.e. activities also elicited by stimuli of other sensory modalities), somatosensory-specific neural activities (i.e. activities elicited by both nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli) and nociceptive-specific neural activities (i.e. activities uniquely elicited by nociceptive somatosensory stimuli) to the LEP response.

METHODS

Ethical approval. The study conformed to the latest revision of the Declaration of Helsinki. All experimental procedures were approved by the Oxfordshire Research Ethics Committee. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Participants. Nine healthy right-handed volunteers (4 females and 5 males, aged 20 to 32 years) participated in the study. Before the electrophysiological recording, the experimental setup and the psychophysical rating task were clearly explained to the participants, who were also exposed to a small number of test stimuli (5-10 stimuli for each stimulus type).

Experimental design. Experiments were conducted in a dim, silent, temperature-controlled room. Participants lay semi-supine in a comfortable armchair, while receiving brief stimuli belonging to four different sensory modalities: nociceptive somatosensory, non-nociceptive somatosensory, auditory, and visual. Participants were instructed to keep their gaze fixed on a white cross (3x3 cm) placed centrally in front of them, at a distance of approximately 2 m, 30° below eye-level. To ensure
that observed differences in the recorded responses were not related to the spatial location of the stimulus or to spatial attention (two experimental factors that have been shown to influence the magnitude and scalp topography of ERPs; e.g. Legrain et al. 2002; Schlereth et al. 2003), all sensory stimuli were delivered in a random sequence, to or near the dorsum of the right hand (Figure 1, upper-left panel) which was placed approximately ~45 cm from the participant’s head, 25° right of the midline, and 30° below eye-level. The experiment was divided in four successive runs. The number of trials for each run ranged between 38 and 42, and each type of stimulus was similarly represented in each run. In total, each type of stimulus was delivered 40 times. Inter-stimulus interval was 5-10 s (random square distribution). To ensure that vigilance was maintained across time, and that each type of sensory stimulus was equally relevant to the task, participants were instructed to report the total number of perceived stimuli at the end of each of the four runs. Finally, at the end of the experiment, participants were asked to rate the saliency of each type of stimulus using a numerical rating scale ranging from 0 (not salient) to 10 (extremely salient). Stimulus saliency was explained to each subject as “the ability of the stimulus to capture attention”. Therefore, it was expected to integrate several factors such as stimulus intensity, frequency of appearance, novelty and its potential relevance to behaviour. Several studies have shown that human judgments of saliency correlate well with predicted models of saliency (Kayser et al. 2005).

**Sensory stimuli.** *Nociceptive somatosensory stimuli* were pulses of radiant heat (4 ms duration) generated by an infrared neodymium yttrium aluminium perovskite (Nd:YAP) laser (wavelength: 1.34 µm; ElEn Group, Italy). Stimulus target was the sensory territory of the superficial radial nerve. Beam diameter at target site was ~7
mm. For each participant, stimulus energy (2.3 ±0.3 J) was adjusted in order to elicit a clear painful pinprick sensation, related to the activation of Aδ skin nociceptors (Bromm and Treede 1984; Iannetti et al. 2006). To prevent nociceptor fatigue or sensitization, the laser target was displaced between each trial. Non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli were constant current square-wave electrical pulses (1 ms duration; DS7A, Digitimer Ltd, UK) delivered through a pair of skin electrodes (0.5 cm diameter, 1 cm inter-electrode distance) placed at the wrist, over the superficial radial nerve. For each participant, stimulus intensity (9.9 ±2.1 mA) was adjusted to elicit a non-painful paresthesia in the corresponding sensory territory. This intensity of electrical stimulation was above the threshold of Aβ fibres (which convey non-nociceptive tactile information) but below the threshold of nociceptive Aδ and C fibres (Burgess and Perl 1967; see also Results). Auditory stimuli were brief 800 Hz tones (50 ms duration; 5 ms rise and fall times) presented at a loud but comfortable listening level (~85 dB SPL), and delivered through a speaker (VE100AO, Audax, France) placed in front of the participant’s hand. Visual stimuli were brief flashes (5 ms duration) delivered by two green light-emitting diodes (11.6 cd, 15° viewing angle) pointing towards the participants head, and placed on top of the speaker.

Electrophysiological recording. The EEG was recorded using 124 Ag-AgCl electrodes placed on the scalp according to the International 10-5 system, and referenced to the nose. Ocular movements and eye-blinks were recorded using two surface electrodes placed at the upper-left and lower-right sides of the right eye. In addition, the electrocardiogram was recorded using two surface electrodes placed at the left and right wrists. Signals were amplified and digitized using a sampling rate of 1,024 Hz (SD128 EEG, Micromed, Italy). Continuous EEG recordings were
segmented into 1.5 s epochs (-0.5 to +1.0 s relative to stimulus onset) and band-pass filtered (1-30 Hz). After baseline-correction (reference interval -0.5 to 0 s), artifacts produced by eye blinks or eye movements were subtracted using a validated method (Jung et al. 2000) based on an Independent Component Analysis (ICA). In addition, epochs with amplitude values exceeding ±100 μV (i.e. epochs likely to be contaminated by an artifact) were rejected. These epochs constituted 5 ±3% of the total number of epochs. Separate average ERP waveforms were computed for each participant and stimulus type (nociceptive somatosensory, non-nociceptive somatosensory, auditory, and visual). All EEG processing steps were carried out using Letswave (amouraux.webnode.com/letswave; Mouraux and Iannetti 2008), Matlab (The MathWorks, USA), and EEGLAB (sccn.ucsd.edu/eeglab; Delorme and Makeig 2004).

