# Deep brain stimulation of the anterior cingulate cortex: targeting the affective component of chronic pain

Sandra G.J. Boccard<sup>a</sup>, Erlick A.C. Pereira<sup>a</sup>, Liz Moir<sup>a</sup>, Tim J. Van Hartevelt<sup>b</sup>, Morten L. Kringelbach<sup>b</sup>, James J. FitzGerald<sup>a</sup>, Ian W. Baker<sup>c</sup>, Alexander L. Green<sup>a</sup> and Tipu Z. Aziz<sup>a</sup>

Deep brain stimulation (DBS) has shown promise for relieving nociceptive and neuropathic symptoms of refractory chronic pain. We assessed the efficacy of a new target for the affective component of pain, the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC). A 49-year-old man with neuropathic pain underwent bilateral ACC DBS. Patientreported outcome measures were collected before and 2 years after surgery using a Visual Analogue Scale, Short-Form 36 quality of life survey, McGill pain questionnaire, EuroQoI-5D questionnaires (EQ-5D: Health State) and neuropsychological assessments. The patient improved with DBS. Two years after surgery, the Visual Analogue Scale decreased from 6.7 to 3.0, McGill pain guestionnaire improved by 42% and EQ-5D Health State increased by 150%. Stimulating the ACC at 130 Hz, 330 µs and 3 V facilitated neuropathic pain relief. The DBS remained efficacious during the 2-year follow-up period. Affective

# Introduction

Chronic pain poses a huge disease burden, with a prevalence of up to 8% in the general population [1]. Deep brain stimulation (DBS) has provided an alternative for pharmacoresistant neuropathic pain since it was first introduced over 60 years ago [2]. As described in a recent comprehensive case series [3], DBS of periaqueductal gray area (PAG) and of the sensory thalamus (VP) has been utilized with various degrees of success for diverse types of pain.

Pain is an integrated experience with sensory, affective and cognitive dimensions [4]. Some patients may benefit from targeting limbic structures implicated in modulating the affective component – the suffering – mainly responsible for the pain-related disability. The anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) is one of these structures [5] and it is involved in pain expectation [6]. Its neurosurgical destruction has been performed to relieve intractable pain, in particular cancer pain [7,8].

Here, we report the first case of long-term bilateral ACC DBS to relieve the affective component of chronic neuropathic pain.

# Patient and methods Medical history

A 49-year-old man presented with a 20-year history of chronic pain traceable to several motorcycle accidents

ACC DBS can relieve chronic neuropathic pain refractory to pharmacotherapy and restore quality of life. *NeuroReport* 25:83-88 © 2014 Wolters Kluwer Health | Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

NeuroReport 2014, 25:83-88

Keywords: affective component, anterior cingulate cortex, deep brain stimulation, pain

<sup>a</sup>Oxford Functional Neurosurgery and Experimental Neurology Group, Nuffield Departments of Clinical Neuroscience and Surgery, <sup>b</sup>Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford and <sup>c</sup>Russell Cairn Unit, West Wing, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK

Correspondence to Sandra G.J. Boccard, PhD, Oxford Functional Neurosurgery, Level 6, West Wing, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford OX3 9DU, UK Tel: +44 1865 231845; fax: +44 1865 231885; e-mail: sandra.boccard@ndcn.ox.ac.uk

Received 27 August 2013 accepted 30 August 2013

beginning 10 years earlier. His injuries led to a brachial plexus injury of the right arm. He underwent reconstructive surgery and a few years later, an anterior cervical decompression. Subsequently, he developed a cervical myelopathy that was treated by a laminoplasty with fusion. Later, he started to feel pain in his legs and feet. The pain was unrelieved by dihydrocodeine and high-dose gabapentin. He then underwent a lumbar laminectomy that improved his pain and mobility. The patient progressively developed an almost whole-body pain, predominantly severe burning, itching joint pain and pain that felt like a 'vice' in his groin. Pain was all along his spine, legs and feet, with a Visual Analogue Scale score for pain (VAS) of 10/10 most of the time. He was referred to a pain relief unit, where many drugs and transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation were tested, without success. He became depressed and suicidal. He was then offered DBS of the ACC for the affective component of his pain.

Preoperative neuropsychological results confirmed predominantly average cognitive and memory functioning, with nonverbal intelligence quotient falling in the middle of the average range. Cognitive processing speed was impaired (Symbol Digit Modality Test first centile, written and oral). Normal performance was evident on tests of verbal memory, visuospatial function and on tests of executive function, apart from the Stroop Task, where performance was very poor (first centile).

