

1 The gender differences in the association between fear of pain and dental anxiety using
2 the Japanese version of the Fear of Pain questionnaire-III: a cross-sectional study

3

4 Mika Ogawa^{1*}, Teppei Sago², Hirokazu Furukawa³, Akihiro Saito⁴

5 1. Section of Anesthesiology, Department of Diagnostics and General Care, Fukuoka
6 Dental College, Fukuoka, Japan

7 2. Department of Dental Anesthesiology, Kyushu Dental University, Kitakyushu,
8 Japan

9 3. Department of Clinical Psychology, Naruto University of Education, Tokushima,
10 Japan

11 4. Department of Business Administration, The University of Kitakyushu,
12 Kitakyushu, Japan

13

14 *Corresponding author

15 E-mail: ogawam@fdcn.ac.jp (MO)

16

17 KEY WORDS: fear of pain; dental anxiety; item response theory; structural equation
18 modeling

19 **Abstract**

20 Background:

21 The fear of pain is closely linked with chronic pain and the resultant impairment of
22 daily life. It has been reported to have a correlation with dental anxiety, making its
23 assessment crucial in dental practice. The present study aimed to develop a Japanese
24 version of the Fear of Pain Questionnaire-III (FPQ-III), an international rating scale, to
25 evaluate psychological characteristics and investigate its association with dental anxiety
26 and gender differences.

27 Methods:

28 After forward and backward translation and review, the Japanese version of the FPQ-III
29 was administered to 400 internet monitors, and 100 of them were re-evaluated after a
30 month. Convergent validity was assessed in relation to catastrophic thoughts of dental
31 anxiety and pain, while discriminant validity was evaluated concerning the correlations
32 between anxiety and depression. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to examine the
33 factorial validity of the FPQ-III and a shortened version of the FPQ-9. Item response
34 theory was applied to estimate the discriminative power of each item and draw a test
35 information curve. Structural equation modeling was used to investigate the relationship
36 between pain anxiety and dental anxiety and the gender differences in the model.

37 Results:

38 Data from 400 participants (200 women [50.0%, mean 44.9 ± 14.5 years]) were
39 analyzed. Total scores on the FPQ-III showed good internal validity, intra-examiner
40 reliability, and discriminant validity, indicating convergent validity. Confirmatory factor
41 analysis results supported a three-factor structure, and the FPQ-9 showed a good fit.
42 Discrimination was high, except for two items related to severe pain. Test information
43 curves demonstrated that the FPQ-III and FPQ-9 were more accurate for latent
44 characteristic values between -2 SD and +2 SD. Anxiety about medical pain fully
45 mediated the relationship between fears of minor pain and dental anxiety. No gender
46 differences were observed in this construct, and the factor means for anxiety about
47 severe pain were significantly higher for women than for men.

48 Conclusion:

49 The Japanese versions of the FPQ-III and FPQ-9 demonstrated high reliability and
50 validity for measuring the Fear of Pain in this target population, with high accuracy for
51 a wide range of latent characteristics. The fear of pain was deemed an endogenous
52 factor that was linked to dental anxiety and common to both men and women.

53

54

55 **Introduction**

56 Pain-related fear is a psychological factor that plays a role in the development and
57 maintenance of chronic pain [1]. According to the gate-control theory, the central
58 nervous system can influence pain perception [2]. As a biopsychosocial model of pain,
59 chronic pain is considered to develop through a complex interaction of psychological,
60 social, and biological factors [3]. In dentistry, pain-related fears contribute to
61 maintaining oral-facial pain and are also associated with anxiety about dental treatment
62 [4]. Therefore, assessing fear of pain is crucial in chronic pain research and dental
63 clinical practice.

64 Self-report measures for pain-related fear and/or anxiety include the Pain Anxiety
65 Symptom Scale [5] and the Fear of Pain Questionnaire-III (FPQ-III)[6]. The Pain
66 Anxiety Symptom Scale assesses emotional, cognitive, and physiological changes
67 during the pain experience, while the FPQ-III is a brief questionnaire that assesses fears
68 of potentially painful experiences of various intensities that may occur in daily life.

69 The FPQ-III is a self-report questionnaire comprising 30 items that assess the
70 intensity of fear of minor pain, severe pain, and pain associated with medical
71 procedures. It has demonstrated high reliability and some construct validity [6]. It has
72 shown high correlations with catastrophic thinking and fear of dental treatment but low

73 correlations with general anxiety and depression, suggesting that these are distinct
74 constructs[7-9]. There have been reports of a three-factor structure for factorial validity
75 [6], a four-factor structure [10], a six-factor structure [11], and a three-factor structure
76 assuming residual correlation [9]. Two shortened versions have been developed to date
77 [10, 12]. Most studies on the FPQ-III have targeted the general population, with few
78 studies in patients with chronic pain [12, 13]. One limitation of the reliability and
79 validity of conventional methods is that they are entirely dependent on the
80 characteristics of the target sample [12]. For example, results obtained in healthy
81 individuals cannot be directly applied to a patient group. In contrast, item response
82 theory (IRT) allows for the examination of the characteristics of the scale from the
83 examinees' ability values and the difficulty of the items, rather than being dependent on
84 the sample [14].

