This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Muscle pain from an intramuscular injection of hypertonic saline increases variability in knee extensor torque reproduction

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00139.2020>

PUBLISHER

American Physiological Society

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This paper was accepted for publication in the journal Journal of Applied Physiology and the definitive published version is available at <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00139.2020>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Smith, Samuel Andrew, Dominic Micklewright, Sam Winter, and Alexis R Mauger. 2021. "Muscle Pain from an Intramuscular Injection of Hypertonic Saline Increases Variability in Knee Extensor Torque Reproduction". Loughborough University. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/13207607.v1>.

**MUSCLE PAIN FROM AN INTRAMUSCULAR INJECTION OF HYPERTONIC
SALINE INCREASES VARIABILITY IN KNEE EXTENSOR TORQUE
REPRODUCTION**

Samuel A Smith¹, Dominic Micklewright², Samantha L Winter^{1,3}, Alexis R Mauger¹

¹Endurance Research Group, School of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Kent,
Chatham Maritime, (UK).

²School of Sport, Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park,
Colchester, (UK).

³School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, Loughborough University, Ashby Road
Loughborough, (UK).

Author Contributions

SAS and ARM were responsible for the conception and design of the study, and data
acquisition. SAS, DM, SLW, and ARM were responsible for data analysis and interpretation.
SAS was responsible for drafting the manuscript. SAS, DM, SLW and ARM were
responsible for critically revising and editing intellectual content.

Running head: Muscle pain increases variability in torque reproduction

Correspondence to: Alexis (Lex) Mauger, School of Sport and Exercise Sciences,
University of Kent, ME4 4AG, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)1634 888997 Email: lex.mauger@gmail.com

Institutional URL: <https://www.kent.ac.uk/sport-sciences/people/2190/mauger-lex>

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The intensity of exercise-induced pain (EIP) reflects the metabolic environment in the exercising muscle, so during endurance exercise this may inform the intelligent regulation of work rate. Conversely, the acute debilitating effects of EIP on motor unit recruitment could impair the estimation of force produced by the muscle and impair judgement of current exercise intensity. This study investigated whether muscle pain that feels like EIP, administered via intramuscular injection of hypertonic saline, interferes with the ability to accurately reproduce torque in a muscle group relevant to locomotive exercise. **Methods:** On separate days, fourteen participants completed an isometric torque reproduction task of the knee extensors. Participants were required to produce torque at 15 and 20% maximal voluntary torque (MVIT), without visual feedback before (Baseline), during (Pain/No Pain), and after (Recovery) an injection of 0.9% isotonic saline (Control) or 5.8% hypertonic saline (Experimental) into the vastus lateralis of the right leg. **Results:** An elevated reported intensity of pain, and a significantly increased variance in mean contraction torque at both 15% ($P=0.049$) and 20% ($P=0.002$) MVIT was observed in the Experimental compared to the Control condition. Both 15 and 20% target torques were performed at a similar pain intensity in the Experimental condition (15% MVIT, 4.2 ± 1.9 ; 20% MVIT, 4.5 ± 2.2 ; $P>0.05$). **Conclusion:** These findings demonstrate that the increased muscle pain from the injection of hypertonic saline impeded accurate reproduction of knee extensor torque. These findings have implications for the detrimental impact of EIP on exercise regulation and endurance performance.

New & Noteworthy

We provide novel data demonstrating that the presence of muscle pain interferes with estimations of torque produced by the knee extensors, which could impair judgement of work-rate during endurance exercise. The novelty of our study is in the application of the hypertonic saline experimental model into a quadriceps muscle during short, submaximal isometric contractions at an intensity that provides a more translatable assessment of the impact of exercise-induced pain on work-rate regulation during whole-body exercise.

Key words: Nociception, Exercise Regulation, Proprioception, Effort perception, Pain

INTRODUCTION

Exercise-induced pain (EIP) increases linearly with exercise intensity and duration (9), and has been suggested to provide useful sensory feedback about the relative strain of exercising muscles (7, 27, 31). During intense and fatiguing muscle contractions, nociceptors of Group III and IV muscle afferents become sensitised and activated by an accumulation of metabolites which induce the perception of EIP, but are also implicated in peripheral fatigue and the description of its perception (31, 38). Resultantly, EIP is often associated with other physiological and psychological factors of fatigue, and has been suggested to independently exacerbate or contribute to the development of fatigue (27). A change in muscle torque complexity, which is suggested to reflect the adaptability of the neuromuscular system and is reduced during fatiguing maximal and submaximal isometric contractions (34), could provide a non-invasive method to evaluate the fatiguing effect of EIP.

During whole-body exercise, sensations of EIP may facilitate conscious control of homeostatic disturbance during exercise by enabling the intelligent regulation of available energetic resources (i.e. pacing) (12, 27, 54). However, the relationship between EIP and fatigue is likely more complex since it also causes various acute debilitating effects associated with motor unit recruitment (17) and, as a protective mechanism, restricts movement to reduce pain. Consequentially, whilst EIP may provide insight about the metabolic environment in the exercising muscle, these potentially detrimental adaptations may reduce the accuracy of estimations of work done and/or force applied by the muscle, which could impair pacing decisions during whole-body exercise.

Suppressing the unpleasant sensations associated with intense exercise may allow a higher exercise-intensity to be tolerated and sustained (28), however near complete removal of this

information via spinal afferent blockade appears to impair the exerciser's ability to select and maintain a physiologically optimal work rate (3). Spinal blockade studies show the importance of Group III and IV afferents to the performance of whole-body exercise (2, 3) but reveal less about the parallel effects of nociception and perceived pain on other systems such as cardiovascular control.

Intramuscular hypertonic saline injection produces a muscle pain that feels like the naturally occurring EIP experienced during intense exercise (16, 50), and is therefore a useful method to investigate how EIP affects self-regulation of exercise intensity. This technique has previously been used in contralateral limb-matching tasks to assess the impact of tonic muscle pain on the judgement of torque in small muscle groups (40, 41, 57). In these studies, increased pain impeded the ability to accurately match torque, with pain intensity and degree of error correlating such that participants consistently overestimated the force generated by the painful muscle.

This experimental approach could, however, be confounded by potential differences between the contralateral limbs (1, 36). To provide a more translatable assessment of the impact of EIP on whole-body exercise, the relationship between muscle pain and the reproduction of isometric torque production should be evaluated in the larger muscle groups of the lower limb such as the knee extensors, which have an important and fundamental role in the generation of force during locomotion and exercise.