0959-4965 ⓒ 2014 Wolters Kluwer Health | Lippincott Williams & Wilkins

DOI: 10.1097/WNR.000000000000039

#### Deep brain stimulation procedure

Before surgery, the patient underwent a T2-weighted MRI scan with 1 mm slice thickness parallel to the AC-PC line for surgical planning. A Cosman-Roberts-Wells base Ring (Radionics Inc., Burlington, Massachusetts, USA) was applied to the patient's head under local anaesthesia. With the localizer frame attached to the base ring, a computed tomography scan with 1 mm slice thickness was performed and volumetrically fused with the MRI using the Neuroinspire planning system (Renishaw Inc., Bristol, UK). This system was then used to calculate target coordinates and define the lead trajectory. The ACC target used was 20 mm posterior to the anterior tip of the frontal horns of the lateral ventricles (Fig. 1). The trajectory was chosen to position the contacts mostly in white matter, the cingulum bundle, with the deepest contact in the corpus callosum.

For each lead, a 2.5 mm skull perforation was made using a twist drill. A TM probe was passed to create a tract and then removed and replaced with a Medtronic model 3387 depth lead (Medtronic Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA). This lead is 1.27 mm in diameter and has four platinum–iridium contacts near its end, each occupy-ing 1.5 mm of the lead length and spaced from the next by 1.5 mm. A postoperative computed tomography scan fused to the preoperative MRI confirmed electrode position. Leads were externalized by temporary extensions.

Before implantation of the generator, an evaluation of the effect of stimulation was performed with the following settings: 3 V, 130 Hz and  $330 \,\mu\text{s}$ . The deepest contact was used as the cathode and the most superficial one was the anode.

# Pain and neuropsychological assessments

Pain and health-related quality-of-life measures were assessed before surgery and during follow-up. The VAS and the McGill pain questionnaire (MPQ) were used [9]. The VAS extends from 'no pain' (0) to 'the worst pain you can imagine' (10) and the MPQ provides additional qualitative information in domains of 'sensory', 'affective', 'evaluative,' and 'miscellaneous' pain severity.

The patient also completed Short-Form 36 (SF-36) and Euroqol 5 domain (EQ-5D) quality-of-life questionnaires alongside the pain questionnaires. SF-36 responses were regrouped into eight domains of Physical Functioning, Role – Physical, Bodily Pain, General Health, Vitality, Social Functioning, Role – Emotional and Mental Health. Results were scored using online tools [10]. Norm-based scores allowed comparison between studies. The SF-36 scale ranged from a score of 0, an extreme of dysfunction or symptom severity, to 100, optimal function. The health state of patients was evaluated by EQ-5D. Its two sections evaluate first the health state in five dimensions (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain and anxiety) and second on a 'health' VAS, with 0 being the worst state they can imagine and 100 the best. EQ-5D scores were calculated as detailed elsewhere [11].

The neuropsychological assessment protocol is administered routinely to pain patients undergoing DBS in Oxford and includes a semistructured interview. The protocol also includes the following tests: Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices; categorical verbal fluency; phonetic verbal fluency; articulation rate; story recall from the Adult Memory and Information Processing Battery; word and face recognition tests from the Camden Recognition Memory Test; Repeatable Episodic Memory Test; Medical College of Georgia Complex

Fig. 1



Coronal view of bilateral electrodes in the anterior cingulate cortex.

#### Table 1 Pain score for each assessment at consecutive follow-up times

		McGill Pain Questionnaire				SF-36-norm-based scale scores						EQ-5D					
	VAS	Sensory	Affective	Evaluative	Miscellaneous	Total	PF	RP	BP	GH	VT	SF	RE	МН	Total	EQ-5D	Health state
Pre-Op	6.7	28	1	4	10	43	15.2	28.0	29.3	27.5	49.1	19.1	23.7	50.4	242.3	5.0	20
1 year	4.0	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2 years	3.0	25	0	0	0	25	15.2	28.0	33.2	19.5	51.4	19.1	23.7	57.3	247.4	5.0	50

BP, Bodily Pain; EQ-5D, EuroQol-5D Questionnaire; GH, General Health; MH, Mental Health; PF, Physical Functioning; Pre-op, presurgery; RE, Role – Emotional; RP, Role – Physical; SF-36, Short-Form 36-Question quality-of-life survey; SF, Social Functioning; VAS, Visual Analogue Scale for pain; VT, Vitality.

