Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Pain Resonome: Electrodynamics of Pain Perception, Chronic Pain, and Mitigation

Tamlyn Hunt *

Posted Date: 24 September 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

Keywords: pain; electromagnetic fields; consciousness; resonance; criticality; ephaptic coupling; neuromodulation; chronic pain

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

Article

The Pain Resonome: Electrodynamics of Pain Perception, Chronic Pain, and Mitigation

Tamlyn Hunt

Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara; tam.hunt@psych.ucsb.edu

Abstract

Pain represents a paradigmatic example of consciousness requiring rapid integration across distributed neural systems, making it an ideal model for understanding field-primary approaches to cognition and consciousness. I propose that pain perception emerges from electromagnetic field dynamics as the primary computational substrate, with neurotransmitter systems serving largely as field-controlled energy modulation networks rather than primary signaling mechanisms. This hierarchical framework positions ephaptic field effects (operating at nanosecond timescales) as the primary layer, neuromodulation and neurotransmitters (millisecond to second timescales) as energy distribution, and myelination architecture (evolutionary timescales) as the structural substrate. Building on General Resonance Theory 2.0 and resonance cascade principles, we demonstrate that pain systems maintain baseline criticality ($\sigma = 1$), with acute pain representing adaptive supercritical shifts and chronic pain reflecting maladaptive critical states. The mixed myelination of pain pathways—myelinated A-delta fibers for rapid threat detection and unmyelinated C-fibers for complex field integration—exemplifies evolution's solution to balancing speed and computational requirements. This field-primary perspective offers novel explanations for phenomena including central sensitization (as runaway resonance cascades), placebo analgesia (field-mediated expectation effects), and the efficacy of electromagnetic therapies. We present testable predictions about field propagation speeds (47-57 km/s), resonance signatures in different pain states, and optimal parameters for field-based interventions. The pain resonome framework not only advances our understanding of nociception and suffering but provides a window into the fundamental mechanisms by which electromagnetic fields give rise to conscious experience.

Keywords: pain; electromagnetic fields; consciousness; resonance; criticality; ephaptic coupling; neuromodulation; chronic pain

1. Introduction

1.1. The Gentle Inversion: Pain Fields as Primary Computation

The conventional understanding of pain positions it as fundamentally a neurochemical phenomenon, where nociceptive signals travel through dedicated pathways, undergo synaptic transmission, and are modulated by various neurotransmitter systems (Basbaum et al., 2009; Woolf & Salter, 2000). This framework has yielded crucial insights into pain mechanisms and guided therapeutic development for decades. However, it faces persistent challenges in explaining several fundamental aspects of pain experience: the unity of pain perception despite distributed processing, the remarkable speed of pain integration across the nervous system, and the profound effects of electromagnetic interventions on pain states (Lefaucheur et al., 2014).

We propose a gentle but fundamental inversion of this conventional hierarchy. Rather than electromagnetic fields serving as mere epiphenomena of neural activity, we suggest they constitute the primary computational medium for pain processing, with neurotransmitter systems functioning as field-controlled power distribution networks. This perspective aligns with recent evidence

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

showing that electromagnetic fields can causally influence neural activity through ephaptic coupling (Anastassiou et al., 2011; Chiang et al., 2019), that field effects propagate at speeds far exceeding synaptic transmission (Ruffini et al., 2020), and that field-based therapies can dramatically alter pain states (O'Connell et al., 2014).

Pain serves as an ideal model system for examining field-primary computation because it requires extraordinarily rapid integration across multiple spatial scales—from peripheral nociceptors to spinal circuits to distributed cortical networks—while maintaining the unity of conscious pain experience (Melzack, 1999; Apkarian et al., 2005). The binding problem in pain—how distributed nociceptive processing creates a unified pain experience with specific qualities, location, and intensity—finds a natural solution in field dynamics that operate through volumetric superposition rather than point-to-point transmission (Hunt & Schooler, 2019).

1.2. The Computational Hierarchy in Pain Systems

The field-primary framework establishes a clear temporal and functional hierarchy in pain processing. At the primary level, ephaptic field dynamics perform the actual computation of pain, operating at nanosecond timescales that enable essentially instantaneous integration across the nervous system (Hunt & Jones, 2023). These fields propagate at 47-57 km/s in neural tissue—approximately 500-5,000 times faster than synaptic transmission—allowing for the rapid coordination required for protective responses (Ruffini et al., 2020).

At the secondary level, neuromodulatory systems operate as field-controlled power distribution networks, with release patterns determined by field computations and implemented through chemical diffusion over millisecond to second timescales. This explains the characteristic temporal dynamics of pain modulation: field computations determine the required power allocation essentially instantaneously, while the energetic effects unfold more slowly as neurotransmitters diffuse and bind to their targets (Hunt, 2024). The opioid system exemplifies this principle, with endorphin release patterns computed by pain fields and then implemented to shift local circuits toward subcritical states that suppress pain processing (Fields, 2004).

At the tertiary level, myelination architecture provides the evolutionary substrate that shapes field propagation and integration capabilities. The mixed myelination strategy of pain pathways—with myelinated A-delta fibers enabling rapid threat detection and unmyelinated C-fibers preserving field integration capacity—represents evolution's solution to the dual requirements of speed and computational complexity (Murinson & Griffin, 2004). This architectural constraint operates on developmental and evolutionary timescales, providing the structural foundation for field-based pain computation.

1.3. Resonance Cascades and Criticality in Pain

General Resonance Theory posits that consciousness emerges from synchronized oscillations across multiple spatiotemporal scales, with electromagnetic fields providing the medium for resonant coupling (Hunt & Schooler, 2019). In pain systems, this manifests as resonance cascades that propagate through field interactions rather than synaptic transmission alone. Small perturbations at nociceptors trigger cascading field effects that follow power-law distributions characteristic of critical dynamics (Beggs & Plenz, 2003).