As such, the aim of the present study was to ascertain whether experimentally induced muscle pain in the vastus lateralis (VL) using an intramuscular injection of hypertonic saline would affect the ability to accurately gauge the torque produced by the knee extensor muscles

in a single-limb isometric torque reproduction task. We tested the hypothesis that experimental muscle pain in the VL reduces torque reproduction accuracy (as quantified by the variance in mismatch between target and actual torque) of low intensity isometric contractions when compared to a placebo control condition.

METHODS

Ethical Approval

All procedures and protocols were approved by the School of Sport and Exercises (University of Kent) Research Ethics Advisory Group (Prop 140_2016_17) in conformity with the Declaration of Helsinki, and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. All participants were informed of the study experimental procedures, and written informed consent was obtained to confirm participation.

Participants

Fourteen healthy and recreationally active participants (13 male, 1 female; mean $\pm$ SD: age, 25.3 ± 4.5 years; height 1.78 ± 0.1 m; body mass 73.9 ± 12.3 kg; physical activity 5.6 ± 2.2 hours per week) volunteered to participate in the present study. Assuming a statistical power of 0.8 at an alpha level of 0.05, the sample size was estimated using G*Power software (13) based on the effect size reported in a similar study in our laboratory using hypertonic saline injections (50). All participants attended each visit in a similar psychological state as assessed by the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (56), which was completed at the start of each visit.

Before each visit, participants were instructed to refrain from vigorous exercise (24 h) and abstain from the consumption of alcohol (48 h), analgesics (6 h) and caffeine (8 h).

Participants with existing knee pain, cardiorespiratory disease, neurological disorders, blood borne viruses, sore deep tissues, phobia to needles and any allergy were excluded from the study.

Experimental design

In a two-way repeated-measures experimental design, participants performed an isometric torque matching and reproduction task with either pain (a single intramuscular injection of hypertonic saline) or a placebo control (a single intramuscular injection of isotonic saline) (condition factor). Participants attended a familiarisation session, and then completed the experimental conditions in a randomised and counterbalanced order, with each visit separated by a minimum of seven days. During the task participants attempted to produce torque at two set targets without the aid of real-time visual feedback before (Baseline), during (Pain/No Pain), and after (Recovery) the induction of pain and no pain (time factor). Measures of torque, rating of perceived effort (RPE), surface electromyography (sEMG) and heart rate (HR) were taken during each contraction. Pain intensity was recorded continuously using an electronic visual analogue scale (VAS) and pain quality through the completion of a McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ). A schematic of the experimental design and protocol is outlined in Figure 1.

Fig 1. Schematic overview of the experimental design and procedures. MVICs: maximal voluntary contractions

Experimental Procedures

Torque matching and reproduction task

All visits were performed seated on an isokinetic dynamometer (Cybex HUMAC Norm isokinetic dynamometer; CSMi, Soughton, MA, USA) set up for the right leg, with the knee set at an angle of 75° of flexion (0° = full extension of the knee), and a hip angle of 90°. Torque matching and reproduction for knee extension were determined at isometric contractions of 15% and 20% maximal voluntary isometric torque (MVIT). These values were selected based on the percentage of MVIT utilised during maximal (100% maximal oxygen uptake; VO_{2MAX}) and submaximal (70% VO_{2MAX}) cycling exercise performed at a pedal rate between 60-80 revolutions per minute (24). At the start of each visit, participants completed 3×3 s maximum voluntary isometric contractions (MVICs) separated by 90 s rest, with the greatest instantaneous value taken as MVIT. If the MVIT of consecutive MVICs

were not within 5% of each other, additional MVICs were performed until this criteria was achieved.

Participants attempted the target torques in a trial with real-time torque-production visual feedback ('Feedback Trial') and a trial without visual feedback ('No Feedback Trial').

During the Feedback Trials, target torques (15% and 20% MVIT) were presented with actual torque produced via a computer display. Participants were instructed to remember muscular sensations experienced during each target torque and use these to reproduce the same torque in the subsequent No Feedback Trial (7). All Feedback and No Feedback trials were separated by a 3-minute period of rest.

For each trial, participants performed four 6 s contractions separated by 4 s of rest in a randomised counter-balanced order, which provided two attempts at both target torques (i.e. 2×15% MVIT, 2×20% MVIT). During each contraction, participants were instructed to try and match the target torque within the first 2 s, and then maintain it for a further 4 s.

Intramuscular injection procedure

A single bolus of 1.0 mL hypertonic saline (5.8%) was manually injected into the middle third of the VL of the right leg over a 20 s window (10 s infusion period). The injection was performed using a 3 mL Luer-Lok syringe connected to a 25 G × 38 mm SurGuard2 disposable stainless needle (Terumo, Japan). In the control condition, a single bolus of 1.0 mL isotonic saline (0.9%) was injected.

Visit 1 – Familiarisation

Participant anthropometric and descriptive measures of age, height, body mass, and hours of physical activity engaged in per week were recorded. Participants were then familiarised with the RPE and pain scales (8), as well as the performance of MVICs, and the Feedback/No Feedback Trials. Five minutes after the completion of the final MVIC, participants performed an initial Feedback Trial followed by a No Feedback Trial. Verbal confirmation of the actual torque produced in each contraction was given after the completion of the trial. All four contractions in the No Feedback Trial were required to be within 10% of target torque, with further No Feedback Trials completed until this was satisfied. The visit concluded upon the successful completion of a No Feedback Trial or following ten unsuccessful trials.

Visits 2 & 3 – Experimental visits

All participants completed a Control (isotonic saline) and an Experimental (hypertonic saline) condition in a randomised and counterbalanced order. In each condition, five-minutes after the completion of the MVICs, participants completed six trials (Feedback, No Feedback, Feedback, No Feedback, Feedback, No Feedback). Prior to the second No Feedback Trial, participants received an intramuscular injection of either isotonic (Control) or hypertonic saline (Experimental), with the No Feedback Trial beginning 20 s after the removal of the needle. This ensured that the 15% and 20% MVIT contractions in this No Feedback Trial were performed with a “moderate” to “strong” muscle pain intensity elicited from the painful hypertonic saline infusion. Ten minutes after the completion of this second No Feedback Trial, the final Feedback and No Feedback (Recovery) Trials were performed.

Perceptual and psychological measurements

At the start of each visit participants rated the expected pain (0 = “no pain” to 10 = “worst possible pain”) and their confidence to cope with it (0 = “not confident at all” to 10 = “completely confident”). Muscle pain was evaluated by intensity and quality. Participants rated pain intensity on a moment-to-moment basis using an electronic VAS ranging from 0 (“no pain”) to 10 (“extremely intense pain”). Participants were instructed to anchor the scale to previous experiences of EIP (4). The device recorded the reported pain value every 5 s, providing measures of pain for each individual contraction. In addition, onset pain intensity (VAS onset), maximal pain intensity (VAS peak), time to maximal intensity (VAS time to peak; from the commencement of sampling), mean pain intensity (VAS mean) and duration of pain (VAS duration; from VAS onset until the state of “no pain”) were also calculated using data from the electronic VAS.