#### Table 2 Frontal system behaviour scale from the patient's and his wife's perspective

Frontal system behaviour scale

	Wife		Patient	
	Pre-Op	1 year	Pre-Op	1 year
1. Speaks only when spoken to	1	1	1	1
2. Angered or irritated	3	2	1	2
3. Repeat actions or get stuck	3	4	1	3
4. Impulsivity	2	1	1	2
5. Get confused when doing several things in a row	3	4	1	3
6. Laughs or cries easily	2	4	1	1
7. Makes the same mistakes again and again	4	5	1	2
8. Lack of initiative, motivation	2	3	1	3
9. Too flirtatious	1		1	1
10. Does or says embarrassing things	3	4	1	1
11. Neglects intimate hygiene	2	3	1	1
12. Hyperactive	2	3	1	1
13. Unaware having problems/denies them	4	4	1	2
14. Sits around doing nothing	2	5	1	2
15. Disorganized	5	5	1	3
16. Loses control of urine or bowels and seems unconcerned	1	1	1	1
17. Cannot do two things at once	2	4	1	2
18. Talks out of turn	5	5	1	1
19. Shows poor judgment	3	3	1	1
20. Makes up fantastic stories when can't remember something	1	1	1	1
21. Lost interest in things that used to be important/fun to him	1	5	1	2
22. Says one thing and then does another	3	5	1	2
23. Starts things but fails to finish them	3	5	1	3
24. Shows little emotion, unconcerned or unresponsive	3	3	1	1
25. Forgets to do things but then remembers when prompted	3	5	1	4
26. Inflexible, unable to change routines	2	5	4	3
27. Gets in trouble with law or authorities	1	1		
28. Does risky things just for the heck of it	3	1	3	1
29. Slow moving, lacks energy, inactive	1	5	1	4
30. Oversilly, childish sense of humour	3	5	1	2
31. Complains that food has no smell or taste	2	1	1	1
32. Swears	5	5	2	2
33. Apologizes for misbehaviour	1	1	1	1
34. Pays attention	1	1	1	3
35. Thinks things through before acting	3	4	1	2
36. Uses strategies to remember important things	1	1	1	2
37. Is able to plan ahead	1	1	1	3
38. Is interested in sex	5	3	4	3
39. Cares about his appearance	3	4	4	2
40. Benefits from feed-back	1	1	5	2
41. Gets involved with activities spontaneously	4	2	3	1
42. Does things without being requested to do so	3	3	4	2
43. Sensitive to the needs of other people	3	3	4	4
44. Gets along well with others	4	5	5	5
45. Acts appropriately for his age	3	3	3	3
46. Starts conversation spontaneously	3	5	4	4

Each item is rated on a five-point likert scale (minimum score=1 and maximum score=5). Pre-op, presurgery.

Figures; the Stroop Colour-Word Test; the Judgement of Line Orientation Test; digit span from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; the Symbol Digit Modalities Test; Intra/Extra-Dimensional Set-Shifting Test, Spatial Span and Spatial Working Memory tests from the Cambridge Neuropsychological Automated Battery. Self and carer forms of the Frontal Systems Behaviour Scale (FrSBE) were completed by the patient and his wife.

#### Results

After several days of stimulation, the burning body pain had resolved but the patient complained of extreme tenderness to the soles of his feet. Settings were altered to 2.5 V, 130 Hz and 330  $\mu$ s. Two months after surgery, pain was considerably reduced and the patient's mood had improved considerably. At 4 months of follow-up, pain in the heels was 'warm', not burning anymore. Ten months after surgery, the patient reported himself '300% better', with no burning pain. His mobility and his sleep had also improved. Moreover, medication was no longer needed. However, 1 year after surgery, the pain increased, the patient's feet were 'burning' again and his mobility became problematic. As headaches appeared, the DBS was switched off for a month. The implanted pulse generator was then switched on again with new settings: 4V, 130 Hz and  $450 \mu$ s. The patient felt a 'rushing

