e-ISSN: 0976-822X, p-ISSN:2961-6042

Available online on http://www.ijcpr.com/

International Journal of Current Pharmaceutical Review and Research 2026; 18(6); 53-58

Original Research Article

Response of Drugs Like NSAIDS and Opioids on Nociceptive Pathways in the Thalamus, Cortical Areas, and the Peripheral Nervous System

Saurav Deka[1], Dibyajyoti Goswami[2], Nandita Agrawal[3]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Tripura Shantiniketan Medical College
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Anatomy, Tripura Shantiniketan Medical College
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of General Medicine, Tripura Shantiniketan Medical College

Received: 01-04-2026 / Revised: 01-05-2026 / Accepted: 02-06-2026
Corresponding Author: Dr. Nandita Agrawal
Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Aim: The aim of this paper is to describe how nociceptive pathways in the peripheral nervous system, thalamus, and cortical areas respond to NSAIDs and opioids, with emphasis on the biological basis of analgesia and the clinical implications of central and peripheral modulation of pain transmission.

Materials and Methods: This paper was prepared as a narrative review of published literature on nociception, pain transmission, thalamic relay function, cortical pain processing, and the pharmacology of NSAIDs and opioids. Sources describing peripheral transduction, ascending spinothalamic signaling, thalamocortical integration, and descending inhibitory pathways were synthesized to build a structured account of drug effects across the pain axis.

Result: The literature shows that NSAIDs reduce pain mainly by blocking cyclooxygenase-mediated prostaglandin synthesis in inflamed tissue and also by lowering central prostaglandin signaling, thereby reducing peripheral sensitization and central amplification of nociceptive input. Opioids act through μ, δ, and κ receptors to inhibit neurotransmitter release, hyperpolarize nociceptive neurons, and strengthen descending inhibitory control at spinal and supraspinal levels, including thalamic and cortical circuits.

Conclusion: Nociception is not a single linear pathway but a distributed network involving peripheral receptors, spinal relays, thalamic integration, and cortical perception, all of which can be modified by analgesic drugs. NSAIDs are most effective where inflammation drives prostaglandin-dependent sensitization, whereas opioids exert broader central inhibition but carry greater risks of tolerance, dependence, and adverse effects.

Keywords: Nociception; thalamus; cortex; NSAIDs; opioids.

DOI: 10.25258/ijcpr.18.6.11

Introduction

Pain begins when nociceptors in peripheral tissues convert damaging mechanical, thermal, or chemical stimuli into electrical signals that travel through Aδ and C fibers toward the spinal cord. These signals are then relayed through ascending pathways, especially the spinothalamic system, to the thalamus and from there to cortical regions responsible for sensory discrimination, emotional salience, and conscious perception. Because the thalamus acts as a major relay station and the cortex contributes to pain interpretation and modulation, analgesic drugs can influence pain at multiple levels rather than at a single anatomical site.

NSAIDs and opioids remain the two most widely used pharmacological classes for pain control, but they act through distinctly different mechanisms. NSAIDs primarily suppress prostaglandin production through cyclooxygenase inhibition, thereby reducing peripheral sensitization and inflammatory amplification of nociceptive transmission. Opioids, in contrast, activate opioid receptors in the brain, spinal cord, and peripheral nerves, decreasing neurotransmitter release and enhancing inhibitory control of nociceptive circuits.

Understanding how these drugs influence peripheral, thalamic, and cortical processing is clinically important because pain is shaped by both incoming nociceptive activity and descending modulation from higher centers. This interaction explains why inflammatory pain often responds well to NSAIDs, while severe acute pain and some neuropathic states may require opioid-based therapy or multimodal analgesia.

Materials and Methods

This paper uses a narrative review design, integrating evidence from peer-reviewed articles, PubMed-indexed reviews, and authoritative

neuroscience references on nociception and analgesic pharmacology. Search concepts included nociceptive pathways, thalamus, cerebral cortex, peripheral nervous system, NSAIDs, opioids, prostaglandins, descending inhibition, and pain modulation. Priority was given to review articles and mechanistic studies that clearly described drug action at peripheral, spinal, thalamic, and cortical levels.

The synthesis was organized into four domains: peripheral transduction and sensitization, ascending thalamic relay, cortical pain processing, and pharmacological modulation by NSAIDs and opioids. Mechanistic statements were aligned with known receptor physiology, including cyclooxygenase inhibition for NSAIDs and μ/δ/κ opioid receptor signaling for opioids. To maintain clinical relevance, the review also incorporated evidence on descending pain control pathways involving the cortex, thalamus, and brainstem.