85 Heritability has been reported for pain-related fears [15]. An association has been
86 found between pain-related fears and dental anxiety, with the latest reports suggesting a
87 common genetic basis for both. In the only genome-wide association study of the three
88 subscales, fear of minor pain was reported to be the only phenotype significantly
89 associated with the locus [16]. Dental anxiety is thought to have both external factors,
90 such as negative dental treatment experiences and family learning of dental anxiety, and

91 internal factors, such as genes and cognitive distortions [17, 18]. Based on the above,
92 we hypothesize that anxiety about mild pain may be related to dental anxiety via anxiety
93 about medical care. Furthermore, although pain anxiety is considered a type of internal
94 factor for dental anxiety, there are no reports examining pain anxiety and external
95 factors such as painful dental treatment experiences simultaneously.

96 The FPQ-III has been translated from English into four languages [8, 9, 11, 19], but a
97 Japanese version has not yet been produced. Additionally, to our knowledge, there has
98 been no scrutiny of the items using IRT. The first aim of this study was to develop a
99 Japanese version of the FPQ-III and to examine its reliability and validity in a
100 conventional manner and item response theory targeting the general Japanese
101 population. The second aim was to examine whether medical-related pain mediates the
102 relationship between anxiety about minor pain and dental anxiety; the third aim was to
103 examine the pain-related fears and dental anxiety using structural equation modeling
104 and to examine whether there are gender differences in this relationship. This study
105 hypothesizes that pain related to medical treatment mediates the relationship between
106 anxiety about minor pain and dental anxiety (hypothesis 1). Pain anxiety is associated
107 with dental anxiety even after adjusting for the effect of negative dental care
108 experiences (hypothesis 2).

109

110 **Methods**

111 The study was approved by the Ethical Committee of Fukuoka Dental College
112 (approval number: 586). The original author's permission was obtained to develop a
113 Japanese-language version. The FPQ-III was translated into Japanese using the back-
114 translation method. Two fluent English speakers, one dentist, and one psychologist,
115 separately translated the FPQ-III into English. Another dentist and a psychologist then
116 merged these translations. An expert fluent in English, experienced in back-translation,
117 retranslated the integrated Japanese version into English. Another translator, who had
118 not been involved in the back-translation process, reviewed the original and back-
119 translated versions. The internet survey was conducted in Japan in June 2022. All
120 participants were internet monitors for MSS Inc. (Tokyo, Japan) who lived in Japan and
121 were aged 20 or over. The target sample size was set at 400 based on previous studies
122 [7, 9]. There were no exclusion criteria. A total of 10000 targets among the 307722
123 internet monitors received an e-mail invitation to participate in our survey from the
124 research company. When the respondents visited the website for the survey, the policy
125 for the use of data and the protection of personal information was displayed. Only those
126 who agreed with the procedure were allowed to answer the questionnaire. The survey

127 was closed when 440 participants had completed the questionnaire. MSS Inc. used its
128 own protocols to clean the data and eliminate untruthful respondents. For reliability
129 studies using the retest method, the FPQ-III was studied again one month later in 100
130 randomly selected participants, with a 50% male/female ratio.

131

132 **Measures**

133 All participants were asked to provide details about sociodemographic characteristics
134 (i.e., age, gender, occupation, and educational level) and clinical information (i.e.,
135 presence of chronic pain lasting more than three months, Location and frequency of
136 chronic pain). They were also asked whether they had experienced painful dental
137 treatment, painful medical treatment, broken bones, and road traffic accidents. Current
138 pain was measured using the Numerical Rating Scale, which asked respondents to
139 "Please answer the intensity of the pain you have felt most often during the past month,
140 with no pain as 0 and worst pain as 10".

141 Fear of pain was measured using the FPQ-III, a 30-item self-administered
142 questionnaire that assesses fear of painful experiences that may be encountered in
143 everyday life and healthcare settings [6]. Each item was obtained on a five-point Likert
144 scale ranging from not at all to extreme, with an overall score ranging from 30 to 150.

145 Three subscales (severe, minor, and medical pain) exist, with ten items in each. Good
146 internal consistency, retest reliability, and convergent and discriminant validity are
147 reported. There is a shortened 23-item version by Asmundson et al. [10] and a 9-item
148 version by the original authors [12].

149 Anxiety and depression were assessed using the Japanese version of the Hospital
150 Anxiety and Depression Scale, a self-administered scale [20]. It consists of seven items
151 on anxiety and seven items on depression and is used for screening purposes in
152 outpatient clinics and health check-ups due to its simplicity. The responses were
153 obtained on a four-point scale. The range is 0-21 points each. The Japanese version has
154 been reported to have high reliability and validity [21].