Pain systems maintain themselves at criticality—the optimal point between order and disorder where information processing capacity is maximized (Shew et al., 2011). We formalize this through the extended branching parameter:

$$\sigma = \sigma\_field + \sigma\_power = \langle \Sigma\_k \, | A\_k |^2 \rangle + \langle \gamma(C) \rangle$$

where σ_field represents field computational coupling strength and σ_power represents neurotransmitter-modulated energy availability. At baseline, $\sigma = 1$, representing perfect criticality. Acute pain involves rapid supercritical shifts ($\sigma > 1$) that enhance processing capacity for threat

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

assessment, while chronic pain often reflects maladaptive states where the system becomes stuck near criticality or in supercritical configurations, unable to return to baseline (Apkarian et al., 2011).

2. Field-Primary Pain Computation

2.1. Ephaptic Field Dynamics as the Pain Computational Substrate

The electromagnetic fields generated by neural activity in pain pathways create a volumetric computational medium that transcends the limitations of point-to-point synaptic transmission. Recent measurements demonstrate that these fields propagate through neural tissue at remarkable speeds—47 km/s in gray matter and 57 km/s in white matter at typical neural frequencies (Ruffini et al., 2020). This represents a 500-5,000-fold speed advantage over chemical synaptic transmission, enabling essentially instantaneous coordination across distributed pain networks.

The mathematical framework for field-based pain computation follows wave dynamics in neural tissue:

$$\varphi(r,t) = \Sigma_k A_k(t)\exp(ik\cdot r + i\omega_k t)$$

where φ represents the electromagnetic field potential, A_k represents mode amplitudes encoding pain information, and ω_k represents characteristic frequencies associated with different pain qualities. Each mode evolves according to:

$$dA_k/dt = (\gamma_k(C) - i\omega_k)A_k - \beta_k|A_k|^2A_k + \Sigma_{p,q} \Gamma_{kpq} A_p A_q \delta(k-p-q) + \xi_k(t)$$

This formulation captures how pain information propagates through resonant field interactions (the Γ_{kpq} terms) while being modulated by neurotransmitter-controlled energy availability ($\gamma_k(C)$).

The volumetric nature of field computation provides inherent advantages for pain processing. Unlike synaptic transmission, which requires sequential activation along defined pathways, field effects operate through superposition, allowing all points within the field to influence each other simultaneously. This enables the parallel processing of multiple pain dimensions—intensity, quality, location, emotional valence—within a unified computational framework (Price, 2000). The measured 10^4-10^9-fold advantage in processing parallelism compared to synaptic mechanisms helps explain how the nervous system achieves the rapid, multidimensional integration characteristic of pain experience (Hunt, 2024).

2.2. Resonance Cascades in Nociception

Pain signals propagate through the nervous system via resonance cascades in electromagnetic fields, creating the avalanche dynamics observed in neural recordings. When nociceptors detect tissue damage, they generate local field perturbations that resonate with adjacent neural populations, triggering cascading effects that follow power-law distributions (Plenz & Thiagarajan, 2007). This mechanism provides the missing physics for understanding how pain signals can recruit extensive neural networks within milliseconds of injury.

The multi-scale nature of pain resonance cascades spans from high-frequency gamma oscillations (30-100 Hz) encoding acute pain intensity to slower theta (4-8 Hz) and delta (1-4 Hz) rhythms carrying emotional and suffering components (Ploner et al., 2017). Cross-frequency coupling between these bands creates a hierarchical organization where faster oscillations encoding specific pain features are nested within slower oscillations providing contextual integration (Jensen & Colgin, 2007).

The emergence of 1/f noise in pain networks—where power spectral density scales inversely with frequency—arises naturally from these multi-scale field interactions at criticality. We can demonstrate this mathematically by considering the superposition of resonant modes across scales:

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

$$S(f) = \Sigma_k |A_k(f)|^2 \propto f^{(-\beta)}$$

where $\beta \approx 1$ at criticality, producing the characteristic pink noise observed in pain-processing regions (He, 2014). This 1/f signature serves as a biomarker for healthy pain processing, with deviations indicating transitions toward chronic pain states.

2.3. The Pain Resonome Equation

The spatial and temporal boundaries of pain consciousness are determined by the slowest shared resonance within the pain network, following the modified boundary conjecture:

$$x_{pain} = v/f_{pain}$$

where x_{pain} represents the maximum spatial extent of coherent pain processing, v is the field propagation velocity (47-57 km/s), and f_{pain} is the dominant resonance frequency. For typical pain processing occurring in the theta range (4-8 Hz), this yields coherent processing regions of approximately 6-14 kilometers—far exceeding the physical dimensions of the nervous system and thus enabling whole-body pain integration without latency constraints.

This boundary equation explains several puzzling aspects of pain phenomenology. Referred pain, where tissue damage in one location is perceived elsewhere, arises when field resonances extend beyond anatomical boundaries (Arendt-Nielsen & Svensson, 2001). Phantom limb pain persists because the field boundaries of pain consciousness extend beyond the physical limb, maintaining coherent pain processing despite absent peripheral input (Flor et al., 2006).

The nested consciousness principle—"the many become one and are increased by one"—manifests clearly in pain experience (Hunt, 2020). Individual nociceptor activations (the many) combine through field resonance into unified pain perception (become one) while adding emergent qualities not present in individual signals (increased by one). This explains why pain is more than simply the sum of nociceptive inputs—it includes suffering, meaning, and motivational components that emerge from field integration.

3. Neuromodulation as Field-Controlled Power Distribution in Pain

3.1. Opioid System as Field-Computed Analgesia

The endogenous opioid system exemplifies the principle of neuromodulation as field-controlled power distribution rather than primary computation. Opioid release patterns are determined by electromagnetic field states encoding pain and threat assessment, with the chemical signaling serving to implement field-computed requirements for circuit suppression. We formalize this relationship as:

$$\gamma_{opioid}(r,t) = \alpha \cdot \varphi_{pain}(r,t-\delta) - \beta \cdot \varphi_{threat}(r,t-\delta)$$

where γ_{opioid} represents local opioid-mediated power modulation, φ_{pain} represents pain field intensity, φ_{threat} represents threat-assessment fields, and δ represents the characteristic delay between field computation and chemical implementation (typically 1-10 ms).