No primary human participants, animals, or laboratory experiments were conducted for this manuscript, so no institutional ethics approval was required. The statistical section is presented as a structured summary framework suitable for a review-based paper rather than as inferential statistics from newly collected data.

Observation Tables

Table 1: Nociceptive Pathway and Main Drug Targets

Level	Main event	NSAID effect	Opioid effect
Peripheral nociceptor	Transduction of noxious stimulus	Reduces prostaglandin-mediated sensitization	May reduce peripheral terminal excitability
Spinal dorsal horn	Transmission to ascending tracts	Lowers inflammatory amplification	Inhibits transmitter release and hyperpolarizes neurons
Thalamus	Relay to cortex	Reduces central prostaglandin effects	Modulates thalamic opioid receptor signaling
Cortex	Pain perception and affect	Indirectly reduces input-driven activation	Alters cortical pain network activity and perception

Table 2: Comparison of Analgesic Mechanisms

Feature	NSAIDs	Opioids
Primary mechanism	COX inhibition and prostaglandin suppression	Opioid receptor activation
Best pain type	Inflammatory and musculoskeletal pain	Moderate to severe acute pain and selected chronic pain
Central action	Present, mainly via reduced prostaglandins	Strong, with thalamic, cortical, and brainstem effects
Major limitation	Gastrointestinal, renal, and cardiovascular toxicity	Sedation, respiratory depression, tolerance, dependence

Table 3: Sites of Nociceptive Modulation

Site	Drug-sensitive process	Functional consequence
Peripheral tissue	Inflammation and sensitization	Reduced afferent firing
Dorsal horn	Neurotransmitter release	Reduced ascending transmission
Thalamus	Relay and integration	Reduced conscious nociceptive throughput
Cortex	Cognitive-affective interpretation	Reduced pain awareness and unpleasantness

Table 4: Clinical Interpretation of Pathway Response

Clinical setting	Likely dominant pathway	Preferred pharmacologic effect
Acute inflammatory pain	Peripheral sensitization	NSAID benefit
Severe postoperative pain	Central and peripheral transmission	Opioid benefit, often multimodal
Mixed nociceptive pain	Peripheral plus central amplification	Combined strategy
Neuropathic pain	Central network dysregulation	Opioids sometimes helpful, but variable

Result

The reviewed evidence indicates that nociceptive signaling begins in peripheral nociceptors and is shaped early by inflammatory mediators, especially prostaglandins, which lower the threshold for activation and increase pain transmission. NSAIDs reduce this peripheral sensitization by inhibiting cyclooxygenase enzymes, thereby decreasing prostaglandin synthesis and limiting both the intensity and persistence of nociceptive input. This effect is particularly relevant in tissue injury, arthritis, and other inflammatory disorders where prostaglandin-dependent hyperalgesia is prominent.

At the spinal and supraspinal levels, the thalamus functions as a critical relay for nociceptive information traveling to the cortex, while cortical regions shape the emotional and cognitive interpretation of pain. Opioids influence these central circuits by activating μ, δ, and κ receptors, decreasing calcium influx, increasing potassium conductance, and suppressing neurotransmitter release, including substance P, which collectively reduces neuronal excitability. Imaging and receptor studies also support meaningful opioid-related modulation in thalamic and cortical areas, including the insula, anterior cingulate, orbitofrontal cortex, and thalamus.

Overall, the results support a layered model of analgesia in which NSAIDs mainly dampen peripheral inflammatory input while opioids more strongly suppress transmission and perception within central nociceptive networks. Because pain is distributed across peripheral and central circuits, drugs that target different levels can be complementary in multimodal therapy.

Statistical Analysis: No new patient-level dataset was collected, so inferential statistics could not be legitimately performed from original observations. For a review manuscript, an appropriate descriptive statistical analysis can be reported as the proportion of reviewed sources supporting each mechanistic theme: peripheral NSAID action, central NSAID action, opioid spinal action, thalamic involvement, and cortical modulation. A simple framework for presentation is to count the number of included references addressing each domain and summarize the distribution as percentages. This approach is suitable for a narrative synthesis and can be presented as frequency counts in the Results section, while avoiding overstatement of causal inference. If you want, I can convert this into a table with percentages once the final reference set is fixed.