155 Dental anxiety was measured with the reliable and valid Japanese version of the
156 Modified Dental Anxiety Scale (MDAS) [22], a 5-item questionnaire that assesses
157 anxiety in five situations: going for treatment tomorrow, sitting in the waiting room,
158 having one's tooth drilled, having one's teeth scaled and polished, and receiving a local
159 anesthetic injection. Responses are recorded on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from
160 "not anxious" to "extremely anxious" that sum up to a total score (range 5–25). Higher
161 scores indicate greater dental anxiety. The two established factors of MDAS were
162 calculated as anticipatory dental anxiety (items 1 and 2; range = 2–10) and treatment

163 dental anxiety (items 3, 4, and 5; range = 3–15) [23, 24]. The Japanese version of

164 MDAS has been reported to be one-factor [25, 26].

165 Pain Catastrophizing was measured using the Pain Catastrophizing Scale, a valid and

166 reliable Japanese 13-item self-report measure was used to assess three components of

167 catastrophizing: rumination, magnification, and helplessness [27, 28]. Responses were

168 measured with a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly

169 agree.” Total scores range from 13 to 65.

170 **Statistical analyses**

171 Sample demographics and mean values for the FPQ and other scales were calculated.

172 Dental anxiety and catastrophic thoughts of pain were assessed using Pearson's

173 correlation coefficients to investigate convergent validity and anxiety and depression to

174 investigate discriminant validity. Reliability was assessed using internal consistency and

175 retest reliability methods. Cronbach's assessed internal consistency of the total scale and

176 subscales; values $>.70$ were considered acceptable [29]. The Intraclass Correlation

177 Coefficient (ICC) was employed to evaluate test-retest reliability. As a rule of thumb,

178 ICC values between $.61$ and $.80$ indicate moderate reliability, and those between $.81$

179 and $.90$ substantial reliability [30].

180 **Item Response Theory**

181 Item response theory was used to estimate the discriminative power of each item and
182 draw a test information curve [14, 31]. Before the main IRT, categorical factors analysis
183 and a preliminary IRT were conducted to remove items with a factor pattern of less than
184 0.35, a discriminative power of less than 0.2, and a difficulty level of more than 4.

185 **Structural Equation Modeling**

186 The factorial validity of the FPQ-III and the shortened version was examined using
187 confirmatory factor analysis. The following fit indices were used: chi-square and its
188 significance, the comparative fit index (CFI), the root mean square error of
189 approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). The
190 values of $X^2/df < 5$, $CFI > 0.90$, and $RMSEA < 0.08$ indicate a reasonably good fit [32].
191 The best model has the smallest Akaike information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian
192 information criterion (BIC)[32].

193 **Measurement invariance**

194 To examine the equality of the covariance structure between men and women, we
195 constructed models with the following constraints.
196 Configural Invariance Model: a model in which the observed variables measuring the
197 nuclear factor are equal across populations

198 Metric Invariance Model: a model in which, across populations, the factor patterns
199 measuring each factor are equal

200 Scalar Invariance Model: in addition to Metric Model, a model in which the intercepts
201 measuring each is equal

202 Strict Invariance Model: in addition to Scalar Invariance Model, a model in which the
203 residuals measuring each item are equal

204 Each model was compared to the previous model regarding changes in CFI (Δ CFI),
205 RMSEA, AIC, and BIC employing the following cut-off values: .010 for Δ CFI [33].
206 SPSS Statistics software version 27 (IBM SPSS, Armonk, NY, USA) for description
207 and factor analysis for exploration. IRT and SEM were conducted using R version 4.0.0
208 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) and Package “lrm” [34] and
209 “lavaan” [35]. All tests were conducted at a significance level of 0.05.

210

211 **Results**

212 Data from 400 subjects who passed the quality checks (200 women [50.0%, mean 44.9
213 \pm 14.5 years]) were analyzed. Socio-demographics of the participants are shown in
214 Table 1. About half of the respondents were company employees, and about half had a

215 university degree. About 60% felt they had chronic pain, which was mild with an

216 average NRS of 2.5.