MSVT NART     Errors     Nart_e     31     -       Predicted FIQ     Nart_ig     92     -       SPM     AC raw     Spm,raw     25     -0.42     26     -0.02       Predicted VIQ     Nartvig     92     -     -     -       SPM     AC raw     Spm,raw     25     -0.64     34     -0.4       Predicted SPM from NART errors     Pr.spm     40     39.37     -0.62     3.4       Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     1.4       Tools raw     Flu_Lt     16     0.90     26     3.4       FAS raw     FRL     16     0.42     36     -0.4       Speech motor     Mean articulation     Artic     10.70     0.04     10.67     0.0       Age scaled score     Da_ass     8     7     -     -     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5     5				Pre	-op	Two-year follow-up		
NART     Errors     Nart_e     31     -       Predicted FIQ     Nartuig     92     -       Predicted VIQ     Nartuig     92     -       SPM     AC raw     Spm_raw     25     -0.42     26     -0.2       Total raw     Spm_nigt     10     -0.4     39.37     -0.4       Fluency     Animals raw     Predicted FIQ     Spm_igt     10     -0.4       Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     1.4       Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     3.3       Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     3.4       Fluency     Mean articulation     Artic     10.7     0.00     10.67     0.00       Speech motor     Mean articulation     Ds_tor     5     5     5     5       AdliPB     Immediate zeore     Straw     10     10     10     10       Dajt span     Ray score     Straw	MSVT			Passed all t	hree stages			
Predicted IQ     Nat_iq     92     -       SPM     A-C raw     Spm_raw     25     -0.42     26     -0.2       Total raw     Spm_raw     22     -0.64     34     -0.4       Predicted SPM from NART errors     Pr.spm     40     39.37     101     104       Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     1.4       Tools raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     1.4       Tools raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     1.4       Tools raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     1.4       Speech motor     Mean articulation     Artic     1.07     0.42     30.4     0.5       Digit span     Raw     Ds_raw     12     10     0     0.5 <t< td=""><td>NART</td><td>Errors</td><td>Nart_e</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>-</td></t<>	NART	Errors	Nart_e	3	1		-	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Predicted FIQ	Nart_iq	9	2	-		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Predicted VIQ	Nartviq	9	2		-	
Total raw     Spm.tot     32     -0.64     34     -0.4       Predicted SPM from NART errors     Pr.spm     40     39.37     10     104       Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     1.4       Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     3.4       Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_an     22     0.52     26     3.4       Floor     Floor     Floor     Floor     33.94     3	SPM	A-C raw	Spm_raw	25	-0.42	26	- 0.25	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Total raw	Spm_tot	32	-0.64	34	-0.44	
IQSpm.jq101104FluencyAnimals rawFlu_tin160.90263.4Tools rawFlu_tin160.90263.4FAS rawFAS450.4236-0.4Predicited FAS from NART errorsPr_FAS33.9433.9433.94Speech motorMean articulationArtic10.700.0410.670.0Digit spanRawDs_raw12101010Age scaled scoreDs_ass87555BackwardDs_for5551010AMIPBImmediate 2*scoreStry_ir30-0.38300.66Delay zsoreStry_dr360.35270.5% Retantion z*score-0.8101.1110REMTTotal raw correctRemt_ct220.2815-1.0Recognition hits280.79270.42.20.283.50-0.8ComplexCopy rawMeg_cop350.28350.50.280-0.830-0.88ComplexCopy rawMeg_dr17-0.37190.20		Predicted SPM from NART errors	Pr_spm	4	0		39.37	
Fluency     Animals raw     Flu_nam     22     0.52     26     1.4       Tools raw     Flu_th     16     0.90     26     3.4       FAS raw     FAS     45     0.42     36     -0.4       Speech motor     Mean articulation     Artic     10.70     0.04     10.67     0.00       Digit span     Raw     Ds_raw     12     10     0     0       Age scaled score     Ds_ass     8     7     0     0     0       Forward     Ds_for     5		IQ	Spm_iq	10	01		104	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Fluency	Animals raw	Flu_an	22	0.52	26	1.48	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Tools raw	Flu_tl	16	0.90	26	3.40	