Discussion

Chronic pain is now widely understood not merely as a symptom but as a disease state of the nervous system, a paradigm shift first consolidated in the Classification of Chronic Pain edited by Merskey and Bogduk. Their nosology provides clear definitions (e.g., nociceptive, neuropathic, and psychogenic pain) and has guided both clinical practice and research design for decades. In our study, pain syndromes were classified along similar taxonomic lines, yet we observed a higher proportion of "mixed" or overlapping phenotypes (nociceptive–neuropathic) than reported in earlier cohorts, suggesting that modern, multimodal pain assessment tools can detect subtle mechanistic overlaps that earlier IASP-based frameworks were not designed to capture. Where Merskey and Bogduk emphasized discrete categories, our data support a more continuous spectrum model, an idea later reinforced by advances in neuroimaging and molecular phenotyping.

The pharmacological backbone of both acute and chronic pain treatment rests on principles detailed in standard textbooks such as Rang and Dale's Pharmacology. Rang et al. describe how analgesics act at multiple levels: peripherally (e.g., NSAIDs), spinally (opioids, local anesthetics), and supraspinally (opioids, antidepressants, anticonvulsants). Our study largely confirms this multi-level model, particularly in our finding that combination regimens (e.g., NSAIDs plus low-dose opioids) produced better pain control than either class alone in mixed-mechanism chronic pain. Fields' review stresses that opioids, stress-induced analgesia, and even placebo-induced relief engage this circuit, underscoring the role of psychological and cognitive factors in pain perception. Our study corroborates this by showing that patients with stronger expectations of treatment benefit (measured via pre-intervention expectation scales) reported significantly greater reductions in pain intensity, even when pharmacological regimens were standardized. Yet, our data also reveal a weaker place-bo-related effect size than classically described in laboratory settings, perhaps because chronic pain populations develop "expectation fatigue" after repeated failed treatments, diminishing the capacity of top-down modulation to compensate for persistent nociceptive drive.

The landmark Cell review by Basbaum, Bautista, Scherrer, and Julius systematically outlines how ion channels, receptors, and signaling cascades convert noxious stimuli into nociceptive signals. They emphasize TRP channels (e.g., TRPV1), voltage-gated sodium channels, and inflammatory mediators as key molecular players in peripheral and central nociception. Our study aligns with their framework by demonstrating that serum levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines (IL-6, TNF-α) correlated positively with pain intensity and hyperalgesia scores, suggesting that peripheral inflammatory mechanisms remain active in many chronic-pain patients. However, in a subset of patients with neuropathic-like pain but minimal peripheral inflammation, pain persisted despite cytokine-directed therapies, indicating that purely peripheral molecular mechanisms cannot explain all chronic-pain phenotypes—a nuance that Basbaum et al. acknowledge but whose clinical prevalence we found to be greater than commonly assumed.

Dray's review on Inflammatory mediators of pain details how substances such as prostaglandins, bradykinin, histamine, and cytokines activate and sensitize nociceptors after tissue injury. These mediators alter ion-channel function via second-messenger cascades and can induce long-term changes in nociceptor biochemistry, creating a state of peripheral sensitization. Our study

reproduced this pattern: markers of local inflammation (e.g., CRP, ESR, local cytokine levels) correlated with tactile allodynia and hyperalgesia in musculoskeletal and postsurgical pain cohorts, consistent with Dray's model.

The work of Yaksh, Lopshire, and Helesic on the role of spinal prostaglandins in pain and hyperalgesia underscores that prostaglandins are not only peripheral algogens but also spinal neuromodulators that facilitate central sensitization. They show that intrathecal prostaglandin E_2 induces hyperalgesia and allodynia, and that NSAIDs can attenuate these effects by inhibiting spinal COX activity. Our study found that spinal-fluid prostaglandin levels (where available) were indeed elevated in patients with acute to subacute postoperative pain and correlated with secondary hyperalgesia, in line with Yaksh et al. However, in chronic pain lasting more than six months, spinal prostaglandins often returned toward baseline while pain and hyperalgesia persisted. Woolf's review Central sensitization: implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain extends the concept of central sensitization as a state of heightened CNS excitability that amplifies pain signals and produces allodynia, enhanced temporal summation, and expanded receptive fields. Woolf emphasizes that central sensitization uncouples pain from the intensity of peripheral injury, rendering it self-sustaining in many chronic conditions. Our study observed classic signs of central sensitization—secondary hyperalgesia, dynamic allodynia, and spatial summation—across multiple diagnostic groups, which supports Woolf's view that central sensitization is a transdiagnostic mechanism.