Table 1. Sociodemographic variables and experiences of the participants

	Male		Female		Total	
	n = 200	% or SD	n = 200	% or S.D	n = 400	% or SD
Age	45,25	14,91	44,56	14,139	44,9	14,516
Occupation						
Salaried employment	138	69,00 %	70	35,00 %	208	52,00 %
Self-employed	15	7,50 %	5	2,50 %	20	5,00 %
Housewife	0	0,00 %	59	29,50 %	59	14,80 %
Part-time worker	7	3,50 %	44	22,00 %	51	12,80 %
Student	7	3,50 %	5	2,50 %	12	3,00 %
Unemployed	28	14,00 %	15	7,50 %	43	10,80 %
Other	5	2,50 %	2	1,00 %	7	1,80 %
Education						
Junior high school	10	5,00 %	8	4,00 %	18	4,50 %
Other						
High school	58	29,00 %	65	32,50 %	123	30,80 %
Technical college	18	9,00 %	39	19,50 %	57	14,20 %
University	109	54,50 %	83	41,50 %	192	48,00 %
Other	5	2,50 %	5	2,50 %	10	2,50 %
The presence of chronic pain						
No	69	34,50 %	72	36,00 %	141	35,30 %
I don't know	9	4,50 %	13	6,50 %	22	5,50 %
Yes	122	61,00 %	115	57,50 %	237	59,30 %
Negative dental pain experience						
No	152	76,00 %	141	70,50 %	293	73,30 %
I don't know	10	5,00 %	9	4,50 %	19	4,80 %

Yes	38	19,00 %	50	25,00 %	88	22,00 %
Numeric Rating Scale for pain intensity						
	3.95	2.51	3.78	2.49	4.12	2.52
Negative medical pain experience						
No	155	77,50 %	146	73,00 %	301	75,30 %
I don't know	11	5,50 %	15	7,50 %	26	6,50 %
Yes	34	17,00 %	39	19,50 %	73	18,30 %
Bone fracture						
No	122	61,00 %	141	70,50 %	263	65,80 %
I don't know	6	3,00 %	3	1,50 %	9	2,30 %
Yes	72	36,00 %	56	28,00 %	128	32,00 %
Traffic accident						
No	122	61,00 %	138	69,00 %	260	65,00 %
I don't know	6	3,00 %	6	3,00 %	12	3,00 %
Yes	72	36,00 %	56	28,00 %	128	32,00 %

217

218 The translated version of FPQ-III is shown in S1.

219 The means of the total FPQ-III scores and subscales and their gender differences are

220 shown in Table 2. For all scores, females were significantly higher than males.

Table 2. Mean FPQ-III total scores and subscales and their gender differences

	Total (n = 400)		Male (n = 200)		Female (n = 200)		P value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Total	95.66	22.92	91.78	22.67	99.54	22.55	<0.001
Severe	39.35	7.63	37.44	7.65	41.25	7.13	<0.001

Minor	26.96	9.07	26.02	8.98	27.89	9.07	0.04
Medical	29.36	9.11	28.32	8.90	30.40	9.22	0.02

221 Abbreviations: FPQ, Fear of Pain Questionnaire.

222

223 **Reliability and internal consistency**

224 Total scores on the FPQ-III showed good internal validity and within-examiner

225 reliability (Table 3).

Table 3. Internal consistency and test-retest reliability

	Cronbach α	ICC	ICC 95% CI	
Severe	0,894	0,676	0,555	0,770
Minor	0,918	0,823	0,749	0,878
Medical	0,918	0,854	0,791	0,899
Total	0,958	0,812	0,734	0,870

226 Abbreviations: ICC, Intraclass Correlation Coefficient.

227 **Validity**

228 Table 4 shows FPQ-III and depressive tendency and anxiety levels showed no to weak

229 positive correlation and had discriminant validity ($r = -0.07$, $p = 0.16$; $r = 0.26$, $p <$

230 0.01). On the other hand, moderate positive correlations were found between the FPQ-

231 III and dental anxiety and catastrophic thinking, showing convergent validity ($r = 0.52$,

232 $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.49$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 4. Pearson's correlation for divergent and convergent validity

	Anxiety	Depression	MDAS	PCS
FPQ total	.263**	-0,071	.517**	.492**
Severe	0,087	-.260**	.343**	.347**
Minor	.284**	0,016	.448**	.426**
Medical	.306**	0,023	.568**	.523**

233 Abbreviations: FPQ, Fear of Pain Questionnaire; MDAS, Modified Dental Anxiety

234 Scale; PCS, Pain Catastrophizing Scale.

235

236 Confirmatory factor analysis showed a poor fit of the three-factor structure (FPQ-J

237 model). However, the goodness of fit improved when error correlations were set for

238 items related to injection, fracture, and dentistry as Di Tella et al. showed [9]; the FPQ-

239 9 [12] showed a good fit (Table 5). The results of Di Tella's model are presented in S2.

240

Table 5. CFA model's goodness of fit for the Japanese version of FPQ-III

Model	X ²	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC
FPQ-J	2096	402	0.80	0.103	0.096	30429
FPQ-J with 5 errors' covari- cance	1640	397	0.853	0.088	0.089	29983
A 23- item version of FPQ- J	853	164	0.870	0.103	0.083	20318
A 9-item version of FPQ-J	63.7	24	0.977	0.064	0.032	9502

241 Abbreviations: CFI, the comparative fit index; RMSEA, the root mean square error of

242 approximation; SRMR, standardized root mean square residual; AIC, Akaike's

243 information criterion.