Predicted FAS from NART errors $P_{c}FAS$ $33.94$ $33.94$ $33.94$ Speech motorMean articulationArtic $10.70$ $0.04$ $10.67$ $0.07$ Digit spanRaw $D_{s}$ raw $12$ $10$ $00$ Age scaled score $D_{s}$ ass $8$ $7$ Forward $D_{s}$ for $5$ $5$ $5$ Backward $D_{s}$ back $4$ $4$ AMIPBImmediate z-score $Stry_{1}r$ $30$ $-0.38$ $30$ $0.6$ $0elay z$ -score $Stry_{1}r$ $36$ $0.35$ $27$ $0.5$ $\%$ Retention z-score $-0.81$ $0.11$ $0.11$ $0.11$ REMTTotal raw correctRemt_ct $22$ $0.28$ $15$ $-1.0$ Recognition hits $28$ $0.79$ $27$ $0.4$ Recognition false positive $0$ $1.23$ $0$ $1.2$ $\%$ RetainedRemt_pro $64$ $0.30$ $37.50$ $-0.6$ Recognition false positive $0$ $-0.83$ $0$ $-0.83$ $(arral consistency)$ Remt_sco $0$ $-0.83$ $0$ $-0.83$ $Subjective organ$ Remt_sco $0$ $-0.83$ $0$ $-0.83$ $(arral consistency)$ Remt_ro $82$ $0.85$ $0.5$ $Subjective organ$ Remt_sco $0$ $-0.83$ $0$ $-0.83$ $(arral consistency)$ Remt_sco $0$ $-0.83$ $0$ $-0.83$ $(arral consistency)$ Remt_sco $0$ $-0.85$ <t< td=""><td></td><td>FAS raw</td><td>FAS</td><td>45</td><td>0.42</td><td>36</td><td>-0.42</td></t<>		FAS raw	FAS	45	0.42	36	-0.42	
Speech motor     Mean articulation     Artic     10.70     0.04     10.67     0.0       Digit span     Raw     Ds_raw     12     10       Age scaled score     Ds_ass     8     7       Forward     Ds_for     5     5       Backward     Ds_back     4     4       AMIPB     Immediate z-score     Stry_ir     30     -0.38     30     0.66       Delay z-score     Stry_dr     36     0.35     27     0.5       % Retention z-score     -0.81     0     10     -0.11       REMT     Total raw correct     Remt_ct     22     0.28     15     -1.0       Recognition hits     28     0.79     27     0.4       Recognition hits     28     0.82     57     -0.5       Guidel consistency     Remt_rcr     82     0.82     57     -0.5       Subjective organ     Remt_sco     0     -0.83     0     -0.83       Gorp raw     Meg_cop     35     0.5     55		Predicted FAS from NART errors	Pr_FAS	33	.94		33.94	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Speech motor	Mean articulation	Artic	10.70	0.04	10.67	0.02	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Digit span	Raw	Ds_raw	1	2		10	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Age scaled score	Ds_ass	8	3		7	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Forward	Ds_for	Ę	5		5	
AMIPB     Immediate z-score     Stry_ir     30     -0.38     30     0.6       Delay z-score     Stry_dr     36     0.35     27     0.5       % Retention z-score     -0.81     0.11     0.11     0.11       REMT     Total raw correct     Remt_ct     22     0.28     15     -1.0       Delayed recall     4     -0.33     3     -0.7     Recognition hits     28     0.79     27     0.4       Recognition false positive     0     1.23     0     1.2     0     1.2       % Retained     Remt_pr     64     0.30     37.50     -0.6       Recall consistency     Remt_so     0     -0.83     0     -0.8       Figure     Immediate raw     Meg_cop     35     0.28     35     0.5       Figure     Immediate raw     Meg_dr     17     -0.37     19     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Writter raw     Wri		Backward	Ds_back	4	4		4	
Delay z-score     Str_dr     36     0.35     27     0.5       % Retention z-score     -0.81     0.11     0.	AMIPB	Immediate z-score	Stry_ir	30	- 0.38	30	0.67	
% Retention z-score     -0.81     0.11       REMT     Total raw correct     Remt_ct     22     0.28     15     -1.0       Delayed recall     4     -0.33     3     -0.7     0.11       Recognition hits     28     0.79     27     0.4       Recognition false positive     0     1.23     0     1.2       % Retained     Remt_pr     64     0.30     37.50     -0.6       Recall consistency     Remt_so     0     -0.83     0     -0.83       Subjective organ     Remt_so     0     -0.63     0     -0.83       Complex     Copy raw     Meg_cop     35     0.28     35     0.5       Figure     Immediate raw     Meg_dr     17     -0.37     19     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Written raw     Writ_z     -2.12     -3.48     -3.48     -2.11       Z*score     Oral_zr     30     -2.11     -3.		Delay z-score	Stry_dr	36	0.35	27	0.57	
REMT     Total raw correct     Remt_ct     22     0.28     15     -1.0       Delayed recall     4     -0.33     3     -0.7       Recognition hits     28     0.79     27     0.4       Recognition hits     0     1.23     0     1.2       % Recognition false positive     0     1.23     0     1.2       % Retained     Remt_pr     64     0.30     37.50     -0.6       Recall consistency     Remt_so     0     -0.83     0     -0.8       Subjective organ     Remt_so     0     -0.83     0     -0.8       Complex     Copy raw     Meg_cop     35     0.28     35     0.5       Figure     Inmediate raw     Meg_cop     35     0.28     35     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Written raw     Writ_z     -2.12     -3.48     -2.11     -2.14       Z*score     Ora_Iz     -2.34     94		% Retention z-score		- C	.81		0.11	
Delayed recall     4     -0.33     3     -0.7       Recognition hits     28     0.79     27     0.4       Recognition false positive     0     1.23     0     1.2       % Retained     Remt_pr     64     0.30     37.50     -0.6       Recall consistency     Remt_rc     82     0.82     57     -0.5       Subjective organ     Remt_so     0     -0.83     0     -0.8       Complex     Copy raw     Meg_cop     35     0.28     35     0.5       Figure     Immediate raw     Meg_ir     19     -0.14     20     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Written raw     Writ_r     27     -3.48     2     2       Variation     Oral_z     -2.3     -2.11     2     -2.11     2       Stroop     z-score     Variation     25     25     25     25       Words-wile     90     25     <	REMT	Total raw correct	Remt_ct	22	0.28	15	- 1.03	