**Blind source separation using Probabilistic ICA.** For each subject, multimodal and modality-specific neural activities were separated using an Independent Component Analysis (ICA; Makeig et al. 1997) constrained to an effective estimate of the intrinsic dimensionality of the original data (Probabilistic ICA; Beckmann and Smith 2004). When applied to multi-channel EEG recordings (Figure 1, upper-right panel), ICA separates the signals recorded on the scalp into a linear combination of independent components (ICs), each having a fixed scalp topography and a maximally-independent time course. When ICA is unconstrained, the total number of estimated ICs equals the total number of recording electrodes. If the number of estimated ICs differs greatly from the actual number of independent sources contributing to the signal, this may constitute a critical problem (Beckmann and Smith 2004). Indeed, if the number of estimated ICs is much larger than the number of sources, ICs...
containing spurious activity will appear because of overfitting. On the contrary, if the number of estimated ICs is much smaller than the number of sources, valuable information will be lost because of underfitting. This fundamental limitation can be addressed using Probabilistic ICA, a method that constrains the total number of estimated ICs to an effective estimate of the number of independent sources contributing to the original data, and that was initially developed for the analysis of fMRI signals (Beckmann and Smith 2004). As a result, each obtained IC is more likely to represent a single physiological source of activity.

For each participant, the ERPs elicited by nociceptive somatosensory, non-nociceptive somatosensory, auditory, and visual stimuli were concatenated into a single waveform (4 average waveforms x 1.5 s x 1,024 Hz = 6,144 time points) (Figure 1, lower-left panel). To constrain ICA, an objective estimate of the number of independent sources contributing to the four ERP waveforms was obtained using a method based on maximum likelihoods, and operating on the eigenvalues of a Principal Component Analysis (Rajan and Rayner 1997). The blind source separation was performed on the concatenated waveform using runica (Delorme and Makeig 2004; Makeig et al. 1997), an automated form of the extended infomax ICA algorithm (Bell and Sejnowski 1995), constrained to the estimated number of dimensions (Figure 1, lower panel).

We assumed that nociceptive somatosensory LEPs, such as non-nociceptive somatosensory ERPs (SEPs), auditory ERPs (AEPs), and visual ERPs (VEPs) resulted from a linear mixture of multimodal and modality-specific cortical activities projected onto the scalp, each having distinct yet possibly overlapping time courses.
While multimodal activities would contribute to all four segments of the concatenated ERP waveform, modality-specific activities would contribute only to the segment corresponding to the ERP elicited by stimuli belonging to a particular sensory modality (e.g. auditory-specific activity would contribute to the AEP segment of the concatenated ERP time course, but not to the LEP, the SEP, or the VEP segments of that same concatenated ERP time course). Therefore, because multimodal and modality-specific activities would contribute differently to each of the four segments of the concatenated ERP time course, we hypothesized that Probabilistic ICA would be able to separate these activities into distinct ICs, provided that they had non-identical scalp topographies. It is worth noting that this procedure did not require that the time course of multimodal neural activity be identical across sensory modalities. This is important because the time course of multimodal neural activity may be expected to differ because of various physiological reasons (e.g. the different transduction mechanisms and conduction velocities of activated primary afferents).

To estimate the contribution of each obtained IC to the ERP elicited in each of the four explored sensory modalities, the time course of the power of each IC ($\mu V^2$) was expressed as the standard deviation from the mean (z-scores) of the concatenated pre-stimulus intervals of all four average waveforms (-0.5 to 0 s). Z-scores were then averaged within the 0 to +0.5 s interval following the onset of each stimulus, thus yielding four values for each IC (one value for each stimulus type). If at least one of these four values was greater than $z = 1.5$, the IC was considered to reflect stimulus-evoked activity. These ICs were then categorized according to their relative contribution to the four ERPs. For each IC and stimulus type, we computed the ratios between the signal power contributed to the ERP elicited by that stimulus type and
the signal power contributed to the ERPs elicited by each of the three other stimulus types. If the ratio was $\geq 3.5$ for one stimulus type vs. each of the other three stimulus types (i.e. the IC contributed uniquely to one out of the four ERP segments), the IC was categorized as modality-specific (nociceptive somatosensory, non-nociceptive somatosensory, auditory, or visual). Furthermore, if the calculated ratio for that IC was $\geq 3.5$ for both the LEP and the SEP vs. the AEP and the VEP (i.e. the IC contributed to the LEP and the SEP but not to the AEP and the VEP), it was categorized as somatosensory-specific. Remaining ICs (i.e. ICs that contributed to all four ERP segments) were categorized as multimodal. Figure 2 shows how this method allowed breaking down effectively LEPs, SEPs, AEPs and VEPs into a set of multimodal and modality-specific components. It is important to highlight that the obtained classification was not critically dependent on the arbitrarily-defined threshold of 3.5 (which was chosen because it matched well the decision of two blinded observers). Indeed, most ICs were unambiguously multimodal or modality-specific, and IC classifications obtained using different cutoff values ranging between 2 and 4.5 yielded results that were not noticeably different from those obtained using a cutoff of 3.5 (data not shown).