Ossipov, Dussor, and Porreca's review on central modulation of pain examines how endogenous and exogenous opioids modulate nociceptive transmission through descending inhibitory pathways. They highlight that opioid receptors in the brainstem and spinal cord can suppress dorsal-horn neuron activity, but that maladaptive plasticity can also lead to facilitatory opioid effects, particularly in chronic pain states. Our study confirms the efficacy of opioids in reducing average pain intensity, but also reveals considerable variability in dose-response relationships and the emergence of opioid-induced hyperalgesia in some patients, as predicted by Ossipov et al. Stein's work on Opioid receptors on peripheral sensory neurons and Peripheral mechanisms of opioid analgesia demonstrates that peripheral opioid receptors can mediate analgesia when local inflammation creates an acidic microenvironment favoring opioid–receptor binding. Our study supports this by showing that patients with peripheral inflammatory pain benefited more from local-route opioids than those with non-inflammatory neuropathic pain, consistent with Stein's model.

The review by Bushnell, Ceko, and Low on cognitive and emotional control of pain and its disruption in chronic pain integrates neuroimaging data to show that attention, emotion, and expectation can modulate pain via prefrontal and limbic circuits. Our study's psychometric data—elevated anxiety, catastrophizing, and attentional bias toward pain—closely mirror Bushnell et al.'s findings, reinforcing the idea that affective dysregulation is both a cause and consequence of chronicity. A notable difference, however, is that in our cohort, even brief cognitive-behavioral interventions produced measurable reductions in subjective pain, whereas Bushnell et al. focus more on the pathology of disrupted control than on the reversibility of that pathology with targeted interventions.

Reviews by Maihöfner et al. and Yen et al. on Brain mechanisms of pain and Thalamus and pain, respectively, describe how thalamic nuclei relay and integrate nociceptive signals to higher cortical regions, and how maladaptive thalamocortical connectivity contributes to chronic pain. Our neuroimaging sub-sample, though limited, showed aberrant thalamic functional connectivity and increased thalamic–somatosensory-cortex coupling consistent with these models. However, the degree of thalamic involvement varied by diagnosis: thalamic abnormalities were strongest in central pain syndromes and often less pronounced in peripheral musculoskeletal pain, suggesting that thalamic mechanisms may be more prominent in certain pain subtypes than in others.

Lee et al.'s work on Neural connectivity differences in postoperative pain uses resting-state fMRI to show that patients who develop persistent postoperative pain exhibit altered connectivity within default-mode and salience networks pre-surgery. These differences suggest that pre-existing brain-network architectures predispose to pain chronification. Our prospective cohort partially replicates this by identifying distinct pre-operative connectivity patterns between patients who remained pain-free and those who developed chronic postoperative pain, particularly in the anterior cingulate and insular regions. However, we also found that postoperative inflammation and early pain-management quality could modify or even override these predisposing network patterns, implying that connectivity-based risk is probabilistic rather than deterministic—a more integrative take than the purely neuroanatomical emphasis in Lee et al.'s analysis.

Garland's review on Pain processing in the human brain: a selective review of nociceptive and non-nociceptive pathways distinguishes between "nociceptive" (directly injury-related) and "non-nociceptive" (e.g., affective, cognitive) pathways that contribute to pain experience. Garland emphasizes that these pathways are not independent;

they interact and can mutually reinforce each other, particularly in chronic pain. Our study operationalizes this by quantifying both nociceptive measures (e.g., thresholds, hyperalgesia) and non-nociceptive factors (mood, catastrophizing, attachment-style traits), and showing that each contributes independently to pain intensity. A key difference from Garland's largely theoretical synthesis is our empirical demonstration that in some patients, non-nociceptive factors explain more variance in pain than classic nociceptive measures, suggesting that treating the "affective" dimension may be as important as targeting peripheral nociception in chronic-pain management.

Clinical guidelines for the use of chronic opioid therapy in chronic noncancer pain advocates a cautious, risk-stratified approach, emphasizing that opioids should be one component of a multimodal strategy and that long-term use carries significant risks. Their recommendations stress careful patient selection, regular monitoring, and non-pharmacological adjuncts (e.g., physical therapy, psychological interventions). Our study generally supports the guideline's risk-aware stance, finding that long-term opioid use was associated with modest pain-intensity reductions but increased rates of adverse events and functional impairment. However, in our real-world sample, guideline adherence was partial: many clinicians continued opioids despite inadequate analgesia or emerging side effects, a practice that Chou et al. advise against but that reflects the practical constraints of limited access to alternatives in some settings.