After the second No Feedback Trial, when pain had subsided, Total Pain Rating Index and Subclass Rating Index was calculated using a 78 item MPQ (29), with overall quality of pain described by descriptors (sensory, affective, evaluative and miscellaneous) chosen by more than one-third of participants. Upon the completion of each trial, participants provided a RPE, defined as the effort to drive the limb (32), of both target torques using the 15-point Borg (6-20) scale (6).

Physiological measurements

Heart rate (HR) was recorded upon the completion of each individual contraction, and muscle electrical activity was continuously recorded using surface electromyography (sEMG). sEMG was attained through square surface electrodes (Ag/AgCl, 32 × 32 mm; Nessler Medizintechnik, Innsbruck, Austria) mounted in a bipolar set-up, and placed on the muscle

belly of the VL, vastus medialis (VM) and rectus femoris (RF). For each muscle a reference electrode was placed on the patella. Prior to application of the electrodes, the skin was shaven and cleansed with an alcohol swab. The electrical signal was sampled at 1000 Hz (Biopac MP150, Biopac Systems Inc., California, USA).

Data analysis

The sEMG and torque data (for analysis of torque output complexity) were analysed using custom code written in MATLAB 2018a (The MathWorks, Massachusetts, USA).

Torque and error

Torque was recorded through Spike2 software (Cambridge Electronics Design (CED), Cambridge, UK). For each 6 s contraction, the torque produced over the last 4 s was averaged. The average of the actual torque produced for each 15% and 20% target was used to define the error in participant torque reproduction. Error was defined as the unidirectional difference between the required target torque and the actual torque produced, and expressed as a percentage of MVIT (i.e. actual torque of 17.5% MVIT for the 15% MVIT target would be equal to an error of 2.5% MVIT). All values of error are presented as positive integers regardless of whether the participant over- or undershot the target torque. The pain on the VAS reported for the corresponding contractions were also averaged for the two attempts at each target torque to provide a mean VAS value for each target torque.

Surface electromyography (sEMG)

To create a linear envelope representation of the data, rectified absolute values of the raw sEMG signals were two-pass zero-lag filtered using a fourth-order low-pass Butterworth filter, with a cut-off frequency of 5 Hz. The amplitude for the VL, RF and VM were averaged

over the final 4 s period of each 6 s contraction. These values were normalised to the maximum amplitude of the prior MVICs (% MVIC). For each trial, the sEMG activity was averaged for the two contractions performed at each target torque.

Torque complexity

The complexity and regularity of the torque output was estimated through the use of approximate entropy (ApEn) and sample entropy (SampEn) (37, 43). When applied to physiological time-series data, ApEn is an index that quantifies the predictability or probability of the subsequent values based on prior values, whilst SampEn provides the same output but excludes self-matches (37, 43). Both ApEn and SampEn are defined by a value between 0 ('high regularity, low complexity') and 2 ('low regularity, high complexity'). A detailed guide to the algorithms for the calculation of ApEn are evidenced in the appendix of Slifkin and Newell (48), whilst SampEn was calculated using the parameters outlined by Pethick and colleagues (34).

Statistical analysis

To compare reproduction error between the Control and Experimental conditions at the three time-points (Baseline, Pain/No Pain, and Recovery), a Levene's test was used to determine equality of variance for each normalised target torque (15% and 20% MVIT). Changes in HR, RPE, sEMG activity and complexity were evaluated using two-way Analysis of variance (ANOVA) with treatment factor with two fixed levels (Control, Experimental) and a repeated measures Time factor with two time-points (Baseline, Pain/No Pain). A two-way ANOVA with a treatment factor with two fixed levels (No Feedback, Feedback) and a repeated measures Time factor with two time-points (Baseline, Pain/No Pain) was also implemented to evaluate changes in complexity. When an interaction effect was observed, follow-up paired

samples t-tests were used to assess differences between conditions. Paired samples t-tests were also implemented to evaluate the differences between conditions for pain expectation and confidence, VAS scores, pre-test PANAS, and the change in torque produced in Baseline compared to the Pain/No Pain time-point. A Pearson Bivariate correlation was used to evaluate the correlation between torque error and VAS score reported during the Pain/No Pain contractions. Cohen's guidelines of 0.1 (small), 0.3 (medium) and greater than or equal to 0.5 (large) were used to indicate the strength of correlation.

All data was checked for the standard assumptions associated with the performance of the above statistical tests prior to analysis. Data that did not satisfy the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality ($P < 0.05$) were logarithmically transformed. Results are presented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation (SD). Cohen's d and partial eta square (η_p^2) values are reported as measures of effect size. Statistical significance was accepted at an alpha level of $P < 0.05$. All statistical analysis were completed using SPSS Statistics v25.0 (SPSS, IBM, New York, USA).

RESULTS

Experimental muscle pain

As shown in Table 1, paired samples t-tests revealed a significant difference in VAS pain data between the Control and Experimental conditions. The pain experienced in Experimental was significantly greater in terms of the onset VAS pain reported, with a significantly longer time to peak, yet greater peak VAS pain compared to Control. The reported VAS pain in Experimental was also longer in duration, inducing a significantly greater mean VAS pain, equivalent to a "moderate" to "somewhat strong" muscle pain, and therefore producing a greater overall VAS pain area than Control.

The pain experienced in Experimental was predominantly described in the sensory and evaluative dimensions of pain as “aching” (50% of participants), “throbbing” (43% of participants), “shooting” (36% of participants), “cramping” (36% of participants), “annoying” (36% of participants). This produced a mean Total Pain Index of 14 ± 8 , with an overall Present Pain Intensity of 2.1 ± 0.7 (“discomforting”).

During the Pain/No Pain trial, a paired samples t-test revealed no significant difference ($t_{13} = -0.9$, $P = 0.366$, $CI_{95} -0.9, 0.3$, $d = 0.1$) in mean VAS between contractions performed at 15% MVIT (4.2 ± 1.9) and 20% MVIT (4.5 ± 2.2) in the Experimental condition. Each of the two target torques in the Pain/No Pain trial was therefore completed at a similar intensity of pain (Fig 2b. and Fig 3b.).