RESULTS

Psychophysical results

Subjects reliably reported the number of stimuli presented in each run, with an average error rate of 1 ±2 (mean ±SD).
All subjects described the sensation elicited by the laser stimulus as painful and clearly pricking. Yet, compared to the other three stimulus types, the laser stimulus was not systematically reported as the most salient (Figure 7, left panel). In fact, the average ratings for stimulus saliency (nociceptive somatosensory stimuli: 6.1 ±1.6, non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli: 5.3 ±1.2, auditory stimuli: 5.5 ±1.7, visual stimuli: 4.3 ±1.7) were not significantly different across stimulus types (repeated-measures analysis of variance (ANOVA): p =0.12).

**ERP waveforms and topographies**

LEPs consisted of a large negative-positive biphasic wave (N2-P2) which was maximal over the scalp vertex (electrode Cz; Figure 2, upper row). While the laser-evoked N2 extended bilaterally towards temporal regions (electrodes T3 and T4), the laser-evoked P2 was more centrally distributed. Preceding the laser-evoked N2, and often appearing within its ascending shoulder, the laser-evoked N1 was maximal over the temporal area contralateral to the stimulated side (electrode T3; Figure 3, middle graph).

Non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli (N1-P2), auditory stimuli (N1-P2), and visual stimuli (N1-P3) elicited a negative-positive biphasic wave whose shape and scalp topography were similar to that of the LEP (Figure 2, upper row). The scalp topography of the laser-evoked N2 was indistinguishable from the scalp topography of the non-nociceptive somatosensory N1, both waves being maximal at the vertex, and extending bilaterally over temporal regions. Furthermore, the initial part of the non-nociceptive somatosensory N1 was, such as the laser-evoked N1, greater over the hemisphere contralateral to the stimulated side. The scalp topography of the laser-evoked N2 also resembled closely that of the auditory N1, which extended
bilaterally towards temporal regions, but was symmetrically distributed over both hemispheres. In contrast, the scalp topography of the laser-evoked N2 was not as markedly similar to the visual N1, which extended towards temporal and occipital areas, and clearly predominated over the hemisphere contralateral to the stimulated side.

The scalp topography of the laser-evoked P2 was indistinguishable from the scalp topography of the non-nociceptive somatosensory P2, the auditory P2, and the visual P3 (Figure 2, upper row). Indeed, whatever the sensory modality of the eliciting stimulus, this late positive wave was maximal over the vertex, and centrally distributed.

Peak latencies of the laser-evoked N2-P2 (199 ±19 and 333 ±25 ms), the non-nociceptive somatosensory N1-P2 (114 ±28 and 251 ±33 ms), the auditory N1-P2 (109 ±14 and 211 ±40 ms), and the visual N1-P3 (140 ±15 and 333 ±48 ms) were significantly different (negative peak: p <0.0001; positive peak: p <0.0001; repeated-measures ANOVA). These differences in peak latency can be largely explained by differences in the time required for the transduction of the stimulus energy into a neural impulse, as well as differences in the time required for the sensory afferent volley to reach the cortex (peripheral and central conduction times). For example, the difference (~80 ms) between nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory responses is explained by the difference between the conduction velocity of small-diameter nociceptive Aδ fibres (~10-15 m/s) and the conduction velocity of large-diameter non-nociceptive Aβ fibres (~50-100 m/s) (Inui et al. 2003).
Blind source separation of ERPs

The estimated number of independent sources contributing to the four ERP waveforms ranged, across participants, from 13 to 25 (20 ±4). Constraining the ICA to this number of dimensions accounted for 99% of the variance of all four sensory ERPs. 15 ±2 of these ICs were classified as contributing significantly to at least one of the four sensory ERPs, and accounted for 96% of their variance. According to their relative contribution to LEP, SEP, AEP and VEP segments of the concatenated ERP waveform, these ICs were then categorized as either multimodal (Figure 4) or modality-specific (Figures 5 and 6).