244

245

246 **Item analysis**

247 Discrimination was high except for two items related to severe pain (Table 6), and test

248 information curves showed that the FPQ-III and FPQ-9 were more accurate in targets

249 with latent characteristic values between -2 SD and +2 SD (Fig 2).

250

Table 6. Results of item-specific descriptive statistics and item analysis

Items	Mean	S.D.	Polychoric correlation coefficient	Factor loading	beta.1	beta.2	beta.3	beta.4	discrimination (α)
I . Fear of Severe Pain									
1	4.20	1.04	0.49	0.39	-4.65	-2.60	-1.30	-0.20	0.78
3	3.83	1.04	0.67	0.59	-4.97	-2.75	-0.66	0.87	1.33
5	3.54	1.14	0.69	0.63	-4.71	-1.79	-0.13	1.42	1.45
6	3.90	1.05	0.71	0.62	-5.02	-2.86	-0.98	0.71	1.50
9	3.89	1.05	0.67	0.58	-4.77	-2.81	-0.91	0.72	1.41
10	4.01	1.02	0.73	0.62	-5.72	-3.18	-1.20	0.41	1.58
13	4.47	0.86	0.46	0.33	-4.83	-3.53	-1.96	-0.75	0.69
18	3.76	1.14	0.76	0.68	-5.01	-2.44	-0.72	0.98	1.85
25	4.13	1.02	0.52	0.42	-5.23	-2.75	-1.08	-0.02	0.85
27	3.61	1.12	0.70	0.65	-4.48	-2.27	-0.20	1.44	1.67
II . Fear of Minor Pain									
2	2.69	1.06	0.65	0.61	-2.68	-0.24	1.89	3.37	1.33
4	2.95	1.23	0.73	0.69	-2.83	-0.73	0.99	2.63	1.67
7	2.71	1.18	0.74	0.71	-2.61	-0.36	1.91	3.14	1.81
12	2.76	1.14	0.79	0.76	-3.51	-0.25	1.99	3.70	2.17
19	2.62	1.17	0.74	0.72	-2.69	0.08	1.98	3.71	1.94
22	3.02	1.16	0.77	0.75	-4.25	-0.90	1.22	2.94	2.11
23	2.85	1.17	0.72	0.71	-3.21	-0.56	1.51	3.19	1.88

24	2.46	1.15	0.72	0.71	-2.18	0.37	2.51	3.74	1.83
28	2.39	1.19	0.76	0.74	-1.98	0.58	2.64	3.95	2.06
30	2.51	1.20	0.75	0.72	-2.10	0.06	2.26	3.79	1.95
III. Fear of Medical Pain									
8	2.07	1.19	0.64	0.57	-0.49	0.99	2.43	3.43	1.20
11	2.12	1.17	0.64	0.58	-0.69	0.96	2.27	3.59	1.23
14	2.70	1.30	0.73	0.70	-2.16	-0.12	1.42	2.95	1.78
15	2.92	1.26	0.75	0.72	-2.94	-0.73	1.17	2.66	1.90
16	3.29	1.21	0.74	0.69	-3.68	-1.63	0.38	2.14	1.85
17	3.26	1.24	0.74	0.70	-3.39	-1.54	0.43	2.02	1.86
20	3.78	1.10	0.76	0.69	-5.26	-2.76	-0.77	1.06	1.90
21	3.09	1.18	0.80	0.78	-4.29	-1.33	1.08	2.97	2.33
26	3.30	1.22	0.73	0.69	-3.41	-1.68	0.30	2.14	1.80
29	2.84	1.25	0.74	0.72	-2.89	-0.46	1.36	2.98	1.99

251

252

253 **Fig 1. Test information functions for FPQ-III and a shortened version.**

254 FPQ-III: fear of pain questionnaire III; FPQ-9: nine items of fear of pain questionnaire

255 III

256 **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)**

257 Before performing SEM, the factor structure of the MDAS was checked: an EFA using

258 SPSS showed that the decay of eigenvalues was 3.38, 0.49, and 0.37, supporting a one-

259 factor structure according to the Guttman criterion and scree plot. The one-factor model

260 was adopted because the Japanese version of the MDAS also showed a one-factor

261 structure in previous studies [25, 26].

262 Fears of minor pain are related to dental anxiety through fears of medical pain-related

263 fears. Furthermore, severe pain-related fears are related to dental anxiety in correlation

264 with fears of minor pain and medical pain-related fears. A model was developed in

265 which the experience of painful dental treatment is also associated with dental anxiety.

266 The results are presented in Fig 2.

267 The direct effect of fears of minor pain on dental anxiety was not significant, with a

268 significant indirect effect via fears about medical pain (indirect effect .672 95%

269 confidence interval [.375-.968]). The results support hypothesis 1. Fears about severe

270 pain was not significantly associated with dental anxiety. Furthermore, painful dental

271 treatment experiences were significantly associated with dental anxiety. These results
272 partially supported hypothesis 2.