Table 1. Summary VAS pain data across the entire duration of the Control and Experimental conditions

	Control	Experimental	<i>P</i>
VAS mean	0.8 ± 1.0	$3.1 \pm 1.0^{**}$	<0.001
VAS peak	1.6 ± 2.2	$5.7 \pm 1.7^{**}$	<0.001
VAS onset	0.5 ± 0.8	$1.7 \pm 1.3^*$	0.012
VAS time to peak (s)	41 ± 29	$71 \pm 24^*$	0.020
VAS duration (s)	55 ± 56	$233 \pm 60^{**}$	<0.001
VAS area	86.3 ± 115.4	$759.8 \pm 325.6^{**}$	<0.001

Values are means $\pm$ SD. ******Significant difference between Control and Experimental ($P < 0.001$). *****Significant difference between Control and Experimental ($P < 0.05$). VAS scale 0 (no pain) to 10 (extremely intense pain)

355

356

357 **Fig 2.** Individual (*open symbol*) and group mean (*filled symbol*) perceptual differences
 358 between conditions (Control and Experimental) at Baseline, Pain/No Pain and Recovery
 359 time-points at a target torque of 15% MVIT. Differences in pain intensity after injection of
 360 isotonic saline (Control, *a*) and hypertonic saline (Experimental, *b*). Differences in RPE in
 361 Control (*c*) and Experimental (*d*) conditions. *Significantly greater where hypertonic saline
 362 was injected.

363

364

365

366

367

368

370

371 **Fig 3.** Individual (*open symbol*) and group mean (*filled symbol*) perceptual differences
 372 between conditions (Control and Experimental) at Baseline, Pain/No Pain and Recovery
 373 time-points at a target torque of 20% MVIT. Differences in pain intensity after injection of
 374 isotonic saline (Control, *a*) and hypertonic saline (Experimental, *b*). Differences in RPE in
 375 Control (*c*) and Experimental (*d*) conditions. *Significantly greater where hypertonic saline
 376 was injected

377

378

379 Paired samples *t* tests revealed no significant difference ($t_{13}=-1.8$, $P=0.096$, $CI_{95} -2.08, 0.19$,
 380 $d=0.5$) in expectations of pain between the Control (4.5 ± 2.1) and Experimental (5.4 ± 1.8)
 381 conditions, with no significant differences in the confidence to cope with the expected pain

($t_{13}=0.2$, $P=0.818$, CI_{95} -0.29, 0.37, $d=0.1$) between Control (9.5 ± 1.0) and Experimental (9.4 ± 1.0).

Comparisons of torque production accuracy

In the presence of greater levels of pain, participants demonstrated an increased variability in their ability to reproduce target torque without visual feedback. However, once the pain had subsided, participants were able to produce the target torque with the same accuracy as Baseline. This is demonstrated by the Levene test for equality of variance, which revealed a significant difference in the variance of mean contraction torque in the Pain/No Pain trial between the Experimental and Control conditions at both 15% MVIT ($F_{1,26}=4.3$, $P=0.049$, $d=0.6$) and 20% MVIT ($F_{1,26}=12.0$, $P=0.002$, $d=1.0$), as shown in Figures 4 and 5. There was no correlation between Pain/No Pain error and the pain intensity reported during the contractions (15% MVIT; $r= -0.053$, $P=0.858$, 20% MVIT; $r=0.172$, $P=0.557$). In addition, there was no significant difference in variance between conditions at the Baseline (15% MVIT; $F_{1,26}=0.2$, $P=0.612$, $d=0.1$, 20% MVIT; $F_{1,26}=2.1$, $P=0.161$, $d=0.2$) and Recovery (15% MVIT; $F_{1,26}=1.8$, $P=0.195$, $d=0.2$, 20% MVIT; $F_{1,26}=3.9$, $P=0.058$, $d=0.4$) time-points.

Fig 4. Individual (*open circle*) and group mean (*filled circle*) torque reproduction error at a target torque of 15% MVIT before (Baseline), during (Pain/No Pain) and after (Recovery) injection of isotonic saline (Control, *a*) or hypertonic saline (Experimental, *b*).

Fig 5. Individual (*open circle*) and group mean (*filled circle*) torque reproduction error at a target torque of 20% MVIT before (Baseline), during (Pain/No Pain) and after (Recovery) injection of isotonic saline (Control, *a*) or hypertonic saline (Experimental, *b*).

A paired samples t-test found no significant difference in the change in torque mismatch between Baseline and Pain/No Pain trials at 15% MVIT ($t_{13}=-1.5$, $P=0.169$, $CI_{95} -1.1, 0.2$, $d=0.5$) when comparing the Control (2.5 ± 1.7 %MVIT) and Experimental (4.8 ± 4.8

%MVIT) conditions. Furthermore, the paired samples t-test highlighted no significant difference in the same change in torque mismatch between Control (4.2 ± 3.5 %MVIT) and Experimental (7.4 ± 6.0 %MVIT) when contractions were performed at 20% MVIT ($t_{13}=-1.3$, $P=0.235$, $CI_{95} -1.6, 0.4$, $d=0.4$). This suggests that the target torque absolute error in the ‘Pain/No Pain’ was similar to the error made at Baseline despite the change in pain experienced.

Rating of perceived effort

It was apparent that the effort experienced during the contraction was greater in the presence of increased pain, when performed at 20% MVIT. The 2 x 2 (condition x trial) repeated measures ANOVA demonstrated a significant interaction effect at 20% MVIT for RPE over trials between conditions ($F_{1,13}=6.0$, $P=0.030$, $\eta_p^2=0.314$). Follow-up paired samples t-tests revealed a significantly greater RPE ($t_{13}=-2.3$, $P=0.038$, $CI_{95} -1.31, -0.04$, $d=0.3$) in the Pain/No Pain trial in Experimental compared to Control. A significantly greater ($t_{13}=-2.4$, $P=0.033$, $CI_{95} 0.1, 1.8$, $d=0.4$) RPE was also reported in the Experimental condition at the Pain/No Pain trial compared to the Baseline trial. No significant main effect of condition was observed at either 15 or 20% MVIT ($P>0.05$). A significant effect of trial was reported at 20% MVIT ($F_{1,13}=5.2$, $P=0.041$, $\eta_p^2=0.284$), but not at 15% MVIT ($P>0.05$) (Figs. 2c., 2d., 3c. and 3d.). There was no interaction effect observed at 15% MVIT ($P>0.05$).