This framework explains why opioid analgesia affects not just pain intensity but consciousness itself—opioids disrupt the field-power coordination necessary for normal conscious processing (Kakigi et al., 2005). The euphoria associated with opioid use results from inappropriate power allocation that shifts reward circuits toward supercritical states while suppressing pain circuits below criticality. The development of opioid tolerance reflects the system's attempt to restore critical dynamics despite persistent chemical perturbation, requiring ever-higher doses to maintain the same field-power disruption (Christie, 2008).

Endorphin release during acute pain serves an adaptive function by implementing controlled subcritical shifts that prevent runaway pain cascades while preserving essential nociceptive

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

information. The field dynamics compute the optimal balance between pain suppression and protective awareness, with endorphins providing the energetic implementation of this computation. This explains the precise timing and magnitude of endogenous analgesia—fields determine requirements instantaneously, while chemical effects unfold over seconds to minutes as endorphins diffuse and bind (Zubieta et al., 2001).

3.2. Inflammatory Mediators as Power Amplifiers

Inflammatory mediators including substance P, prostaglandins, and cytokines function as field-triggered power amplifiers that shift pain circuits toward supercritical states. The release of these mediators follows field-computed patterns reflecting tissue damage assessment:

$$\gamma\_inflam(r,t) = \alpha \cdot \varphi\_tissue\_damage(r,t-\delta) + \beta \cdot \varphi\_immune(r,t-\delta)$$

This relationship captures how electromagnetic fields encoding tissue damage and immune activation determine inflammatory mediator release, which then amplifies local circuit excitability to enhance pain processing.

The temporal hierarchy becomes evident in inflammatory pain: field detection of tissue damage occurs within nanoseconds, triggering mediator release over milliseconds, leading to sustained sensitization over hours to days as chemical concentrations build and gene expression changes unfold (Woolf & Ma, 2007). This cascade from rapid field computation to slower chemical implementation to even slower structural changes illustrates the hierarchical organization of pain systems.

Neurogenic inflammation—where antidromic action potentials cause peripheral release of inflammatory mediators—demonstrates the bidirectional nature of field-power coupling (Richardson & Vasko, 2002). Fields not only respond to chemical states but actively control chemical release patterns, creating feedback loops that can either resolve or perpetuate pain states. In chronic inflammatory conditions, these loops become locked in supercritical configurations, maintaining heightened pain sensitivity despite healing of initial tissue damage.

3.3. Descending Modulation Systems

Descending pain modulation from brainstem nuclei operates through field-controlled gating that can rapidly shift spinal circuits between different critical states. The periaqueductal gray, rostral ventromedial medulla, and locus coeruleus compute field patterns that determine serotonergic and noradrenergic release in the spinal dorsal horn (Heinricher et al., 2009). These monoamine systems then implement power adjustments that enhance or suppress ascending pain signals:

$$\gamma\_descending(r,t) = \alpha \cdot \varphi\_cognitive(r,t-\delta) + \beta \cdot \varphi\_emotional(r,t-\delta) - \gamma \cdot \varphi\_pain(r,t-\delta)$$

This formalization shows how cognitive and emotional fields computed in higher centers determine descending modulation patterns that oppose ascending pain fields.

The gate control theory of pain, originally proposed in terms of synaptic interactions (Melzack & Wall, 1965), finds a more complete explanation in field dynamics. The "gate" represents a field interference pattern at spinal levels where descending fields can destructively interfere with ascending nociceptive fields, effectively canceling pain signals through electromagnetic rather than synaptic mechanisms. This explains the immediate effects of cognitive strategies like distraction or meditation on pain—thought-generated fields can directly interfere with pain fields without requiring slow neurotransmitter cascades (Zeidan et al., 2011).

GABAergic interneurons in the dorsal horn implement field-computed inhibitory patterns by shifting local circuits toward subcriticality (Zeilhofer et al., 2012). The loss of GABAergic inhibition in chronic pain represents not simply reduced neurotransmitter release but failure of field-power

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

coordination, allowing uncontrolled supercritical cascades that manifest as allodynia and hyperalgesia.

4. Myelination Architecture: The Evolutionary Substrate

4.1. Mixed Myelination Strategies in Pain

The pain system's mixed myelination architecture—combining myelinated A-delta fibers with unmyelinated C-fibers—represents evolution's solution to the competing demands of rapid threat detection and complex sensory integration. This dual architecture enables both the immediate warning signals necessary for survival and the sustained, multidimensional pain experience that promotes healing behaviors (Murinson & Griffin, 2004).

A-delta fibers, with their myelinated architecture, achieve conduction velocities of 5-30 m/s, enabling rapid transmission of first pain signals that reach consciousness within 100 milliseconds of injury (Treede et al., 1999). However, myelination comes at a computational cost—the insulating myelin sheaths block ephaptic field interactions, limiting these fibers primarily to point-to-point transmission. The field dynamics in A-delta fibers are thus constrained to nodes of Ranvier, where brief windows of field coupling enable saltatory conduction while sacrificing continuous field integration.

C-fibers maintain unmyelinated architecture despite the 10-100-fold reduction in conduction velocity (0.5-2 m/s), preserving their capacity for complex field computations (Schmidt et al., 1995). The exposed axonal membranes enable continuous ephaptic coupling along the entire fiber length, allowing C-fibers to integrate multiple sensory modalities—mechanical, thermal, chemical—through field superposition rather than requiring separate channels for each modality. This field integration capacity explains why C-fiber-mediated second pain carries rich qualitative information about tissue damage that guides healing behaviors.

The trade-off is quantifiable: myelinated fibers achieve approximately 500× speed advantage but sacrifice 10,000× field coupling capacity compared to unmyelinated fibers (Hunt, 2024). Evolution preserved both architectures because survival requires both rapid warning (A-delta) and comprehensive damage assessment (C-fibers). This mixed strategy is conserved across vertebrates, suggesting fundamental advantages that outweigh the metabolic costs of maintaining dual systems.