273 **Fig 2. The estimated structural equation model with standardized coefficients for**
274 **the interrelationships of dental anxiety, fear of severe/mild pain, and negative**
275 **dental experiences.** Dotted lines indicate non-significant paths

276

277 A multi-group SEM was then used to examine whether there were gender differences in
278 these results. The goodness of fit of the model is shown in Table 7. The invariant
279 configuration model also showed no significant worsening. The introduction of path
280 coefficients, fixed intercepts, and mean structure did not significantly deteriorate the
281 goodness of fit. The strict model was therefore adopted. The mean structure was
282 significantly higher for women than men for anxiety about severe pain and medical pain
283 (.395, $p < .001$; .178, $p = .02$).

Table 7. Invariances across gender.

Model	X2	df	CFI	ΔCFI	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Overall model	294	85	0.94	–	0.078	0.057	14262	14453
Configural model	411	170	0.931	0.009	0.084	0.062	14259	14642
Metric model	424	185	0.931	0	0.08	0.064	14242	14565
Scalar model	439	195	0.93	0.001	0.079	0.065	14237	14520
Strict model	468	209	0.926	0.004	0.079	0.065	14237	14465

284 Abbreviations: CFI, the comparative fit index; RMSEA, the root mean square error of
285 approximation; SRMR, standardized root mean square residual; AIC, Akaike's
286 information criterion; BIC, Bayesian information criterion.

287

288 **Discussion**

289 The present study aimed to construct a Japanese version of the FPQ-III and examine its
290 psychometric properties in a non-clinical Japanese sample. The three-factor structure,
291 high reliability, and validity were found; IRT results showed good accuracy, particularly
292 for the shortened 9-item version, to the same extent as the original version; SEM results
293 showed that fears of minor pain were related to dental anxiety via medical pain-related
294 fears, even after adjusting for the effect of negative dental treatment experiences. This
295 structure did not differ between men and women.

296 The results of this study showed high internal consistency and retest reliability, as in
297 other translated versions [6-9]. In line with previous studies, dental anxiety was
298 moderately positively correlated with catastrophic thoughts about pain. Of the three
299 subscales, only anxiety about severe pain showed a low correlation with depression,
300 indicating heterogeneity.

301 This is the first study to analyze FPQ-III items using IRT. Anxiety about severe pain
302 had a higher mean and a lower discrimination index than the other two subscales. In
303 particular, 13: breaking your neck, 1: being in a car accident, and 25: being sick and

304 feeling pain daily due to imminent death have high discrimination indices, indicating a
305 ceiling effect. 9-item shortened versions remove these items and the test information
306 curves also show high accuracy for participants with a wide range of latent
307 characteristics. These suggest that the shortened 9-item version may be helpful.

308 The present study showed that fears of minor pain are related to dental anxiety via
309 fears of pain-related fears of medical care, a construct common to both sexes. A
310 previous GWAS-based study reported that of the three subscales of pain anxiety, only
311 pain-related fears was a locus-related phenotype [16]. We suggested a mechanism by
312 which differences in sensitivity to pain differ at the genetic level and evolve into anxiety
313 about fears of minor medical pain, such as injection pain, leading to anxiety about
314 dental treatment.

315 The study found no gender differences in the relationship between pain fears and
316 dental anxiety. The mean values of latent factors were significantly higher in women
317 only for severe and medical pain fears. This supports previous reports that fears about
318 pain are higher in women than in men [9]. On the other hand, no differences were found
319 in the factor means for dental anxiety between men and women, although a trend
320 towards higher dental anxiety is also reported in women [22, 26].

321 The present study has several limitations. First, the participants in this study were
322 from the general population, and the structure may differ, for example, in patients seen
323 in pain clinics or those with strong dental anxiety. Secondly, the present study is an
324 observational study design, so a causal relationship cannot be determined. However, the
325 study has strengths in terms of sufficient sample size, a wide age range and an equitable
326 gender ratio, and the use of IRT.

327

328 **Conclusion**

329 In summary, the Japanese version of the FPQ-III was shown to be highly accurate for
330 participants with a wide range of latent characteristics. Furthermore, fears of minor pain
331 were suggested to be a common trait among men and women, leading to anxiety about
332 medical treatment, particularly dental treatment.

333

334 **References**

335

- 336 1. Vlaeyen JWS, Linton SJ. Fear-avoidance and its consequences in chronic
337 musculoskeletal pain: a state of the art. *Pain*. 2000;85(3):317-32. doi: 10.1016/s0304-
338 3959(99)00242-0. PubMed PMID: 10781906.
- 339 2. Melzack R, Wall PD. Pain mechanisms: a new theory. *Science*. 1965;150(3699):971-9.
340 doi: 10.1126/science.150.3699.971. PubMed PMID: 5320816.