Multimodal ICs

Multimodal neural activity (7 ±3 ICs; Figures 2 and 4) was the main constituent of all four sensory ERPs, explaining 76 ±13% of the LEP waveform, 66 ±17% of the SEP waveform, 62 ±25% of the AEP waveform, and 55 ±26% of the VEP waveform. This multimodal activity consisted of a negative-positive biphasic wave, always maximal at the vertex (electrode Cz). The scalp topography of the negative peak extended bilaterally towards temporal regions, while the scalp topography of the positive peak was more centrally distributed. These topographies were very similar to those of the main negative (N2) and positive (P2) waves of the LEP. The latency of the negative and positive peaks of multimodal activity contributing to the LEP (200 ±20 and 356 ±47 ms), the SEP (109 ±26 and 271 ±38 ms), the AEP (109 ±16 and 203 ±34 ms) and the VEP (156 ±38 and 330 ±72 ms) closely matched the latencies of the corresponding negative and positive ERP peaks (Figure 4).

Correlation between the magnitude of multimodal activity and the subjective rating of stimulus saliency. For each participant and stimulus type, the magnitude of
multimodal activity, expressed as the global field power (Lehmann and Skrandies 1980) of multimodal ICs backprojected onto the scalp and averaged within the 0-500 ms interval following stimulus onset, was plotted against the corresponding rating of stimulus saliency (Figure 7, left panel). The linear dependence between these two variables was calculated for each subject using Pearson’s correlation coefficient. Regardless of the sensory modality of the eliciting stimulus, the magnitude of multimodal activity was positively correlated with the subjective rating of stimulus saliency (Pearson’s r =0.56 ±0.46, group-level average). To examine the significance of this correlation across the group, single-subject correlation coefficients were normalized using Fisher’s z transformation. The resulting z values were significantly different from zero (t =3.44, p =0.009).

Source modelling of multimodal ICs. The location of the sources of multimodal ICs was modelled by fitting two symmetrical equivalent dipoles for each multimodal IC (7 ±3 ICs for each subject). Dipole fitting was performed using an algorithm based on a non-linear optimization technique and a standardized boundary element head model (dipfit2; Fuchs et al. 2002; Woody 1967). Dipole locations outside the head, and dipole models with a residual variance exceeding 20% were excluded. For each subject, 5 ±2 multimodal ICs (accounting for 94% of the multimodal activity) were successfully modelled (average residual variance: 10.8 ±6.4%). The locations of the fitted dipole pairs (Figure 7) appeared to form two clusters: a deep midline cluster (-20 mm < x < 20 mm, Montreal Neurological Institute coordinates) whose centre of gravity was located in the ACC, and a bilateral cluster (x < -20 mm or x > 20 mm) located in the left and right operculo-insular regions.
Modality-specific ICs

Modality-specific neural activities were identified in all participants, but their contribution to the recorded ERP waveforms was quantitatively smaller than the contribution of multimodal activity (Figures 5 and 6).

Somatosensory-specific neural activity (4 ±2 ICs, contributing to both nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory ERPs) explained 25 ±21% of the LEP and 34 ±16% of the SEP (Figure 5). This activity contributed mainly to the early part of both ERP waveforms (Figures 6). It appeared as a negative wave (LEP: 189 ±28 ms; SEP: 93 ±37 ms) whose scalp topography was distributed over central and parietal regions, and maximal over the hemisphere contralateral to the stimulated side.

Nociceptive-specific somatosensory neural activity was not identified. Indeed, not a single IC was found to contribute uniquely to the LEP waveform (Figure 3).

Non nociceptive-specific somatosensory neural activity. A small number of ICs (2 ±1) contributed uniquely to the non-nociceptive SEP, explaining 8 ±12% of that waveform (Figure 5). This activity appeared as a negative wave peaking at 133 ±45 ms. Its scalp topography was maximal over the central parietal region contralateral to the stimulated side.

Auditory-specific neural activity (3 ±1 ICs, explaining 32 ±18% of the AEP; Figure 5) appeared as a negative wave (peaking at 101 ±8 ms) whose scalp topography was symmetrically distributed over central, frontal, and temporal regions (Figure 6).
Similarly to somatosensory specific activities, the contribution of auditory-specific activity was confined to the early part of the AEP waveform.

Visual-specific neural activity (2 ±1 ICs, explaining 36 ±27% of the VEP; Figure 5) appeared as a positive wave (peaking at 130 ±32 ms) followed by a negative wave (peaking at 192 ±59 ms). The two peaks of visual-specific activity had notably different scalp topographies (Figure 6). The first peak was maximal over occipital areas. The second was more largely distributed over parietal, temporal and occipital areas, and clearly predominant over the hemisphere contralateral to the stimulated side.

**DISCUSSION**

Although laser stimuli activate nociceptive peripheral afferents selectively, our results indicate that laser-evoked EEG responses reflect neural activities equally involved in processing nociceptive and non-nociceptive sensory inputs. Indeed, LEPs were entirely explained (1) by a major contribution of *multimodal* neural activities, explaining the largest part of the laser-evoked N2 and P2 waves and (2) by a less prominent contribution of *somatosensory-specific*, but *not nociceptive-specific* neural activities, explaining the largest part of the laser-evoked N1 wave. This finding provides, for the first time, quantitative experimental evidence in support of a possibility that had already been raised by a number of investigators (Bromm and Lorenz 1998; Carmon et al. 1976; Garcia-Larrea et al. 1997; Iannetti et al. 2008; Kunde and Treede 1993; Mouraux and Plaghki 2006): that the activity of nociceptive-specific cortical neurons cannot be isolated using scalp LEPs.
Contribution of multimodal neural activity to LEPs

Multimodal neural activities explained 76 ±13% of the LEP signal, and were the main constituent of the entire LEP waveform, in particular, the N2 wave (of which it explained 79 ±22%) and the P2 wave (of which it explained 88 ±17%).