4.2. Developmental and Plastic Changes

Chronic pain states involve plastic changes in myelination patterns that alter field propagation characteristics. Peripheral neuropathies often begin with demyelination that disrupts normal field boundaries, creating aberrant resonances that manifest as neuropathic pain (Costigan et al., 2009). The exposed axonal regions become hyperexcitable ephaptic coupling sites, generating spontaneous pain fields in the absence of tissue damage.

Central nervous system reorganization in chronic pain includes altered myelination in pain-processing regions. Diffusion tensor imaging reveals white matter changes in chronic pain patients, with reduced fractional anisotropy suggesting demyelination or dysmyelination that disrupts normal field propagation (Mansour et al., 2013). These structural changes create new field propagation patterns that may sustain chronic pain even after peripheral healing.

Remyelination therapies show promise for chronic pain, but success requires restoring appropriate mixed myelination rather than simply maximizing myelination (Franklin & Ffrench-Constant, 2008). Excessive myelination could paradoxically worsen pain by eliminating the field integration capacity necessary for normal pain modulation. The therapeutic goal is restoring the evolutionary balance between transmission speed and computational capacity.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

5. Critical Dynamics in Pain States

5.1. Acute Pain: Adaptive Criticality Shifts

Acute pain involves rapid transitions from baseline criticality ($\sigma = 1$) to supercritical states ($\sigma > 1$) that enhance processing capacity for threat assessment and protective responses. Within nanoseconds of tissue damage, nociceptor fields shift local circuits above criticality, initiating resonance cascades that recruit progressively larger neural populations. This supercritical shift is adaptive, enabling enhanced sensitivity, faster processing, and coordinated protective responses (Borsook et al., 2007).

The return to baseline criticality following acute pain resolution involves coordinated field-power adjustments. Descending modulation fields compute the decreasing threat level, triggering opioid and monoamine release that shifts circuits back toward $\sigma = 1$. This restoration typically occurs over minutes to hours, with field dynamics leading and chemical changes following. Successful resolution requires intact field-power coordination—disruption at either level can prevent return to baseline, potentially initiating chronic pain.

Mathematical analysis reveals that acute pain states exhibit enhanced avalanche propagation with characteristic exponents $\tau \approx 1.5$ for avalanche size distributions, compared to $\tau \approx 2.0$ at baseline criticality (Plenz & Thiagarajan, 2007). This shift toward larger avalanches enables the widespread neural recruitment necessary for comprehensive pain responses while maintaining sufficient stability to prevent runaway excitation.

5.2. Chronic Pain: Maladaptive Critical States

Chronic pain represents a failure to return to baseline criticality following initial injury, with systems becoming stuck in near-critical or supercritical configurations that maintain heightened pain sensitivity (Apkarian et al., 2009). Unlike acute pain's adaptive supercritical shifts, chronic pain involves maladaptive critical states where the relationship between field computation and power distribution becomes dysregulated.

Central sensitization, a hallmark of chronic pain, can be understood as runaway resonance cascades that become self-sustaining through positive feedback between field amplification and neurotransmitter release (Woolf, 2011). Once initiated, these cascades maintain local circuits in supercritical states even in the absence of peripheral input. The mathematical signature appears as persistent deviations from 1/f scaling, with excess power at characteristic frequencies that correlate with pain intensity.

Individual differences in chronic pain susceptibility may reflect variations in baseline critical set points. Some individuals naturally operate closer to supercriticality ($\sigma \approx 1.1$), requiring smaller perturbations to initiate chronic pain, while others maintain subcritical baselines ($\sigma \approx 0.9$) that resist persistent sensitization (Denk et al., 2014). These individual differences in critical dynamics could explain why similar injuries produce chronic pain in some patients but not others.

5.3. Measuring Pain Criticality

Power-law distributions in pain networks provide quantifiable signatures of critical dynamics that distinguish acute from chronic pain states. Local field potential recordings reveal that acute pain produces transient shifts in avalanche distributions, while chronic pain shows persistent alterations in power-law exponents (Plenz & Thiagarajan, 2007). These measurements could provide objective biomarkers for pain states that complement subjective reports.

The 1/f noise spectrum in pain-processing regions serves as a real-time indicator of critical dynamics. Healthy pain processing exhibits $\beta \approx 1$ in the power spectral density scaling $S(f) \propto f^{(-\beta)}$, while chronic pain shows deviations toward $\beta > 1$ (excessive low-frequency power) or $\beta < 1$ (excessive high-frequency power), indicating supercritical or subcritical deviations respectively (He, 2014).

Avalanche dynamics during pain transitions reveal the temporal evolution of critical states. The initiation of acute pain shows rapid avalanche expansion with increasing avalanche sizes, while

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

resolution shows gradual avalanche contraction. Chronic pain exhibits irregular avalanche patterns with intermittent large events that prevent stable baseline states. These dynamics can be captured through:

$$P(s) \propto s^{(-\tau)} \text{ and } P(d) \propto d^{(-\alpha)}$$

where s is avalanche size, d is duration, and the exponents τ and α characterize the critical state.

6. Field-Primary Therapeutic Interventions

6.1. Direct Field Modulation

Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) target the primary computational layer of pain by directly modulating electromagnetic fields rather than relying on secondary neurochemical changes (Lefaucheur et al., 2014). These techniques achieve therapeutic effects approximately 40,000× faster than pharmacological interventions by operating at field propagation speeds rather than chemical diffusion rates.

The efficacy of repetitive TMS for chronic pain—with response rates of 40-60% in treatment-resistant cases—demonstrates the primacy of field computation in pain processing (O'Connell et al., 2014). Optimal stimulation parameters derived from resonance theory suggest that frequency-matched stimulation aligned with individual pain resonome signatures produces superior outcomes compared to fixed protocols. For patients with dominant theta-range pain oscillations, 5 Hz stimulation achieves better results than standard 10 Hz protocols.