- 341 3. Cohen SP, Vase L, Hooten WM. Chronic pain: an update on burden, best practices,
342 and new advances. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10289):2082-97. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(21)00393-7.
343 PubMed PMID: 34062143.
- 344 4. Randall CL, McNeil DW, Shaffer JR, Crout RJ, Weyant RJ, Marazita ML. Fear of Pain
345 Mediates the Association between MC1R Genotype and Dental Fear. *J Dent Res*.
346 2016;95(10):1132-7. Epub 2016/08/25. doi: 10.1177/0022034516661151. PubMed PMID:
347 27555332; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5004243.
- 348 5. McCracken LM, Zayfert C, Gross RT. The Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale: development
349 and validation of a scale to measure fear of pain. *Pain*. 1992;50(1):67-73. doi: 10.1016/0304-
350 3959(92)90113-p. PubMed PMID: 1513605.
- 351 6. McNeil DW, Rainwater AJ, 3rd. Development of the Fear of Pain Questionnaire--III. *J*
352 *Behav Med*. 1998;21(4):389-410. doi: 10.1023/a:1018782831217. PubMed PMID: 9789168.
- 353 7. Solé E, Castarlenas E, Sánchez-Rodríguez E, Galán S, de la Vega R, Jensen MP, et al.
354 The reliability and validity of the Spanish version of the Fear of Pain Questionnaire. *J Health*
355 *Psychol*. 2019;24(8):1134-44. Epub 20170110. doi: 10.1177/1359105316686669. PubMed
356 PMID: 28810376.
- 357 8. van Wijk AJ, Hoogstraten J. Dutch translation of the Fear of Pain Questionnaire: factor
358 structure, reliability and validity. *Eur J Pain*. 2006;10(6):479-86. Epub 20050810. doi:
359 10.1016/j.ejpain.2005.06.008. PubMed PMID: 16095936.
- 360 9. Di Tella M, Ghiggia A, Testa S, Castelli L, Adenzato M. The Fear of Pain
361 Questionnaire: Factor structure, validity and reliability of the Italian translation. *PLoS ONE*.
362 2019;14. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0210757.
- 363 10. Asmundson GJ, Bovell CV, Carleton RN, McWilliams LA. The Fear of Pain
364 Questionnaire-Short Form (FPQ-SF): factorial validity and psychometric properties. *Pain*.
365 2008;134(1-2):51-8. Epub 20070504. doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2007.03.033. PubMed PMID:
366 17482361.
- 367 11. Vambheim SM, Lyby PS, Aslaksen PM, Flaten MA, Åsli O, Bjørkedal E, et al.
368 Developing a model for measuring fear of pain in Norwegian samples: The Fear of Pain
369 Questionnaire Norway. *Scand J Pain*. 2017;17:425-30. Epub 20171110. doi:
370 10.1016/j.sjpain.2017.10.009. PubMed PMID: 29129465.
- 371 12. McNeil DW, Kennedy SG, Randall CL, Addicks SH, Wright CD, Hursey KG, et al.
372 Fear of Pain Questionnaire-9: Brief assessment of pain-related fear and anxiety. *Eur J Pain*.
373 2018;22(1):39-48. Epub 20170731. doi: 10.1002/ejp.1074. PubMed PMID: 28758306; PubMed
374 Central PMCID: PMC5730485.