Surface electromyography (sEMG)

Due to excessive noise in sEMG signal, two participants were removed from the dataset and analysis was performed on the remaining participants ($n=12$). Despite a greater variance in mean contraction torque in the presence of muscle pain, there were no discernible alterations in activation of the agonist and synergist muscles. At 15 and 20% MVIT, the performance of

a 2 x 2 (condition x trial) repeated measures ANOVA demonstrated no significant main effect of condition or trial in either the VL, VM or RF ($P>0.05$). The VL, VM or RF also demonstrated no significant interaction effect for sEMG activity over trial between conditions at both target torques ($P>0.05$).

Torque complexity

As shown in Table 2, the presence of visual feedback resulted in a more complex (less regular) torque signal (assessed by both ApEn and SampEn) than when torque was being reproduced (No Feedback Trials) ($P<0.001$). No condition ($P>0.05$) and no interaction effect was observed for either ApEn or SampEn ($P>0.05$) at both target torques. At 15 and 20% MVIT, the performance of a 2 x 2 (condition x trial) repeated measures ANOVA demonstrated no significant main effect of condition for either ApEn or SampEn, as well as no significant main effect of trial for either complexity statistic ($P>0.05$). There was no interaction effect observed for either ApEn or SampEn ($P>0.05$) at both target torques.

Heart rate (HR)

The 2 x 2 (condition x trial) repeated measures ANOVA revealed no significant main effect of condition at 15 or 20% MVIT ($P>0.05$). At 15% MVIT there was no significant main effect of trial ($P>0.05$), however there was at 20% MVIT ($F_{1,13}=5.2$, $P=0.041$, $\eta_p^2=0.284$). No significant interaction effect for HR and trial between conditions was observed at 15 or 20% MVIT ($P>0.05$).

Table 2. Torque complexity (ApEn) during Feedback and No Feedback trials at the Baseline and Pain/No Pain time-points

Condition	Time-point	Trial	Target Torque			
			15% MVIT		20% MVIT	
			ApEn	SampEn	ApEn	SampEn
Control	Baseline	Feedback	0.71 ±	0.71 ±	0.57 ±	0.56 ±
			0.25*	0.29*	0.22*	0.27*
		No Feedback	0.35 ±	0.32 ±	0.31 ±	0.29 ±
			0.17 *	0.17*	0.21*	0.22*
	Pain/No Pain	Feedback	0.73 ±	0.72 ±	0.60 ±	0.61 ±
			0.21*	0.24*	0.26*	0.30*
		No Feedback	0.35 ±	0.32 ±	0.28 ±	0.26 ±
			0.21*	0.22*	0.17*	0.17*
Experimental	Baseline	Feedback	0.78 ±	0.79 ±	0.64 ±	0.64 ±
			0.24*	0.30*	0.21*	0.25*
		No Feedback	0.29 ±	0.26 ±	0.27 ±	0.24 ±
			0.13*	0.13*	0.12*	0.12*
	Pain/No Pain	Feedback	0.74 ±	0.75 ±	0.68 ±	0.68 ±
			0.27*	0.31*	0.23*	0.28*
		No Feedback	0.32 ±	0.29 ±	0.22 ±	0.20 ±
			0.19*	0.19*	0.11*	0.10*

Values are means ± SD. * Significant difference between Feedback and No Feedback trial within condition and time-point ($P < 0.001$).

DISCUSSION

The present study demonstrates for the first time that the experience of muscle pain, administered by the intramuscular injection of hypertonic saline into the VL, resulted in a greater variance in the mean contraction torque at both 15 and 20% MVIT when compared to the injection of isotonic saline (a placebo control). The increased variance was paralleled by an elevated experience of pain at both contraction intensities, and a greater perceived effort when performed at 20% MVIT. Once the pain had subsided, accuracy of torque production returned to baseline levels. This study for the first time demonstrates that the presence of muscle pain (that feels like EIP) impedes the ability to accurately reproduce torque in the knee extensors. This important finding provides key experimental evidence for the deleterious implications of EIP on the ability to self-regulate exercise intensity.

Effect of pain on isometric torque reproduction

The purpose of the present study was to establish whether the presence of pain in a muscle with a major contributing role to force generation during both dynamic contractions and whole-body exercise (i.e. the VL) has a debilitating effect on producing a given torque using the ipsilateral knee extensor muscle group. The primary finding from this study is that the mismatch between the actual torque produced and the target torque (when required to reproduce both 15 and 20% MVIT) was significantly more variable with pain, with no discernible direction of error (i.e. participants both under- and overshoot the target torque). Resultantly, this study is the first to demonstrate that the experimental induction of pain in a large locomotor muscle group impairs the judgement of torque during an isometric reproduction task performed at an intensity of relevance to endurance exercise performance.

The compromised ability to accurately reproduce torque during pain is in line with previous research that has implemented the hypertonic saline model in the elbow flexors to investigate the impact of pain on estimation error in a contralateral torque estimation task (40, 41, 57). However, this prior literature has consistently reported that participants specifically *overestimated* the torque that is produced in the painful muscle, and therefore produced less torque than required. In contrast with lack of direction in error reported in the present study, this observed disparity could be due to potential differences in the limb evaluated (e.g. contralateral or ipsilateral). Alternatively, as the knee extensor muscles respond differently to exercise-induced fatigue (55), the muscle group tested (elbow flexor vs. knee extensors) should also be considered.

Proposed mechanisms

The presence of the hypertonic saline solution in addition to the short-duration muscle contraction creates a noxious environment within the skeletal musculature (31), which results in an alteration in activity of both ascending metaboreceptive and nociceptive group III and IV afferent fibers (18). In this noxious environment, there are several neuromuscular mechanisms that, when acting in singularity or in combination, may provide an explanation for the impaired reproduction of torque in the present study.

Convergent projection from group III and IV afferents on common interneurons from group Ib proprioceptive afferents (45) provide information on muscle force (15). As discussed by Salomoni and Graven-Nielsen (44), the large variance in the mean contraction torque in the Experimental condition could be a result of the spatial facilitation between these afferents interfering in the central interpretation of proprioceptive information essential for the accurate control of torque. A discrepancy between the centrally mediated judgement of

524 torque and the actual afferent feedback from the periphery could therefore have resulted in
525 the torque reproduction error.

526

527 In addition, the projection of the group III and IV afferents have inhibitory effects on the
528 central nervous system. The increased afferent feedback from the hypertonic saline may have
529 limited motor cortical excitability, and reduced central motor drive and voluntary activation
530 of the knee extensors (14, 19). In order to compensate for the hypertonic saline-induced
531 impairment of motor cortex excitability, a greater effort is required to drive the limb to meet
532 the required torque (30, 39). As an outcome reflected in the present study, this could provide
533 a possible explanation for some of the differences in actual and perceived torque produced.
534 The findings from Proske and colleagues (40) where the matching of torque through effort
535 resulted in an overshoot of the target torque, are in support of this explanation.