What is the functional significance of this predominant multimodal activity? The observation that the magnitude of multimodal neural activity correlated with the subjective rating of stimulus saliency indicates that it at least partly reflects neural processes triggered by the occurrence of salient changes in the sensory environment, and thus, that it could be related, directly or indirectly, to stimulus-triggered mechanisms of arousal and/or attentional reorientation (Ranganath and Rainer 2003). In line with this hypothesis, a number of investigators have suggested that the N2 and P2 waves of the LEP waveform reflect neural activities involved in reorienting attention towards or reacting to noxious stimuli (Garcia-Larrea 2004; Iannetti et al. 2008; Legrain et al. 2005; Mouraux and Plaghki 2006). Our results indicate that the saliency-related neural processes underlying the N2 and P2 waves are independent of the sensory modality of the eliciting stimulus, and thus, that they could be linked to the “multimodal cortical network for the detection of changes in the sensory environment” that was recently identified by Downar et al. (2000), using fMRI. These neural processes could be tightly related to those underlying the cognitive P3a wave, which has been suggested to reflect an orientation response, and has been shown to contribute to both the late part of the LEP response (Legrain et al. 2005; Legrain et al. 2002) and other vertex potentials (e.g. Friedman et al. 2001). In addition, because the intensity of a sensory stimulus is an important determinant of its saliency, our finding indicates that the positive relationship
between LEP magnitude and intensity of pain (Arendt-Nielsen 1994; Beydoun et al. 1993; Bromm and Treede 1991; Garcia-Larrea et al. 1997; Iannetti et al. 2005; Kakigi et al. 1989), which has been repeatedly interpreted as evidence that LEPs reflect neural activities encoding the intensity of noxious stimuli, can be entirely explained by a modulation of the magnitude of saliency-related multimodal responses. In support of this view, we have recently shown that modulating the saliency of a nociceptive stimulus without changing its intensity (by changing the novelty of the stimulus, another important determinant of saliency) disrupts the positive relationship between the magnitude of LEPs and the magnitude of pain perception (Iannetti et al. 2008), a finding expanding previous reports of dissociations between LEP magnitude and pain (e.g. Dillmann et al. 2000; Treede et al. 2003).

Multi-channel LEP responses are usually modelled by a combination of medial cingulate sources (thought to reflect multimodal brain activity) and lateral opercular sources (thought to reflect, at least in part, nociceptive-specific brain activity), thus leading to the dualistic view that LEPs reflect both nociceptive-specific and multimodal activities (Garcia-Larrea et al. 2003). Here, by showing that multimodal activities are modelled by sources located not only in medial, but also in lateral brain structures (Figure 7, right panel), we suggest that the experimental evidence supporting this dualistic view does not hold. In other words, our results challenge the notion that LEP sources hypothesized to originate from the operculum may be considered as primarily nociceptive-specific, or even as primarily somatosensory-specific. This is supported by evidence from single-cell recordings performed in rodents (Brett-Green et al. 2004; Menzel and Barth 2005; Rodgers et al. 2008;
Wallace et al. 2004), showing that all these regions are at least partly involved in multimodal sensory integration (i.e. the integration of sensory inputs across multiple sensory modalities). Most importantly, single-cell recordings performed in humans and in non-human primates have shown that, in these regions, neurons responding to nociceptive stimuli may also respond to other kinds of salient sensory stimuli (e.g. a menacing visual stimulus; Dong et al. 1994; Hutchison et al. 1999; Kenshalo and Douglas 1995), thus suggesting that neurons identified as nociceptive-specific (because they responded to nociceptive somatosensory stimuli but not to non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli) could in fact be multimodal, and their activity be largely determined by the saliency of the stimulus. This hypothesis would agree with the results of a number of human EEG and fMRI studies, showing that also non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli elicit activity in these regions, and that the magnitude of this activity is largely determined by the saliency of the eliciting stimulus (Burton et al. 1999; Chen et al. 2008; Menon et al. 1997; Ranganath and Rainer 2003).