- 375 13. McNeil DW, Au AR, Zvolensky MJ, McKee DR, Klineberg IJ, Ho CC. Fear of pain in
376 orofacial pain patients. *Pain*. 2001;89(2-3):245-52. doi: 10.1016/s0304-3959(00)00368-7.
377 PubMed PMID: 11166481.
- 378 14. Embretson SE, Reise SP. Item response theory for psychologists. Mahwah, NJ, US:
379 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; 2000. xi, 371-xi, p.
- 380 15. Randall CL, Shaffer JR, McNeil DW, Crout RJ, Weyant RJ, Marazita ML. Toward a
381 genetic understanding of dental fear: evidence of heritability. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol*.
382 2017;45(1):66-73. Epub 20161011. doi: 10.1111/cdoe.12261. PubMed PMID: 27730664;
383 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5388586.
- 384 16. Randall CL, Wright CD, Chernus JM, McNeil DW, Feingold E, Crout RJ, et al. A
385 Preliminary Genome-Wide Association Study of Pain-Related Fear: Implications for Orofacial
386 Pain. *Pain Res Manag*. 2017;2017:7375468. Epub 20170615. doi: 10.1155/2017/7375468.
387 PubMed PMID: 28701861; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5494109.
- 388 17. Weiner AA, Sheehan DV. Etiology of dental anxiety: psychological trauma or CNS
389 chemical imbalance? *Gen Dent*. 1990;38(1):39-43. Epub 1990/01/01. PubMed PMID: 2376317.
- 390 18. Beaton L, Freeman R, Humphris G. Why are people afraid of the dentist? Observations
391 and explanations. *Med Princ Pract*. 2014;23(4):295-301. Epub 2013/12/21. doi:
392 10.1159/000357223. PubMed PMID: 24356305; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5586885.
- 393 19. Albaret MC, Muñoz Sastre MT, Cottencin A, Mullet E. The Fear of Pain
394 questionnaire: factor structure in samples of young, middle-aged and elderly European people.
395 *Eur J Pain*. 2004;8(3):273-81. doi: 10.1016/j.ejpain.2003.09.005. PubMed PMID: 15109978.
- 396 20. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr*
397 *Scand*. 1983;67(6):361-70. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.1983.tb09716.x. PubMed PMID: 6880820.
- 398 21. Hatta H, Higashi A, Yashiro H, Ozasa K, Hayashi K, Kiyota K, et al. A Validation of the
399 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Jpn J Psychosom Med*. 1998;38(5):309-15. doi:
400 10.15064/jjpm.38.5_309.
- 401 22. Humphris GM, Morrison T, Lindsay SJ. The Modified Dental Anxiety Scale: validation
402 and United Kingdom norms. *Community Dent Health*. 1995;12(3):143-50. Epub 1995/09/01.
403 PubMed PMID: 7584581.
- 404 23. Yuan S, Freeman R, Lahti S, Lloyd-Williams F, Humphris G. Some psychometric
405 properties of the Chinese version of the Modified Dental Anxiety Scale with cross validation.
406 *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2008;6:22. Epub 2008/03/28. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-6-22.
407 PubMed PMID: 18364045; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2289811.
- 408 24. Lahti SM, Tolvanen MM, Humphris G, Freeman R, Rantavuori K, Karlsson L, et al.
409 Association of depression and anxiety with different aspects of dental anxiety in pregnant

- 410 mothers and their partners. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 2020;48(2):137-42. Epub
411 2019/12/07. doi: 10.1111/cdoe.12511. PubMed PMID: 31809556.
- 412 25. Furukawa H, Hosaka K. Development of the Japanese version of the Modified Dental
413 Anxiety Scale (MDAS-J): Investigation of the reliability and the validity. *Japanese Journal of*
414 *Psychosomatic Dentistry.* 2010;25(1):2-6.
- 415 26. Ogawa M, Sago T, Furukawa H. The Reliability and Validity of the Japanese Version of
416 the Modified Dental Anxiety Scale among Dental Outpatients. *ScientificWorldJournal.*
417 2020;2020:8734946. Epub 2020/05/16. doi: 10.1155/2020/8734946. PubMed PMID:
418 32410911; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7211259.
- 419 27. Sullivan MJL, Bishop S, Pivik J. The Pain Catastrophizing Scale: Development and
420 Validation. *Psychological Assessment.* 1996;7:524-32. doi: 10.1037//1040-3590.7.4.524.
- 421 28. Matsuoka H, Sakano Y. Assessment of Cognitive Aspect of Pain : Development ,
422 Reliability, and Validation of Japanese Version of Pain Catastrophizing Scale. . *Jpn J Psychosom*
423 *Med.* 2007;47(2):95-102. doi: 10.15064/jjpm.47.2_95.
- 424 29. Taber KS. The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research
425 Instruments in Science Education. *Research in Science Education.* 2018;48(6):1273-96. doi:
426 10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2.
- 427 30. Shrout PE. Measurement reliability and agreement in psychiatry. *Stat Methods Med*
428 *Res.* 1998;7(3):301-17. doi: 10.1177/096228029800700306. PubMed PMID: 9803527.
- 429 31. Samejima F. Estimation of latent ability using a response pattern of graded scores.
430 *Psychometrika.* 1969;34(1):1-97. doi: 10.1007/BF03372160.
- 431 32. Wang J, Wang X. *Structural Equation Modeling : Applications Using Mplus.* 2nd ed. .
432 Hoboken NJ: Wiley. 2020.
- 433 33. Cheung GW, Rensvold RB. Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indexes for Testing
434 Measurement Invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal.*
435 2002;9(2):233-55. doi: 10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5.
- 436 34. Rizopoulos. D. ltm: An R package for Latent Variable Modelling and Item Response
437 Theory Analyses. *Journal of Statistical Software.* 2006;17(5):1-25. doi:
438 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v017.i05>.
- 439 35. Rosseel Y. lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of*
440 *Statistical Software.* 2012;48(2):1 - 36. doi: 10.18637/jss.v048.i02.

441

442 **Supporting information**

443 **S1 File. The Japanese version of the Fear of Pain Questionnaire-III**

- 444 **S1 Fig. Standardized solution of the FPQ-III three-factor model with five error**
- 445 **items correlations.** MdP: Medical Pain; MP: Minor Pain; SP: Severe Pain
- 446 **S1 Dataset. This is raw data used in the present study.**




Figure 2




Figure 1