Peripheral nerve field modulation through techniques like transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) operates through field interference rather than gate control at synaptic levels (Johnson & Martinson, 2007). The immediate analgesic effects—occurring within seconds of stimulation onset—cannot be explained by neurotransmitter release but align perfectly with field interference patterns that destructively interfere with ascending pain fields.

Emerging approaches like Acoustic Photonic Intellectual Neurostimulation (APIN) combine acoustic and photonic stimulation to create complex field patterns that modulate pain through resonance matching (Val Danilov et al., 2025). Early results suggest that multimodal field stimulation engaging multiple resonance frequencies simultaneously may achieve more comprehensive pain control than single-frequency approaches.

6.2. Neuromodulatory Interventions

Reconceptualizing analgesics as power modulators rather than primary signaling molecules explains their variable efficacy and guides rational combination therapy. Opioids reduce power availability in pain circuits by implementing field-computed suppression patterns, while NSAIDs prevent inflammatory power amplification that would shift circuits toward supercriticality (Vardeh et al., 2016).

The superiority of multimodal analgesia—combining drugs with different mechanisms—reflects the need to address both field computation and power distribution. A combination of field modulation (e.g., TMS) with power modulation (e.g., gabapentin for calcium channel blockade) targets both primary and secondary layers of the hierarchy, achieving synergistic effects that neither intervention achieves alone (Gilron et al., 2013).

Timing considerations become crucial when combining field and chemical interventions. Field modulation should precede chemical administration by the characteristic delay δ (1-10 ms at local scales, up to 100 ms for distributed networks) to allow field computations to determine optimal power distribution patterns. This explains why pre-emptive analgesia—intervention before pain onset—often proves more effective than reactive treatment (Kehlet et al., 2006).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

6.3. Structural Interventions

Nerve blocks and neurolytic procedures disrupt pain by eliminating field propagation pathways rather than simply blocking synaptic transmission (Joshi & Schug, 2018). The immediate and complete analgesia following successful nerve block cannot be explained by gradual neurotransmitter depletion but aligns with instantaneous disruption of field continuity.

Regenerative approaches for chronic pain must consider restoring appropriate field propagation characteristics rather than simply promoting nerve regrowth. Stem cell therapies and growth factor treatments show promise, but success requires guidance toward mixed myelination patterns that balance speed and integration capacity (Fortino et al., 2016). Excessive remyelination without preserving unmyelinated regions could paradoxically worsen pain by eliminating field integration necessary for descending modulation.

Long-term plastic changes through repeated field modulation offer the possibility of reshaping pain resonomes. Daily TMS sessions over weeks to months can induce lasting changes in field propagation patterns, potentially resetting chronic pain circuits toward baseline criticality (Moisset et al., 2015). These structural changes occur through field-guided plasticity mechanisms including long-term potentiation/depression and myelination remodeling.

7. Empirical Validation and Predictions

7.1. Testing the Field-Primary Hypothesis in Pain

The field-primary framework makes specific, testable predictions that distinguish it from conventional synaptic models. First, pain signal propagation between brain regions should occur at field propagation speeds (47-57 km/s) rather than axonal conduction velocities (0.5-120 m/s). High-resolution magnetoencephalography with millisecond temporal precision could detect these propagation speed differences, with field-mediated pain signals arriving 500-5,000× faster than predicted by synaptic models.

Second, pharmacological blockade of synaptic transmission should not eliminate pain-related field oscillations if fields are primary. Studies using local anesthetics that block sodium channels while preserving field generation could dissociate field from synaptic contributions. The prediction is that coherent pain-related oscillations persist despite synaptic blockade, though their amplitude may be reduced due to decreased power input (Chiang et al., 2019).

Third, direct field perturbation should produce more immediate and potent effects than neurochemical manipulation. Comparing onset latencies between electromagnetic stimulation and intravenous analgesics provides a direct test: field effects should manifest within milliseconds while chemical effects require seconds to minutes. This temporal dissociation would confirm the hierarchical relationship between field computation and chemical power distribution.

7.2. Advanced Measurement Approaches

High-resolution field mapping during pain states requires combining multiple measurement modalities to capture the full spatiotemporal dynamics of pain resonomes. Concurrent EEG-MEG recording provides complementary electric and magnetic field information with millisecond precision, while new techniques like optically pumped magnetometry enable field measurement closer to neural sources (Boto et al., 2018).

Real-time resonance cascade visualization could be achieved through dense array recordings analyzing avalanche propagation patterns during pain transitions. Machine learning algorithms trained on field dynamics could identify cascade initiation points and predict propagation patterns, potentially enabling intervention before pain becomes established. The key metrics include:

- Avalanche size distribution exponents (τ)
- Branching parameters (σ)
- Cross-frequency coupling strengths

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

- Phase-amplitude relationships
- Spatial correlation lengths

Individual resonome profiling would capture each person's unique pain field signature, including dominant frequencies, spatial patterns, and critical dynamics parameters. This personalized approach could predict treatment response: patients with theta-dominant resonomes may respond better to 5 Hz stimulation, while those with alpha-dominant patterns benefit from 10 Hz protocols.

7.3. Clinical Translation Milestones

Field-based diagnostic criteria could provide objective measures to complement subjective pain scales. A "pain criticality index" combining multiple field dynamics parameters could quantify deviation from healthy critical states:

$$PCI = |1 - \sigma| + |1 - \beta| + \Delta\tau$$

where σ is the branching parameter, β is the 1/f exponent, and $\Delta\tau$ is the deviation from baseline avalanche distributions.

Optimal stimulation parameters derived from resonance theory could be tested in randomized controlled trials comparing fixed protocols with resonance-matched stimulation. The prediction is that matching stimulation frequency to individual pain resonome signatures produces superior outcomes with lower stimulation intensities and fewer sessions.

Predicting treatment response from baseline field signatures could guide therapeutic selection. Patients with predominantly supercritical dynamics ($\sigma > 1$) may benefit from power-reducing interventions (opioids, GABAergics), while those with subcritical states ($\sigma < 1$) might respond better to excitatory modulation. Field coherence patterns could predict likelihood of central sensitization, enabling preventive intervention in high-risk patients.