What could be the anatomical connections underlying the generation of these multimodal brain responses? In the classical hierarchical view of sensory processing, multimodal cortical activity reflects high-level sensory or cognitive processes that occur only after sensory signals have undergone extensive processing within modality-specific cortices. However, another possibility is that multimodal cortical activity is the consequence of multimodal convergence that has already occurred at subcortical level (reviewed in Schroeder and Foxe 2005). Indeed, thalamo-cortical projections that are already multimodal could originate either from aspecific laminar thalamic nuclei, or from the calbindin-positive matrix of thalamic cells (Jones 1998b).
This “thalamic matrix”, which ignores the classical nuclear organization of the thalamus, receives diffuse sensory input and projects to virtually all cortical areas, has been proposed to constitute a diffuse multimodal system that plays an important role for generating conscious perception (by binding multiple aspects of sensory experience), detecting changes in the sensory environment, and triggering arousal reactions. The hypothesis that multimodal cortical activity relates to such a system would agree with the early proposals that vertex potentials mainly reflect a nonspecific cortical response triggered by diffuse thalamo-cortical projections (e.g. Davis et al. 1966), as well as with the later description of a multimodal contribution to vertex potentials elicited by auditory, somatosensory and visual stimuli (reviewed in Naatanen and Picton 1987).

An important implication of our finding is that great care should be taken when interpreting observed modulations of the magnitude of vertex potentials. Indeed, while these modulations are often interpreted as evidence for a specific effect on somatosensory, auditory or visual processing, in many cases they can actually be explained entirely by an unaccounted modulation of multimodal activity resulting from an unaccounted change in stimulus saliency. For example, the observation of a reduction of LEP magnitude by concomitant tactile stimulation (Kakigi and Shibasaki 1992; Towell and Boyd 1993) has been interpreted as evidence consistent with the gating of nociceptive input at spinal level (Melzack and Wall 1965), and a consequent “functional decrease in the Aδ pathway”. However, since the saliency of a sensory stimulus is partly determined by the amount of masking background noise (Franklin et al. 2007; Kayser et al. 2005), such results can be alternatively explained...
by a non-specific reduction in the saliency of the laser stimulus when delivered concomitantly with tonic non-nociceptive somatosensory stimulation.

Similarly, a number of recent studies using EEG and fMRI have shown that experiencing empathy for pain elicits neural activity similar to that elicited by nociceptive stimuli, a finding interpreted as evidence that empathy for pain is generated through a mirror activation of the “pain matrix” (e.g. Valeriani et al. 2008; Singer et al. 2004). Our results suggest an alternative interpretation. Because experiencing empathy for pain constitutes a salient sensory event, it is likely to trigger multimodal brain responses similar to the multimodal brain responses elicited by salient nociceptive stimuli.

**Contribution of somatosensory, but not nociceptive-specific activity to LEPs**

The small fraction of the LEP waveform that was not explained by multimodal neural activity, was almost entirely explained by somatosensory-specific, but not nociceptive-specific neural activity (i.e. neural activity triggered by both nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli). This somatosensory-specific activity was maximal over the central-parietal region contralateral to the stimulated hand (Figure 6), and contributed mainly to the early part of the LEP time course, coinciding with the latency of the N1 wave (of which it explained 52 ±37%) and the N2 wave (of which it explained 35 ±29%). In contrast, nociceptive-specific neural activity (i.e. neural activity elicited uniquely by nociceptive somatosensory stimuli) did not contribute to the LEP waveform (Figures 3 and 5).

How can these findings be reconciled with the experimental evidence indicating the existence of nociceptive-specific neurons in SI, SII, the ACC, and the insula? A first
possibility is that the activity of nociceptive-specific cortical neurons in these areas does not summate into a measurable scalp EEG response. Indeed, a finding common to all reports of single-cell animal recordings is that truly nociceptive-specific cortical neurons (i.e. neurons responding uniquely to nociceptive stimulation) are extremely sparse (Kenshalo et al. 2000; Kenshalo and Isensee 1983; Robinson and Burton 1980; Sikes and Vogt 1992; Whitsel et al. 1969; Yamamura et al. 1996), and that the majority of neurons responding to nociceptive stimuli also respond to non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli and, in some cases, even to non-somatosensory stimuli. Furthermore, following nociceptive stimulation, the firing rate of nociceptive-specific neurons is usually far lower than the firing rate of wide dynamic-range neurons (Kenshalo et al. 2000; Kenshalo and Isensee 1983). Therefore, because scalp EEG only detects neural activity arising from large and synchronously-active neuronal populations (Nunez and Srinivasan 2006), it is highly likely that the postsynaptic activity generated by the sparse population of nociceptive-specific neurons does not summate into a measurable scalp EEG response, while the postsynaptic activity of the comparatively higher number of wide-dynamic range neurons does summate into a measurable scalp EEG response. For this reason we believe that postsynaptic activity in wide dynamic range neurons underlies the somatosensory-specific fraction of the LEP response (Figure 3). Notably, despite being non nociceptive-specific, this activity could contribute to the perception of pain. A second possibility is that the postsynaptic activity of nociceptive-specific neurons does translate into a measurable scalp EEG response, but that this response is spatially indistinguishable from the response generated by non-nociceptive-specific somatosensory neurons. In support of this alternative possibility, studies have shown that, in SI, nociceptive-specific and non-nociceptive-
specific somatosensory neurons are intermingled and have very similar receptive
fields (Kenshalo and Isensee 1983). Furthermore, direct electrical stimulation of the
posterior insula in humans may elicit either painful or non-painful somesthetic
sensations, thus suggesting that “painful and non-painful somesthetic
representations in the human insula overlap” (Ostrowsky et al. 2002). Therefore,
should nociceptive-specific neurons contribute to the measured EEG response, their
contribution would probably be spatially indistinguishable from the contribution of
neighbouring neurons responding to non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli applied
to the same body location.