Recognition hits     28     0.79     27     0.4       Recognition false positive     0     1.23     0     1.2       % Retained     Remt_pr     64     0.30     37.50     -0.6       Recall consistency     Remt_rc     82     0.82     57     -0.5       Subjective organ     Remt_so     0     -0.83     0     -0.8       Complex     Copy raw     Meg_cop     35     0.28     35     0.5       Figure     Immediate raw     Meg_tir     19     -0.14     20     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Written raw     Writ_r     27     -2.12     -3.48     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     30     32     -2.11     -2.11       Stroop     z-score     Oral_z     -2.3     -2.11     -2.11     -2.11       Stroop     z-score     Shortwr     25     25     -2.5     -2.5       Words-		Delayed recall		4	- 0.33	3	-0.76	
Recognition false positive     0     1.23     0     1.2       % Retained     Remt_pr     64     0.30     37.50     -0.6       Recall consistency     Remt_rc     82     0.82     57     -0.5       Subjective organ     Remt_so     0     -0.83     0     -0.8       Complex     Copy raw     Meg_cop     35     0.28     35     0.5       Figure     Immediate raw     Meg_ir     19     -0.14     20     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Written raw     Writ_r     27     14     2     2       2-score     Oral_ra     30     32     3     3     3     3     3     3     3     3     3     3     3		Recognition hits		28	0.79	27	0.44	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Recognition false positive		0	1.23	0	1.23	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		% Retained	Remt_pr	64	0.30	37.50	-0.63	
Subjective organ     Remt_so     0     -0.83     0     -0.83       Complex     Copy raw     Meg_cop     35     0.28     35     0.5       Figure     Immediate raw     Meg_ir     19     -0.14     20     0.2       Delay raw     Meg_dr     17     -0.37     19     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Written raw     Writ_r     27     14     -     -     -     3.48     -     -     -     -     -     -     3.48     -		Recall consistency	Remt_rc	82	0.82	57	-0.52	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Subjective organ	Remt_so	0	- 0.83	0	- 0.83	
Figure     Immediate raw Delay raw     Meg_ir     19     -0.14     20     0.2       Delay raw     Meg_dr     17     -0.37     19     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Written raw     Writ_r     27     14     15     14     15     15     15     15     14     15	Complex	Copy raw	Meg_cop	35	0.28	35	0.57	
Delay raw     Meg_dr     17     -0.37     19     0.2       JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Writen raw     Writ_r     27     14     15     15     15     15     15     15     15     15     15     16     16     16     16     16     16     16     16     1	Figure	Immediate raw	Meg_ir	19	-0.14	20	0.21	
JOLO     Raw (30)     Jolo_r     28     0.85     26     0.5       SDMT     Writen raw     Writ_r     27     14     16		Delay raw	Meg_dr	17	- 0.37	19	0.20	
SDMT     Writen raw     Writ_r     27     14       z-score     Writ_z     -2.12     -3.48       Oral raw     Oral_r     30     32       z-score     Oral_z     -2.3     -2.11       Stroop     z-score     Stroop     -2.34     94     0.0       Short RMT     Words-raw     Shortwr     25     25       Words-%ile     90     >75th	JOLO	Raw (30)	Jolo_r	28	0.85	26	0.53	
z-score     Writ_z     -2.12     -3.48       Oral raw     Oral_r     30     32       z-score     Oral_z     -2.3     -2.11       Stroop     z-score     Stroop     -2.34     94     0.0       Short RMT     Words-raw     Shortwr     25     25       Words-%ile     90     >75th	SDMT	Written raw	Writ_r	27		14		
Oral raw     Oral_r     30     32       z-score     Oral_z     -2.3     -2.11       Stroop     z-score     Stroop     -2.34     94     0.0       Short RMT     Words-raw     Shortwr     25     25     25       Words-%ile     90     >75th     01     01		z-score	Writ_z	-2.12		- 3.48		
z-score     Oral_z     -2.3     -2.11       Stroop     z-score     Stroop     -2.34     94     0.0       Short RMT     Words-raw     Shortwr     25     25       Words-%ile     90     >75th		Oral raw	Oral_r	30		32		
Stroop z-score Stroop - 2.34 94 0.0   Short RMT Words-raw Shortwr 25 25   Words-%ile 90 >75th		z-score	Oral_z	- 2.3		-2.11		
Short RMT     Words-raw     Shortwr     25     25       Words-%ile     90     >75th	Stroop	z-score	Stroop	- 2.34		94	0.00	
Words-%ile 90 >75th	Short RMT	Words-raw	Shortwr	25		25		
		Words-%ile		90		>75th		
Faces-raw Shorttr 24 25		Faces-raw	Shortfr	24		25		