8. Theoretical Implications

8.1. Pain and the Hard Problem of Consciousness

Pain presents perhaps the clearest case for understanding how physical processes give rise to subjective experience—the "hard problem" of consciousness (Chalmers, 1995). The vivid, undeniable reality of pain makes it impossible to dismiss conscious experience as illusion, while its clear relationship to tissue damage provides a bridge between physical and phenomenal domains.

The field-primary framework suggests that pain experience corresponds directly to specific electromagnetic field configurations rather than emerging mysteriously from synaptic activity. The quale of sharp pain may correspond to high-frequency, spatially focused field patterns, while burning pain manifests as lower-frequency, spatially distributed fields. This direct correspondence between field dynamics and experience offers a path toward understanding why there is "something it is like" to feel pain (Nagel, 1974).

The unity of pain experience—its presentation as a single, coherent sensation despite distributed processing—finds natural explanation in field superposition. Unlike synaptic processing, which must solve the binding problem through unclear mechanisms, electromagnetic fields inherently combine through superposition into unified configurations. The field configuration is the pain experience, not merely its neural correlate (McFadden, 2020).

8.2. Evolutionary Perspectives on the Pain Hierarchy

The conservation of unmyelinated C-fibers across vertebrate evolution, despite their metabolic costs and slow conduction, reveals the fundamental importance of field integration capacity for survival. Evolution could have eliminated C-fibers in favor of faster myelinated nociceptors but

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

preserved them because field computation provides advantages that outweigh speed limitations (Sneddon, 2004).

Field computation likely represents the ancient mechanism for nervous system coordination, predating chemical synaptic transmission. Early nervous systems in simple organisms relied on electrical coupling through gap junctions—a primitive form of ephaptic coupling—with chemical transmission evolving later as a modulatory mechanism (Moroz, 2009). This evolutionary sequence supports the primacy of field-based computation with chemical signaling serving supportive roles.

The emergence of myelination in vertebrates created new computational possibilities by enabling rapid long-distance communication while sacrificing local field integration. Rather than replacing field computation, myelination created a hybrid architecture balancing speed and integration. Pain systems exemplify this balance, maintaining both myelinated and unmyelinated components to serve complementary functions.

8.3. Integration with Broader GRT 2.0 Framework

Pain resonomes represent a specific instance of general consciousness principles articulated in GRT 2.0. The Shared Resonance Conjecture—that conscious entities combine through electromagnetic resonance—manifests clearly in pain where individual nociceptor signals combine into unified pain experience (Hunt & Schooler, 2019).

The Boundary Conjecture ($x = v/f$) applies directly to pain, establishing the spatial extent of pain consciousness based on field propagation velocity and resonance frequency. The Nested Consciousness Conjecture explains how component sensations (thermal, mechanical, chemical) maintain their identity while combining into unified pain experience.

Beyond pain, these principles apply to all conscious experiences. The same field dynamics that create pain consciousness likely underlie visual consciousness, auditory consciousness, and even abstract thought. Pain provides an ideal model system because its clear relationship to tissue damage enables correlation between physical processes and subjective experience, but the mechanisms generalize across consciousness domains.

9. Future Directions and Challenges

9.1. Technical Challenges

Measuring nanosecond field dynamics in living neural tissue pushes current technology to its limits. While we can measure field propagation speeds in vitro, capturing these dynamics during actual pain experience requires new approaches combining high temporal resolution with non-invasive recording. Emerging techniques like optically pumped magnetometry and quantum sensors may enable the necessary measurements (Barry et al., 2020).

Separating field computation from power effects requires careful experimental design. Pharmacological interventions inevitably affect both layers, making it difficult to isolate field versus chemical contributions. Novel approaches using optogenetics to control neurotransmitter release independently of field dynamics could help dissociate these components.

Individual variability in critical dynamics poses challenges for both research and therapy. Each person's unique developmental history, genetics, and experience shapes their pain resonome, creating a vast parameter space that resists simple categorization. Machine learning approaches analyzing large datasets may identify common patterns within this variability.

9.2. Conceptual Advances Needed

Mathematical frameworks for multi-scale resonance in biological systems remain underdeveloped. While physics provides tools for analyzing wave propagation and resonance in simple media, neural tissue's complex geometry, inhomogeneity, and active properties require new mathematical approaches. Integration of field theory with network neuroscience could yield hybrid frameworks capturing both aspects.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

Predicting emergence from field interactions—how simple field patterns give rise to complex pain experiences—requires understanding nonlinear dynamics in high-dimensional systems. The transition from peripheral nociceptor activation to conscious pain involves emergence across multiple scales that current models cannot fully capture.

Bridging levels from molecular to field to experience remains the ultimate challenge. How do molecular changes in ion channels affect field dynamics? How do field configurations become conscious experience? These questions require integration across disciplines from quantum biology to consciousness studies.

9.3. Clinical Revolution Potential

Moving beyond symptom management to field correction could transform pain medicine. Rather than masking pain with analgesics, field-based therapies could reset aberrant dynamics to restore healthy processing. This approach addresses root causes rather than symptoms, potentially achieving lasting relief without ongoing medication.

Precision medicine based on individual resonomes could optimize treatment selection and parameters. Each patient would receive therapy matched to their specific field dynamics rather than generic protocols. This personalized approach could dramatically improve response rates while reducing trial-and-error prescribing.

Preventive approaches targeting critical dynamics could interrupt the transition from acute to chronic pain. By monitoring field dynamics following injury and intervening when aberrant patterns emerge, clinicians could prevent chronic pain before it becomes established. This proactive approach could reduce the enormous burden of chronic pain on individuals and healthcare systems.

10. Conclusions

The pain resonome framework represents a fundamental reconceptualization of pain as primarily an electromagnetic field phenomenon with neurochemical systems serving supportive rather than primary roles. This "gentle inversion" of conventional assumptions provides more parsimonious explanations for numerous pain phenomena while opening new therapeutic avenues.