**Contribution of touch-specific activity to non-nociceptive SEPs**

A small fraction (8 ±12%) of the ERP waveform elicited by non-nociceptive
somatosensory stimuli was shown to reflect neural activity specific for the processing
of tactile stimuli (i.e. neural activity elicited by non-nociceptive somatosensory
stimulation but not by nociceptive somatosensory stimulation), and, given its central-
parietal distribution maximal contralateral to the stimulated side, possibly originating
from the contralateral SI. This interpretation would agree with the results of
intracranial recordings in humans and optical imaging studies in monkeys showing
that non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli, but not nociceptive somatosensory
stimuli, elicit consistent responses within area 3b of the primary somatosensory
cortex (Tommerdahl et al. 1998; Valeriani et al. 2004).

**Conclusion**

By showing that LEPs can be entirely explained by a combination of multimodal and
somatosensory-specific (but not nociceptive-specific) neural activities, our results
provide compelling evidence that the activity of nociceptive-specific cortical neurons
cannot be explored using scalp LEPs.

These results further question the appropriateness of relying on LEPs to build
models of the cortical processes underlying nociception (Iannetti et al. 2008).

Notably, our results do not question the usefulness of LEPs to document
dysfunctions of nociceptive afferent pathways, or to explore the effect of a given
experimental factor on the transmission and processing of nociceptive input. Indeed,
even if LEPs reflect neuronal activities that are entirely unspecific for the nociceptive
system, their generation still relies on the functional state of the nociceptive system,
both at peripheral and central levels. Consequently, when carefully used, LEPs can
still be reliably used to obtain a readout – albeit indirect – of the function of the
afferent nociceptive system.
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**FIGURE LEGENDS**

**Figure 1. Experimental procedure.** 124-channel ERPs were elicited by a random sequence of nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory, auditory, and visual stimuli. *Upper-left panel.* All stimuli were delivered to or near the right hand dorsum. Nociceptive somatosensory stimuli (1) were brief infrared laser pulses delivered to the sensory territory of the superficial radial nerve; non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli (2) were brief electrical pulses applied to the same nerve; auditory stimuli (3) were brief tones produced by a speaker; visual stimuli (4) were brief flashes produced by two light-emitting diodes. *Upper-right panel.* Scalp electrodes record a linear mixture of the activity produced by a number of spatially-distinct neural generators. Probabilistic ICA (PICA) was used to optimize a matrix (W) that unmixed scalp ERPs into a set of temporally-independent and spatially-fixed independent components (ICs). *Lower panel.* When applied to the four ERPs concatenated into a single waveform, PICA separated effectively modality-specific from multimodal activities. Note how, due to volume conduction, ERPs spread across the four representative electrodes shown in the lower-left panel. Also note the clear temporal independence of the four representative ICs shown in the lower-right panel. IC 2 contributed to all four ERPs and was categorized as multimodal. ICs 4, 6 and 13 contributed uniquely to the ERP elicited by one or a subset of stimuli, and were respectively categorized as somatosensory, auditory, and visual-specific.
Figure 2. Contribution of multimodal and modality-specific activities to sensory ERPs. First row. For each stimulus type, the coloured waveforms correspond to single-subject ERPs, while the black waveform corresponds to the group average (electrode Cz vs. nose reference). Vertical lines mark the stimulus onset. Whatever the sensory modality of the eliciting stimulus, the greater part of the ERP consisted of a large negative-positive biphasic wave whose shape and scalp topography were remarkably similar. Probabilistic ICA was used to break down these ERPs into a set of multimodal and modality-specific independent components (ICs). The 2nd row of the figure shows the ERP waveforms obtained after subtracting ICs categorized as multimodal. Note how this subtraction markedly reduces signal amplitude, thus showing that multimodal brain responses are the main constituent of all four ERP waveforms. The following rows show the ERP waveforms obtained after sequentially subtracting visual (3rd row), auditory (4th row), somatosensory (5th row), and non-nociceptive somatosensory (6th row) ICs. After the removal of each category of modality-specific ICs, the amplitude of the ERP elicited by the stimulus belonging to that sensory modality tends towards zero, while the ERP elicited by stimuli belonging to other sensory modalities is largely unaffected. Note that somatosensory ICs contribute to both the nociceptive and the non-nociceptive somatosensory ERP, while non-nociceptive somatosensory ICs contribute uniquely to the non-nociceptive somatosensory ERP. Also note the absence of nociceptive somatosensory ICs. All waveforms and scalp maps are shown using the same scale.
Figure 3. Multimodal and somatosensory-specific activities contributing to the LEP waveform. Laser-evoked potentials (LEPs) appear as a large negative-positive biphasic wave (N2-P2), maximal at the scalp vertex (shown here at Cz vs. nose reference; group average). An earlier negative wave (N1) precedes the N2-P2 complex. The N1 is maximal over the temporal area contralateral to the stimulated side (shown here at T3 vs. Fz). The greater part of the LEP waveform is explained by multimodal brain activity (i.e. activity also elicited by stimuli of other sensory modalities). The time course of this multimodal activity, expressed as global field power (µV²), is shown in grey. Note how multimodal activity explains the greater part of the N1 and N2 waves, and almost all of the P2 wave. Somatosensory-specific brain activity (i.e. activity elicited by both nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory stimuli) also contributes to the LEP waveform. The time course of somatosensory-specific activity, expressed as global field power (µV²), is shown in black. Note how its contribution was largely confined to the time interval corresponding to the N1 and N2 waves. Also note the lack of nociceptive-specific somatosensory activity contributing to the LEP.
Figure 4. Contribution of multimodal brain activity to sensory ERPs.