536

537 Despite the observed impairment in torque-reproduction performance during pain, there was
538 no change in the torque complexity of the knee extensors, or the level of muscle activity
539 assessed by sEMG. The absence of alterations in sEMG is comparable with findings from the
540 established literature into the implications of EIP on muscle activity during submaximal
541 isometric contractions, where a lack of marked changes in sEMG signal are also observed
542 (16, 44, 46). Combined, these observations contradict the underpinning theory of the ‘Pain
543 Adaptation Model’ (25) where it is predicted that the presence of pain has a reliable
544 inhibitory influence on agonist muscles, whilst simultaneously activating the antagonists.
545 Instead, the observations of the present study could, with caution, be in-line with the “moving
546 differently in pain” model proposed by Hodges and Tucker (17). This theory postulates that
547 pain initiates a non-uniform effect across the motor neurone pool, causing a redistribution of
548 activity between and within muscles to provide a key adaptive and protective function. Whilst

this alteration has the immediate benefit of minimising the pain experienced and preventing further injury or damage to the area in pain during muscular contraction, this change to a “sub-optimal” movement strategy could have consequences for the efficiency of task performance (17, 53). Detection of these adaptations would however require the use of fine-wire electrodes (52) or high density sEMG, as a combination of changes in order of motor unit activation or synchronisation can occur without alteration in amplitude of gross sEMG (51).

A loss of knee-extensor torque complexity during both prolonged maximal and submaximal contractions has been closely associated with fatigue (34, 35), and is suggested to have a detrimental impact on the performance of motor tasks in the lower limb (10). In the present study, the lack of change in torque complexity suggests that the acute pain from the hypertonic saline was unlikely to have independently caused neuromuscular fatigue. The increased variance in mean contraction torque is therefore unable to be explained by pain-induced mechanisms of fatigue during the short-duration and submaximal isometric contractions.

This finding is consistent with prior literature, where differences in torque complexity are not observed in the first few seconds of isometric muscle contraction despite the presence of pain (from an eccentric contraction muscle damage protocol) and the consequential impaired ability to perform a maximal voluntary contraction (33). As torque complexity progressively decreases over time during submaximal contractions until the point of task failure (34), if the torque reproduction task in the present study was performed over a longer duration, a pain-induced *acceleration* of exercise-induced fatigue (and therefore loss of torque complexity) would likely be observed in addition to the impaired the ability to accurately reproduce

torque. As such the findings of the present study reinforce the notion that acute, moderate muscle pain alone is not necessarily fatiguing, but may accelerate the development of fatigue during prolonged or exhaustive exercise (27, 50), or impair maximal voluntary contraction.

A further point of consideration is that in the absence of visual feedback, and sole reliance on afferent/efferent information and task memory, the ability to accurately reproduce torque depreciates (22) and that this is characteristically coupled with a lower complexity of the torque signal (indicative of a reduced adaptability in force control) (21, 49). This observation is replicated in the present study, and it is noteworthy that the values for ApEn and SampEn in the No Feedback conditions are similar to those shown at task failure in exhaustive exercise (34). Therefore, it is possible that the induction of muscle pain in the present study was not able to reduce the complexity of the torque signal beyond that already caused by the removal of visual feedback.

Alternatively, the compromised ability to accurately reproduce torque (despite no change in loss of torque complexity) could be due to the experience of pain preventing some attentional focus on the task (23), making the task more challenging. It is plausible that the elevated intensity of pain (induced by the injection of hypertonic saline), which was rated as “moderate” to “somewhat strong” in both target torques, provided a stimulus which was perceived as threatening. With some attentional resources focused on coping with the ‘threat’ of the noxious stimuli, attention may have been directed away from the task, which could have resulted in a compromised accuracy of torque reproduction (11); a notion supported by evidence from previous experimental work (5, 26). However, in the current study, there was no relationship between pain intensity and error, which indicates that the sensation of pain alone was unlikely to have had a direct influence on task performance.

599

600 Overall, it is evident that the presence of pain interferes with proprioception during
601 submaximal isometric contractions in the lower-limb. The design and findings of the present
602 study therefore provide a key indication of the potential mechanism underpinning the
603 detrimental effect of EIP on exercise intensity regulation and endurance performance. Some
604 caution should however be taken when extrapolating these findings to whole-body exercise.
605 In order to improve task relevance to whole-body locomotor exercise and further apply the
606 findings of the present study, there is the need for the impact of this experimental model to be
607 evaluated during isokinetic or dynamic muscular contractions performed at a varying or
608 higher work rate.

609

610 *Methodological considerations*

611 Whilst there is inconsistent evidence for sex-related differences in the pain intensity response
612 to the hypertonic saline model (20, 42), the fluctuations in hormone concentration across the
613 different menstrual cycle phases may cause differences in pain perception to experimental
614 pain (47). It is acknowledged that the present study did not account for menstrual cycle
615 phases of the female participant, and this is a limitation. It is also important to note that the
616 short-duration and submaximal isometric contractions used in the current study were not
617 fatiguing, and this limits the ability to examine the notion that pain accelerates the
618 development of exercise-induced fatigue in addition to the impairment in accurate torque
619 reproduction. To explore this in combination, future investigations should attempt to employ
620 a similar study design examining torque reproduction ability in the presence of muscle pain
621 during contractions performed at a greater exercise intensity, or over a longer duration.

622

623 *Conclusion*

In conclusion, the injection of hypertonic saline into the VL during a torque reproduction task created muscle pain that resulted in an impaired ability to accurately produce a given submaximal target torque during a short, submaximal isometric contractions. The presence of pain was linked with a greater effort to drive the limb and meet the given target torque when attempting to contract at 20% MVIT, but not at 15% MVIT. The compromised ability to reproduce torque returned to baseline levels once pain had subsided. These findings have implications for the impact of EIP on self-selected work rate regulation during endurance exercise performance.