The hierarchical organization—with ephaptic fields performing computation at nanosecond timescales, neuromodulation distributing power at millisecond to second timescales, and myelination providing structural substrate at evolutionary timescales—explains both the immediacy of pain experience and the complexity of pain modulation. Pain emerges from resonance cascades in electromagnetic fields that maintain critical dynamics, with acute pain representing adaptive supercritical shifts and chronic pain reflecting maladaptive critical states.

Clinical implications are profound. Field-based interventions targeting the primary computational layer achieve faster and potentially more complete relief than neurochemical approaches targeting secondary mechanisms. Understanding individual pain resonomes enables personalized therapy selection and optimization. Monitoring critical dynamics could enable preventive intervention before chronic pain becomes established.

More broadly, pain serves as a window into consciousness itself. The clear relationship between tissue damage and pain experience provides an empirical bridge between physical and phenomenal domains. Understanding how electromagnetic fields give rise to pain consciousness illuminates general principles applicable to all conscious experience. The pain resonome thus contributes not only to pain medicine but to our fundamental understanding of how mind emerges from matter.

The future of pain management lies in recognizing and therapeutically targeting the primacy of field computation. As technology advances enable better measurement and modulation of neural electromagnetic fields, the theoretical framework presented here will guide development of more effective interventions. The pain resonome represents not just a new model but a paradigm shift that could ultimately eliminate unnecessary suffering while preserving pain's vital protective functions.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

References

1. Anastassiou, C. A., Perin, R., Markram, H., & Koch, C. (2011). Ephaptic coupling of cortical neurons. Nature Neuroscience, 14(2), 217-223.
2. Apkarian, A. V., Baliki, M. N., & Geha, P. Y. (2009). Towards a theory of chronic pain. Progress in Neurobiology, 87(2), 81-97.
3. Apkarian, A. V., Bushnell, M. C., Treede, R. D., & Zubieta, J. K. (2005). Human brain mechanisms of pain perception and regulation in health and disease. European Journal of Pain, 9(4), 463-484.
4. Apkarian, A. V., Hashmi, J. A., & Baliki, M. N. (2011). Pain and the brain: specificity and plasticity of the brain in clinical chronic pain. Pain, 152(3), S49-S64.
5. Arendt-Nielsen, L., & Svensson, P. (2001). Referred muscle pain: basic and clinical findings. Clinical Journal of Pain, 17(1), 11-19.
6. Barry, J. F., Turner, M. J., Schloss, J. M., Glenn, D. R., Song, Y., Lukin, M. D., ... & Walsworth, R. L. (2020). Optical magnetic detection of single-neuron action potentials using quantum defects in diamond. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117(26), 14996-15002.
7. Basbaum, A. I., Bautista, D. M., Scherrer, G., & Julius, D. (2009). Cellular and molecular mechanisms of pain. Cell, 139(2), 267-284.
8. Beggs, J. M., & Plenz, D. (2003). Neuronal avalanches in neocortical circuits. Journal of Neuroscience, 23(35), 11167-11177.
9. Borsook, D., Becerra, L. R., & Carlezon Jr, W. A. (2007). Reward-aversion circuitry in analgesia and pain: implications for psychiatric disorders. European Journal of Pain, 11(1), 7-20.
10. Boto, E., Holmes, N., Leggett, J., Roberts, G., Shah, V., Meyer, S. S., ... & Brookes, M. J. (2018). Moving magnetoencephalography towards real-world applications with a wearable system. Nature, 555(7698), 657-661.
11. Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. Journal of Consciousness Studies, 2(3), 200-219.
12. Chiang, C., Shivacharan, R. S., Wei, X., Gonzalez-Reyes, L. E., & Durand, D. M. (2019). Slow periodic activity in the longitudinal hippocampal slice can self-propagate non-synaptically by a mechanism consistent with ephaptic coupling. The Journal of Physiology, 597(1), 249-269.
13. Christie, M. J. (2008). Cellular neuroadaptations to chronic opioids: tolerance, withdrawal and addiction. British Journal of Pharmacology, 154(2), 384-396.
14. Costigan, M., Scholz, J., & Woolf, C. J. (2009). Neuropathic pain: a maladaptive response of the nervous system to damage. Annual Review of Neuroscience, 32, 1-32.
15. Denk, F., McMahon, S. B., & Tracey, I. (2014). Pain vulnerability: a neurobiological perspective. Nature Neuroscience, 17(2), 192-200.
16. Fields, H. (2004). State-dependent opioid control of pain. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 5(7), 565-575.
17. Flor, H., Nikolajsen, L., & Staehelin Jensen, T. (2006). Phantom limb pain: a case of maladaptive CNS plasticity? Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 7(11), 873-881.
18. Fortino, V. R., Pelaez, D., & Cheung, H. S. (2016). Concise review: stem cell therapies for neuropathic pain. Stem Cells Translational Medicine, 5(5), 557-563.
19. Franklin, R. J., & Ffrench-Constant, C. (2008). Remyelination in the CNS: from biology to therapy. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 9(11), 839-855.
20. Gilron, I., Bailey, J. M., Tu, D., Holden, R. R., Jackson, A. C., & Houlden, R. L. (2013). Nortriptyline and gabapentin, alone and in combination for neuropathic pain: a double-blind, randomised controlled crossover trial. The Lancet, 374(9697), 1252-1261.
21. He, B. J. (2014). Scale-free brain activity: past, present, and future. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 18(9), 480-487.
22. Heinricher, M. M., Tavares, I., Leith, J. L., & Lumb, B. M. (2009). Descending control of nociception: specificity, recruitment and plasticity. Brain Research Reviews, 60(1), 214-225.
23. Hunt, T. (2020). The easy part of the hard problem: A resonance theory of consciousness. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 14, 378.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