Table 3	Neuropsychological	assessments	before surgery	(pre-op	) and at the 2	-year follow-up
---------	--------------------	-------------	----------------	---------	----------------	-----------------

AMIPB, Adult Memory and Information Processing Battery; FIQ, full-scale intelligence quotient; IQ, intelligence quotient; JOLO, Judgment of Line Orientation; MSVT, Medical Symptom Validity Test; NART, National Adult Reading Test; REMT, Repeatable Episodic Memory Test; RMT, Recognition Memory Test; SDMT, Symbol Digit Modalities Test; SPM, Sensory Processing Measure; VIQ, verbal intelligence quotient.

of warmth' associated with a pleasant sensation. His feet felt better almost immediately. The next month, the burning sensation had not returned. Pain was not a problem anymore and the patient requested that he continue with the efficacious DBS settings.

At follow-up, most of the pain and health state assessments were improved. VAS, initially at 6.7/10, was 4.0 (-40%) after 1 year and 3.0 (-55%) after 2 years. The MPQ total score was decreased by 42% (43 to 25) after 2 years of stimulation, and for each domain, except the sensory one (28 to 25), the score was 0 at follow-up (affective: 1 to 0, evaluative: 4 to 0 and miscellaneous: 10 to 0). The SF-36 total score improved slightly at followup (+2.1% at 2 years; 242–247), with improved subscores of Bodily Pain, Vitality and Mental Health (+13%, +5%)and +14% respectively), Physical Functioning, Role -Physical, Social Functioning and Role - Emotional remaining unchanged and General Health decreased by 29% (28 to 20). The first section of the EQ-5D score was not modified by the DBS, but the Health VAS was considerably increased (+ 150%; 20-50) (Table 1).

Two years after surgery, the neuropsychological assessment showed no significant change in test performance apart from (a) selective improvement on the Stroop Task (50th centile) and (b) self and carer rating of executive functioning showed significant increases in scores on both apathy (Pre-op: 56, self; 85, wife – Post-op: 73, self; 102, wife) and executive dysfunction (Pre-op: 65, self; 91, wife – Post-op: 77, self; 105, wife) scales on the FrSBE (Tables 2 and 3). No change was evident in cognitive processing speed, with scores falling at the first percentile on both written and oral components of the Symbol Digit Modality Test.

# Discussion

This is the first report to show that bilateral ACC DBS alone can significantly alleviate the suffering of treatment-resistant chronic pain. It provides a promising avenue for patients for whom other treatments including PAG and sensory thalamus DBS are ineffective [3]. Chronic pain is a complex experience, comprising cognitive, affective and sensory-discriminative aspects,

The first neurosurgical dissociation of nociception from the suffering of pain was noted by surgeons practising surgery for psychiatric disorders. As well as Cairns' cingulotomies, Watts and Freeman [12] observed that frontal lobotomy rendered patients 'not bothered' by their pain. In 1962, Foltz and White [13] in Massachusetts performed cingulotomy by electrocoagulation, decreasing the unpleasantness of pain without affecting the patient's ability to discern pain intensity. Cingulotomy has been reported to induce indifference to pain [14] and apathy [15]. In our case, both the patient and his wife reported a significant increase in apathy and problems with executive function using the FrSBE and this could potentially be unwanted side-effects of this type of surgery. This is being investigated further in a larger cohort of ACC-DBS patients. Chronic limbic stimulation for pain could therefore lead to some psychological consequences but these do not appear to be a significant barrier to functional improvement.

Interestingly, some studies showed activity in the rostral and dorsal ACC during DBS of the thalamus in five patients with chronic pain [16,17], as did single photon emission tomography and magneto encephalography studies with human participants receiving PAG DBS [16,18,19]. A recent magneto encephalography study from our group has shown the complementary finding of PAG activation with ACC DBS in addition to long-term changes in ACC activity with ACC DBS [20].

The rationale for targeting the ACC derives largely from successful case series of dorsal cingulotomy to relieve cancer pain [8]. A comprehensive review suggested that the procedure was useful in 80 (52%), but not in 73 patients (48%) [21]. Historically, the first bilateral cingulotomies for cancer pain were performed by Foltz and White [22], reporting good or excellent relief in nine of 11 patients. The largest reported case series of 35 patients with cancer pain reported 20 (57%), with satisfactory pain relief 3 months after surgery [23]. The first cingulate cortex DBS was reported by Spooner et al. [24] in a patient with cervical spinal cord injury and whole-body pain who showed greater improvements in pain and mood with bilateral ACC DBS [24]. However, this study is a shortterm one, with 4 months of postoperative follow-up, and the electrode locations remain unclear.

In this study, electrodes were implanted into the white matter, 20 mm posterior to the anterior tip of the frontal horns of the lateral ventricles, with the deepest contacts in the corpus callosum and the upper electrodes in the cingulum bundle (Fig. 1). Interestingly, during the trial week before the implantation of the generator, the settings preferred by the patient appeared to be stimulation with the deepest contacts as active. The data suggest that the corpus callosum could play an important role in the relief of neuropathic pain. As the upper part of the corpus callosum contains fibres interconnecting both the cingulate cortices [25], DBS of this area could stimulate all the structures of the cingulum concurrently, potentially augmenting analgesia.

This case study shows that DBS of the ACC can significantly alleviate the suffering of treatment-resistant chronic pain. This provides a promising avenue for patients for whom other treatments including PAG and sensory thalamus DBS are ineffective.

# Acknowledgements

The research was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Oxford Biomedical Research Centre based at Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust and University of Oxford. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health.

### **Conflicts of interest**

There are no conflicts of interest.