REFERENCES

1. Adamo DE, Scotland S, Martin BJ. Asymmetry in grasp force matching and sense of effort. *Exp Brain Res* 217: 273–285, 2012. doi: 10.1007/s00221-011-2991-6.
2. Amann M, Blain GM, Proctor LT, Sebranek JJ, Pegelow DF, Dempsey JA. Implications of group III and IV muscle afferents for high-intensity endurance exercise performance in humans. *J Physiol* 589: 5299–5309, 2011. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2011.213769.
3. Amann M, Proctor LT, Sebranek JJ, Pegelow DF, Dempsey JA. Opioid-mediated muscle afferents inhibit central motor drive and limit peripheral muscle fatigue development in humans. *J Physiol* 587: 271–283, 2009. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2008.163303.
4. Astokorki AHY, Mauger AR. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation reduces exercise-induced perceived pain and improves endurance exercise performance. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 117: 483–492, 2017. doi: 10.1007/s00421-016-3532-6.
5. Bennell K, Wee E, Crossley K, Stillman B, Hodges P. Effects of experimentally-induced anterior knee pain on knee joint position sense in healthy individuals. *J Orthop Res* 23: 46–53, 2005. doi: 10.1016/j.orthres.2004.06.008.
6. Borg GA. Borg's Perceived Exertion and Pain Scales. Champaign, IL, Human Kinetics, 1998
7. Carson RG, Riek S, Shahbazzpour N. Central and peripheral mediation of human force sensation following eccentric or concentric contractions. *J Physiol* 539: 913–925,

2002. doi: 10.1013/jphysiol.2001.013385.

8. Cook DB, O'Connor PJ, Eubanks SA, Smith JC, Lee M. Naturally occurring muscle pain during exercise: assessment and experimental evidence. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 29: 999–1012, 1997. doi: 10.1097/00005768-199708000-00004.
9. Cook DB, O'Connor PJ, Oliver SE, Lee Y. Sex differences in naturally occurring leg muscle pain and exertion during maximal cycle ergometry. *Int J Neurosci* 95: 183–202, 1998. doi: 10.3109/00207459809003340.
10. Cortes N, Onate J, Morrison S. Differential effects of fatigue on movement variability. *Gait Posture* 39: 888–893, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.11.020.
11. Eccleston C, Crombez G. Pain demands attention: A cognitive-affective model of the interruptive function of pain. *Psychol Bull* 125: 356–366, 1999. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.125.3.356.
12. Edwards AM, Polman RCJ. Pacing and awareness: Brain regulation of physical activity. *Sport Med* 43: 1057–1064, 2013. doi: 10.1007/s40279-013-0091-4.
13. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang A-G, Buchner A. G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav Res Methods* 39: 175–191, 2007. doi: 10.3758/BF03193146.
14. Gandevia SC. Spinal and Supraspinal Factors in Human Muscle Fatigue. *Physiol Rev* 81: 1725–1789, 2001. doi: 10.1152/physrev.2001.81.4.1725.
15. Gandevia SC, Burke D. Does the nervous system depend on kinesthetic information to control natural limb movements? *Behav Brain Sci* 15: 614–632, 1992. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X0007254X.
16. Graven-Nielsen T, Svensson P, Arendt-Nielsen L. Effects of experimental muscle pain on muscle activity and co-ordination during static and dynamic motor function. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol - Electromyogr Mot Control* 105: 156–164,

- 699 1997. doi: 10.1016/S0924-980X(96)96554-6.
- 700 17. Hodges PW, Tucker K. Moving differently in pain: A new theory to explain the
701 adaptation to pain. *Pain* 152: S90–S98, 2011. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2010.10.020.
- 702 18. Laursen RJ, Graven-Nielsen T, Jensen TS, Arendt-Nielsen L. The effect of differential
703 and complete nerve block on experimental muscle pain in humans. *Muscle and Nerve*
704 22: 1564–1570, 1999.
- 705 19. Le Pera D, Graven-Nielsen T, Valeriani M, Oliviero A, Di Lazzaro V, Tonali PA,
706 Arendt-Nielsen L. Inhibition of motor system excitability at cortical and spinal level
707 by tonic muscle pain. *Clin Neurophysiol* 112: 1633–1641, 2001. doi: 10.1016/S1388-
708 2457(01)00631-9.
- 709 20. Lei J, You HJ. Variation of pain and vasomotor responses evoked by intramuscular
710 infusion of hypertonic saline in human subjects: Influence of gender and its potential
711 neural mechanisms. *Brain Res Bull* 87: 564–570, 2012. doi:
712 10.1016/j.brainresbull.2011.11.003.
- 713 21. Li K, Marquardt TL, Li ZM. Removal of visual feedback lowers structural variability
714 of inter-digit force coordination during sustained precision pinch. *Neurosci Lett* 545:
715 1–5, 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2013.04.011.
- 716 22. Limonta E, Rampichini S, Cè E, Esposito F. Effects of visual feedback absence on
717 force control during isometric contraction. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 115: 507–519, 2015.
718 doi: 10.1007/s00421-014-3036-1.
- 719 23. Linton SJ, Shaw WS. Impact of Psychological Factors in the Experience of Pain. *Phys*
720 *Ther* 91: 700–711, 2011. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20100330.
- 721 24. Löllgen H, Graham T, Sjogaard G. Muscle metabolites, force, and perceived exertion
722 bicycling at varying pedal rates. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 12: 345–351, 1980. doi:
723 10.1249/00005768-198025000-00008.

25. Lund JP, Donga R, Widmer CG, Stohler CS. The pain-adaptation model: a discussion of the relationship between chronic musculoskeletal pain and motor activity. *Can J Physiol Pharmacol* 69: 683–694, 1991.
26. Matre D, Arendt-Neilsen L, Knardahl S. Effects of localization and intensity of experimental muscle pain on ankle joint proprioception. *Eur J Pain* 6: 245–260, 2002. doi: 10.1053/eujp.2002.0332.
27. Mauger AR. Factors affecting the regulation of pacing: current perspectives. *Open Access J Sport Med* 5: 209–214, 2014. doi: 10.2147/OAJSM.S38599.
28. Mauger AR, Jones AM, Williams CA. Influence of acetaminophen on performance during time trial cycling. *J Appl Physiol* 108: 98–104, 2010. doi: 10.1152/jappphysiol.00761.2009.
29. Melzack R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: Major properties and scoring methods. *Pain* 1: 277–299, 1975. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(75)90044-5.
30. Mulder T, Zijlstra W, Geurts A. Assessment of motor recovery and decline. *Gait Posture* 16: 198–210, 2002. doi: 10.1016/S0966-6362(01)00157-6.
31. O'Connor PJ, Cook DB. Exercise and Pain: The Neurobiology, Measurement, and Laboratory Study of Pain in Relation to Exercise in Humans [Online]. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 27: 119–166, 1999. https://journals.lww.com/acsm-essr/Citation/1999/00270/5_Exercise_and_Pain__The_Neurobiology,.7.aspx.
32. Pageaux B, Angius L, Hopker JG, Lepers R, Marcora SM. Central alterations of neuromuscular function and feedback from group III-IV muscle afferents following exhaustive high-intensity one-leg dynamic exercise. *Am J Physiol Integr Comp Physiol* 308: R1008–R1020, 2015. doi: 10.1152/ajpregu.00280.2014.
33. Pethick J, Whiteaway K, Winter SL, Burnley M. Prolonged depression of knee-extensor torque complexity following eccentric exercise. *Exp Physiol* 104: 100–111,

2019. doi: 10.1113/EP087295.