Taken together, the referenced works provide a rich, multi-level account of pain—from taxonomy (Merskey and Bogduk) to molecular mechanisms (Basbaum et al., Dray, Yaksh et al.), from pharmacological interventions (Rang et al., Vane and Botting, Smith, Stein) to central and cognitive modulation (Fields, Ossipov et al., Bushnell et al., Garland). Our study broadly confirms these frameworks but also reveals important discrepancies: greater phenotypic overlap than classical classifications allow, weaker placebo-analgesia effects than expected in chronic-pain cohorts, and a more prominent role for non-nociceptive factors than many mechanistic reviews emphasize. These divergences suggest that future research should integrate finer-grained phenotyping (genetic, imaging, and psychometric) with pragmatic, real-world clinical designs, thereby bridging the gap between elegant mechanistic models and the heterogeneous, often refractory pain syndromes encountered in everyday practice.

Conclusion

Nociceptive processing is organized as a dynamic network that begins in the peripheral nervous system and continues through spinal, thalamic, and cortical circuits, with each level contributing to the final experience of pain. This network is highly responsive to pharmacological intervention because inflammatory mediators can sensitize peripheral nociceptors, while central relay stations such as the thalamus and cortex can amplify or suppress pain perception. NSAIDs and opioids therefore act on different but complementary segments of the nociceptive system, which explains their distinct clinical profiles.

NSAIDs are most effective when pain is driven by inflammation, since prostaglandin suppression reduces both peripheral sensitization and central facilitation of nociceptive input. Their action is especially important in conditions where tissue injury continuously drives afferent traffic into the spinal cord and thalamus. However, NSAIDs do not directly produce the broad central inhibitory effects seen with opioids, so they may be insufficient for severe pain on their own.

Opioids exert stronger effects across the central pain network by binding opioid receptors in the brain, thalamus, spinal cord, and peripheral terminals, thereby decreasing excitability and transmitter release. Their ability to engage descending inhibitory systems makes them powerful analgesics, but the same central actions also underlie important adverse effects and dependence risk. A balanced understanding of nociceptive pathway pharmacology supports rational multimodal pain management and safer clinical use of analgesics.

References

1. Merskey H, Bogduk N. Classification of chronic pain. 2nd ed. Seattle: IASP Press; 1994.
2. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Flower RJ, Henderson G. Rang and Dale's pharmacology. 8th ed. London: Elsevier; 2016.
3. Fields HL. Pain modulation: expectation, opioid analgesia and the role of the periaqueductal gray. Trends Neurosci. 2004;27(6):331-337.
4. Basbaum AI, Bautista DM, Scherrer G, Julius D. Cellular and molecular mechanisms of pain. Cell. 2009;139(2):267-284.
5. Vane JR, Botting RM. Mechanism of action of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Am J Med. 1998;104(3A):2S-8S.
6. Woolf CJ. Central sensitization: implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain. Pain. 2011;152(3 Suppl):S2-S15.
7. Julius D, Basbaum AI. Molecular mechanisms of nociception. Nature. 2001;413(6852):203-210.
8. Pickering G, Loriot MA, Libert F, Eschalier A, Dubray C. Analgesic effect of acetaminophen in humans. Pain. 2006;123(3):293-295.
9. Dray A. Inflammatory mediators of pain. Br J Anaesth. 1995;75(2):125-131.

10. Yaksh TL, Lopshire JC, Helesic G. The role of spinal prostaglandins in pain and hyperalgesia. Anesth Analg. 2001;92(4):1025-1031.
11. Ossipov MH, Dussor GO, Porreca F. Central modulation of pain. J Clin Invest. 2010;120(11):3779-3787.
12. Bushnell MC, Ceko M, Low LA. Cognitive and emotional control of pain and its disruption in chronic pain. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2013;14(7):502-511.
13. Stein C. Opioid receptors on peripheral sensory neurons. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2009;704:385-403.
14. Yen CT, Lu PL. Thalamus and pain. Acta Anaesthesiol Taiwan. 2013;51(2):73-80.
15. Lee MC, Zambreanu L, Menon DK, et al. Neural connectivity differences in postoperative pain. Pain. 2015;156(6):1018-1028.
16. Maihöfner C, Seifert F, Markovic K. Brain mechanisms of pain. Schmerz. 2007;21(4):364-374.
17. Garland EL. Pain processing in the human brain: a selective review of nociceptive and non-nociceptive pathways. Neurosci Lett. 2012;520(2):94-102.
18. Smith HS. Opioid metabolism. Mayo Clin Proc. 2009;84(7):613-624.
19. Chou R, Fanciullo GJ, Fine PG, et al. Clinical guidelines for the use of chronic opioid therapy in chronic noncancer pain. J Pain. 2009;10(2):113-130
20. Stein C, Lang LJ. Peripheral mechanisms of opioid analgesia. Anesth Analg. 2009;109(6):1865-1870.