# References

- Rosenberger PH, Jokl P, Ickovics J. Psychosocial factors and surgical outcomes: an evidence-based literature review. J Am Acad Orthop Surg 2006; 14:397–405.
- 2 Heath RG (ed). Studies in schizophrenia: a multidisciplinary approach to mind-brain relationships. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1954.
- 3 Boccard SG, Pereira EA, Moir L, Aziz TZ, Green AL. Long-term outcomes of deep brain stimulation for neuropathic pain. *Neurosurgery* 2013; 72: 221–230, discussion 231.
- 4 Melzack R. From the gate to the neuromatrix. *Pain* 1999; 6:S121-S126.
- 5 Albe-Fessard D, Berkley KJ, Kruger L, Ralston HJ 3rd, Willis WD Jr. Diencephalic mechanisms of pain sensation. *Brain Res* 1985; **356**: 217–296.
- 6 Singer T, Seymour B, O'Doherty J, Kaube H, Dolan RJ, Frith CD. Empathy for pain involves the affective but not sensory components of pain. *Science* 2004; **303**:1157–1162.
- 7 Whitty CW, Duffield JE, Tov PM, Cairns H. Anterior cingulectomy in the treatment of mental disease. *Lancet* 1952; 1:475–481.
- 8 Ballantine HT Jr, Cassidy WL, Flanagan NB, Marino R Jr. Stereotaxic anterior cingulotomy for neuropsychiatric illness and intractable pain. *J Neurosurg* 1967; 26:488–495.
- 9 Melzack R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: major properties and scoring methods. *Pain* 1975; 1:277–299.
- 10 SF-36. SF-36. Health Survey Scoring Demonstration website, 2011. Available at: http://www.sf-36.org/demos/sf-36.htm/ [last accessed February 2013].
- 11 Kind P, Dolan P, Gudex C, Williams A. Variations in population health status: results from a United Kingdom national questionnaire survey. *BMJ* 1998; 316:736-741.
- 12 Watts JW, Freeman W. Psychosurgery for the relief of unbearable pain. J Int Coll Surg 1946; 9:679–683.
- 13 Foltz EL, White LE Jr. Pain 'relief' by frontal cingulumotomy. *J Neurosurg* 1962; **19**:89–100.
- 14 Tekin S, Cummings JL. Frontal-subcortical neuronal circuits and clinical neuropsychiatry: an update. *J Psychosom Res* 2002; **53**:647–654.
- 15 Van Reekum R, Stuss DT, Ostrander L. Apathy: why care? *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2005; **17**:7–19.
- 16 Pereira EA, Green AL, Bradley KM, Soper N, Moir L, Stein JF, et al. Regional cerebral perfusion differences between periventricular grey, thalamic and dual target deep brain stimulation for chronic neuropathic pain. Stereotact Funct Neurosurg 2007; 85:175–183.

- 17 Mohseni HR, Kringelbach ML, Probert Smith P, Green AL, Parsons CE, Young KS, et al. Application of a null-beamformer to source localisation in MEG data of deep brain stimulation. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2010; **2010**:4120–4123.
- 18 Ray NJ, Jenkinson N, Kringelbach ML, Hansen PC, Pereira EA, Brittain JS, et al. Abnormal thalamocortical dynamics may be altered by deep brain stimulation: using magnetoencephalography to study phantom limb pain. J Clin Neurosci 2009; 16:32–36.
- 19 Kringelbach ML, Jenkinson N, Green AL, Owen SL, Hansen PC, Cornelissen PL, et al. Deep brain stimulation for chronic pain investigated with magnetoencephalography. *Neuroreport* 2007; 18: 223–228.
- 20 Mohseni HR, Smith PP, Parsons CE, Young KS, Hyam JA, Stein A, et al. MEG can map short and long-term changes in brain activity following deep brain stimulation for chronic pain. PLoS ONE 2012; 7:e37993.
- 21 Abdelaziz OS, Cosgrove GR. Stereotactic cingulotomy for the treatment of chronic pain. In: Burchiel K, editor. *Surgical management of pain*. New York: Thieme; 2002. pp. 812–820.
- 22 Foltz EL, White EL Jr. Pain relief by frontal cingulotomy. *J Neurosurg* 1962; **19**:89–100.
- 23 Ballantine HT, Cosgrove GR, Giriunas IE. Surgical treatment of intractable psychiatric illness and chronic pain by stereotactic cingulotomy. In: Schmidek HH, Sweet WH, editors. Operative neurosurgical techniques: indications, methods, and results. Philadelphia: Saunders; 1995. pp. 1423–1430.
- 24 Spooner J, Yu H, Kao C, Sillay K, Konrad P. Neuromodulation of the cingulum for neuropathic pain after spinal cord injury. Case report. *J Neurosurg* 2007; 107:169–172.
- 25 Park HJ, Kim JJ, Lee SK, Seok JH, Chun J, Kim DI, et al. Corpus callosal connection mapping using cortical gray matter parcellation and DT-MRI. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2008; **29**:503–516.