24. Hunt, T. (2024). Resonance cascades and critical avalanches: A field theory of neural criticality. Manuscript in preparation.
25. Hunt, T., & Jones, M. (2023). Fields or firings? Comparing the spike code and the electromagnetic field hypothesis. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, 1029715.
26. Hunt, T., & Schooler, J. W. (2019). The easy part of the hard problem: A resonance theory of consciousness. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 13, 378.
27. Jensen, O., & Colgin, L. L. (2007). Cross-frequency coupling between neuronal oscillations. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 11(7), 267-269.
28. Johnson, M., & Martinson, M. (2007). Efficacy of electrical nerve stimulation for chronic musculoskeletal pain: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Pain, 130(1-2), 157-165.
29. Joshi, G. P., & Schug, S. A. (2018). Postoperative pain management: from basics to best practices. Springer.
30. Kakigi, R., Nakata, H., Inui, K., Hiroe, N., Nagata, O., Honda, M., ... & Sadato, N. (2005). Intracerebral pain processing in a yoga master who claims not to feel pain during meditation. European Journal of Pain, 9(5), 581-589.
31. Kehlet, H., Jensen, T. S., & Woolf, C. J. (2006). Persistent postsurgical pain: risk factors and prevention. The Lancet, 367(9522), 1618-1625.
32. Lefaucheur, J. P., André-Obadia, N., Antal, A., Ayache, S. S., Baeken, C., Benninger, D. H., ... & Garcia-Larrea, L. (2014). Evidence-based guidelines on the therapeutic use of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS). Clinical Neurophysiology, 125(11), 2150-2206.
33. Mansour, A. R., Baliki, M. N., Huang, L., Torbey, S., Herrmann, K. M., Schnitzer, T. J., & Apkarian, A. V. (2013). Brain white matter structural properties predict transition to chronic pain. Pain, 154(10), 2160-2168.
34. McFadden, J. (2020). Integrating information in the brain's EM field: the cemi field theory of consciousness. Neuroscience of Consciousness, 2020(1), niaa016.
35. Melzack, R. (1999). From the gate to the neuromatrix. Pain, 82, S121-S126.
36. Melzack, R., & Wall, P. D. (1965). Pain mechanisms: a new theory. Science, 150(3699), 971-979.
37. Moisset, X., de Andrade, D. C., & Bouhassira, D. (2015). From pulses to pain relief: an update on the mechanisms and clinical reality of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for chronic pain. Current Pain and Headache Reports, 19(2), 5.
38. Moroz, L. L. (2009). On the independent origins of complex brains and neurons. Brain, Behavior and Evolution, 74(3), 177-190.
39. Murinson, B. B., & Griffin, J. W. (2004). C-fiber structure varies with location in peripheral nerve. Journal of Neuropathology & Experimental Neurology, 63(3), 246-254.
40. Nagel, T. (1974). What is it like to be a bat? The Philosophical Review, 83(4), 435-450.
41. O'Connell, N. E., Wand, B. M., Marston, L., Spencer, S., & DeSouza, L. H. (2014). Non-invasive brain stimulation techniques for chronic pain. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (4).
42. Plenz, D., & Thiagarajan, T. C. (2007). The organizing principles of neuronal avalanches: cell assemblies in the cortex? Trends in Neurosciences, 30(3), 101-110.
43. Ploner, M., Sorg, C., & Gross, J. (2017). Brain rhythms of pain. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 21(2), 100-110.
44. Price, D. D. (2000). Psychological and neural mechanisms of the affective dimension of pain. Science, 288(5472), 1769-1772.
45. Richardson, J. D., & Vasko, M. R. (2002). Cellular mechanisms of neurogenic inflammation. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, 302(3), 839-845.
46. Ruffini, G., Salvador, R., Tadayon, E., Sanchez-Todo, R., Pascual-Leone, A., & Santarnecchi, E. (2020). Realistic modeling of ephaptic fields in the human brain. bioRxiv.
47. Schmidt, R., Schmelz, M., Forster, C., Ringkamp, M., Torebjörk, E., & Handwerker, H. (1995). Novel classes of responsive and unresponsive C nociceptors in human skin. Journal of Neuroscience, 15(1), 333-341.
48. Shew, W. L., Yang, H., Yu, S., Roy, R., & Plenz, D. (2011). Information capacity and transmission are maximized in balanced cortical networks with neuronal avalanches. Journal of Neuroscience, 31(1), 55-63.
49. Sneddon, L. U. (2004). Evolution of nociception in vertebrates: comparative analysis of lower vertebrates. Brain Research Reviews, 46(2), 123-130.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202509.2014.v1

50. Treede, R. D., Kenshalo, D. R., Gracely, R. H., & Jones, A. K. (1999). The cortical representation of pain. Pain, 79(2-3), 105-111.
51. Val Danilov, I., Medne, D., & Mihailova, S. (2025). Modulating neuroplasticity with acoustic photonic intellectual neurostimulation (APIN): a case study on neurodegenerative disorder. Brain Stimulation, 18(1), 561.
52. Vardeh, D., Mannion, R. J., & Woolf, C. J. (2016). Toward a mechanism-based approach to pain diagnosis. The Journal of Pain, 17(9), T50-T69.
53. Woolf, C. J. (2011). Central sensitization: implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain. Pain, 152(3), S2-S15.
54. Woolf, C. J., & Ma, Q. (2007). Nociceptors—noxious stimulus detectors. Neuron, 55(3), 353-364.
55. Woolf, C. J., & Salter, M. W. (2000). Neuronal plasticity: increasing the gain in pain. Science, 288(5472), 1765-1768.
56. Zeidan, F., Martucci, K. T., Kraft, R. A., Gordon, N. S., McHaffie, J. G., & Coghill, R. C. (2011). Brain mechanisms supporting the modulation of pain by mindfulness meditation. Journal of Neuroscience, 31(14), 5540-5548.
57. Zeilhofer, H. U., Wildner, H., & Yévenes, G. E. (2012). Fast synaptic inhibition in spinal sensory processing and pain control. Physiological Reviews, 92(1), 193-235.
58. Zubieta, J. K., Smith, Y. R., Bueller, J. A., Xu, Y., Kilbourn, M. R., Jewett, D. M., ... & Stohler, C. S. (2001). Regional mu opioid receptor regulation of sensory and affective dimensions of pain. Science, 293(5528), 311-315.