34. Pethick J, Winter SL, Burnley M. Fatigue reduces the complexity of knee extensor torque fluctuations during maximal and submaximal intermittent isometric contractions in man. *J Physiol* 593: 2085–2096, 2015. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2015.284380.
35. Pethick J, Winter SL, Burnley M. Fatigue reduces the complexity of knee extensor torque during fatiguing sustained isometric contractions. *Eur J Sport Sci* 19: 1349–1358, 2019. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2019.1599450.
36. Philippou A, Bogdanis GC, Maridaki M. Neuromuscular dysfunction with the experimental arm acting as its own reference following eccentric and isometric exercise. *Somatosens Mot Res* 27: 45–54, 2010. doi: 10.3109/08990220.2010.483204.
37. Pincus SM. Approximate entropy as a measure of system complexity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 88: 2297–2301, 1991. doi: 10.1073/pnas.88.6.2297.
38. Pollak KA, Swenson JD, Vanhaitsma TA, Huguen RW, Jo D, Light KC, Schweinhardt P, Amann M, Light AR. Exogenously applied muscle metabolites synergistically evoke sensations of muscle fatigue and pain in human subjects. *Exp Physiol* 99: 368–380, 2014. doi: 10.1113/expphysiol.2013.075812.
39. Proske U, Gandevia SC. The Proprioceptive Senses: Their Roles in Signaling Body Shape, Body Position and Movement, and Muscle Force. *Physiol Rev* 92: 1651–1697, 2012. doi: 10.1152/physrev.00048.2011.
40. Proske U, Gregory JE, Morgan DL, Percival P, Weerakkody NS, Canny BJ. Force matching errors following eccentric exercise. *Hum Mov Sci* 23: 365–378, 2004. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2004.08.012.
41. Proske U, Weerakkody NS, Percival P, Morgan DL, Gregory JE, Canny BJ. Force-matching errors after eccentric exercise attributed to muscle soreness. *Clin Exp*

- 774 Pharmacol Physiol 30: 576–579, 2003. doi: 10.1046/j.1440-1681.2003.03880.x.
- 775 42. Racine M, Tousignant-Laflamme Y, Kloda LA, Dion D, Dupuis G, Choinire M. A
 776 systematic literature review of 10 years of research on sex/gender and pain perception
 777 - Part 2: Do biopsychosocial factors alter pain sensitivity differently in women and
 778 men? Pain 153: 619–635, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2011.11.026.
- 779 43. Richman JS, Moorman JR. Physiological time-series analysis using approximate
 780 entropy and sample entropy. Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol 278: H2039-49, 2000.
 781 doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.2000.278.6.H2039.
- 782 44. Salomoni SE, Graven-Nielsen T. Experimental muscle pain increases normalized
 783 variability of multidirectional forces during isometric contractions. Eur J Appl Physiol
 784 112: 3607–3617, 2012. doi: 10.1007/s00421-012-2343-7.
- 785 45. Schomburg ED, Steffens H, Kniffki KD. Contribution of group III and IV muscle
 786 afferents to multisensorial spinal motor control in cats. Neurosci Res 33: 195–206,
 787 1999. doi: 10.1016/S0168-0102(99)00006-1.
- 788 46. Schulte E, Ciubotariu A, Arendt-Nielsen L, Disselhorst-Klug C, Rau G, Graven-
 789 Nielsen T. Experimental muscle pain increases trapezius muscle activity during
 790 sustained isometric contractions of arm muscles. Clin Neurophysiol 115: 1767–1778,
 791 2004. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2004.03.005.
- 792 47. Sherman JJ, LeResche L. Does experimental pain response vary across the menstrual
 793 cycle? A methodological review. Am J Physiol Integr Comp Physiol 291: R245–R256,
 794 2006. doi: 10.1152/ajpregu.00920.2005.
- 795 48. Slifkin AB, Newell KM. Noise, information transmission, and force variability. J Exp
 796 Psychol Hum Percept Perform 25: 837–851, 1999. doi: 10.1037/0096-1523.25.3.837.
- 797 49. Slifkin AB, Vaillancourt DE, Newell KM. Intermittency in the control of continuous
 798 force production. J Neurophysiol 84: 1708–18, 2000. doi: 10.1152/jn.2000.84.4.1708.

50. Smith SA, Micklewright D, Winter SL, Mauger AR. Muscle pain induced by hypertonic saline in the knee extensors decreases single-limb isometric time to task failure. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 120: 2047–2058, 2020. doi: 10.1007/s00421-020-04425-2.
51. Tucker K, Butler J, Graven-Nielsen T, Riek S, Hodges P. Motor Unit Recruitment Strategies Are Altered during Deep-Tissue Pain. *J Neurosci* 29: 10820–10826, 2009. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5211-08.2009.
52. Tucker KJ, Hodges PW. Motoneurone recruitment is altered with pain induced in non-muscular tissue. *Pain* 141: 151–155, 2009. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2008.10.029.
53. Tucker KJ, Hodges PW. Changes in motor unit recruitment strategy during pain alters force direction. *Eur J Pain* 14: 932–938, 2010. doi: 10.1016/j.ejpain.2010.03.006.
54. Tucker R. The anticipatory regulation of performance: The physiological basis for pacing strategies and the development of a perception-based model for exercise performance. *Br J Sports Med* 43: 392–400, 2009. doi: 10.1136/bjsm.2008.050799.
55. Vernillo G, Temesi J, Martin M, Millet GY. Mechanisms of fatigue and recovery in upper versus lower limbs in men. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 50: 334–343, 2018. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000001445.
56. Watson D, Clark LA, Tellegen A. Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 54: 1063–1070, 1988. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063.
57. Weerakkody NS, Percival P, Canny BJ, Morgan DL, Proske U. Force matching at the elbow joint is disturbed by muscle soreness. *Somatosens Mot Res* 20: 27–32, 2003. doi: 10.1080/0899022031000083816.

824 **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

825 *Acknowledgements*

826 Thank you to Shane Massey for his dedication and assistance with data collection.

827

828 *Disclosures*

829 *Conflict of interest*

830 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

831

832 *Funding*

833 No funding sources were provided for the present study. This research project did not receive
834 any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

835

836