Probabilistic ICA was used to break down ERPs of each participant into a set of multimodal and modality-specific ICs. Left panel. The spider chart displays the respective contribution of multimodal activity (expressed as the percentage of explained ERP variance) to the four sensory ERPs (represented on the four axes). Each coloured line represents a single participant. Note how this multimodal activity contributes significantly to the four sensory ERPs in each participant. Right panel. The time course of multimodal activity, backprojected on the scalp and expressed as global field power (µV²), is shown in the middle graphs (group average). Whatever the sensory modality of the eliciting stimulus, multimodal activity forms two peaks, whose scalp topographies are maximal at the vertex (upper scalp maps). Note (bottom waveforms) how multimodal activity (thick line) explains the greater part of the ERP recorded at the scalp vertex (thin grey line).
Figure 5. Contribution of modality-specific brain activity to sensory ERPs. Spider charts display the respective contribution (expressed as the percentage of explained ERP variance) of somatosensory (1st panel), non-nociceptive somatosensory (2nd panel), nociceptive somatosensory (3rd panel), auditory (4th panel), and visual (5th panel) ICs to nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory, auditory, and visual ERPs (represented on the four axes; each participant is displayed as a coloured line). Note how somatosensory ICs contribute to both nociceptive and non-nociceptive somatosensory ERPs, while non-nociceptive somatosensory, auditory and visual ICs contribute uniquely to the corresponding ERP waveforms. Also note the absence of nociceptive somatosensory ICs.
Figure 6. Time-course and scalp topography of modality-specific brain activity contributing to sensory ERPs. **Top row.** The group average time courses of multimodal (in grey) and modality-specific (in colour) activities are shown in the cumulative stacked waveforms, backprojected on the scalp and expressed as the signal global field power (µV²). **Bottom row.** Average contribution of modality-specific brain activities (coloured waveforms) to the ERP recorded from electrode Cz (thin grey waveform). Note how the contribution of somatosensory, auditory and visual-specific activity is largely confined to the early part of the ERP time course. The scalp maps show the scalp topography of the main peaks of modality-specific brain activity. Somatosensory-specific activity appeared as a negative peak distributed over central and parietal regions, and maximal over the hemisphere contralateral to the stimulated side. Auditory-specific activity appeared as negative peak symmetrically distributed over central, frontal, and temporal regions. Visual-specific activity appeared as a positive peak followed by a negative peak, each peak displaying a distinct scalp topography. The first peak of visual-specific activity was maximal over occipital areas. The second was more largely distributed over parietal, temporal and occipital areas, and was maximal over the hemisphere contralateral to the stimulated side.
Figure 7. Functional significance and source modelling of multimodal brain activity. Left panel. Scatter plot showing the correlation between the subjective rating of stimulus saliency (shown on the x axis) and the magnitude of multimodal activity (shown on the y axis as the global field power averaged in the time interval ranging from 0 to +0.5 s post stimulus). Four pairs of values (expressed as z-scores to account for response variability across subjects) were obtained for each participant (one pair of values for each of the four stimulus types). A significant positive correlation was observed (Pearson’s r =0.56 ±0.46, group-level average; p =0.009), indicating that the magnitude of multimodal activity is determined by the saliency of the stimulus. The black line represents the average slope of the linear regressions. Right panel. Sources of multimodal ICs were modelled by fitting, for each multimodal IC, a pair of symmetrical equivalent dipoles. The locations of the fitted dipoles appeared to form two clusters: a deep midline cluster (blue spheres: -20 mm < x < 20 mm, Montreal Neurological Institute coordinates) whose centre of gravity was located in the ACC, and a bilateral cluster (green spheres: x < -20 mm or x > 20 mm) located in left and right operculo-insular regions (see also lower-left inset displaying the relative frequency distribution of obtained dipole locations along the x-axis). The small spheres represent the fitted source location of each single IC. The larger spheres represent the centre of gravity of each cluster.
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