

## Original research

### Effectiveness of pain education on pain, disability, quality of life and self-efficacy in chronic low back pain: A randomized controlled trial

Mohammad Sidiq<sup>1</sup>, Tufail Muzaffar<sup>2</sup>, Balamurugan Janakiraman<sup>3, 6</sup>, Shariq Masoodi<sup>4</sup>, Rajkumar Krishnan Vasanthi<sup>5</sup>, Arunachalam Ramachandran<sup>6</sup>, Nitesh Bansal<sup>7</sup>, Aksh Chahal<sup>1</sup>, Faizan Zaffar Kashoo<sup>8</sup>, Moattar Raza Rivzi<sup>9</sup>, Ankita Sharma<sup>9</sup>, Richa Hirendra Rai<sup>10</sup>, Rituraj Verma<sup>1</sup>, Monika Sharma<sup>1</sup>, Sajjad Alam<sup>1</sup>, Krishna Reddy Vajrala<sup>1</sup>, Jyoti Sharma<sup>1</sup>, Ramprasad Muthukrishnan\*<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physiotherapy, Galgotias University, Greater Noida, UP, India

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physiotherapy, Physical Medicine Rehabilitation, Sher-i-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (SKIMS) Srinagar

<sup>3</sup>SRM College of Physiotherapy, SRM Institute of Science and Technology (SRMIST), Kattankulathur, Chennai, Tamil Nadu India

<sup>4</sup>Endocrinology Department, Sher-i-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (SKIMS) Srinagar

<sup>5</sup>Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, INTI International University Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia

<sup>6</sup>Faculty of Physiotherapy, Madhav University Abu Road Sirohi Rajasthan, India

<sup>7</sup>Department of Physiotherapy, OP Jindal Global University Sonapat, Haryana, India

<sup>8</sup>Department of Physical Therapy and Health Rehabilitation, College of Applied Medical Sciences, Majmaah University, Al Majmaah 11952, Saudi Arabia

<sup>9</sup>Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, Manav Rachna International Institute of Research Studies

<sup>10</sup>School of Physiotherapy, Delhi Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research University, New Delhi India

<sup>11</sup>College of Health Sciences, Gulf Medical University, Ajman, UAE

#### \*Corresponding Author:

Ramprasad Muthukrishnan

College of Health Sciences, Gulf Medical University, Ajman, UAE

Email address: [mrp@gmu.ac.ae](mailto:mrp@gmu.ac.ae)

**Words; Abstract – 261 words, Manuscript - 6237**

## **Abstract**

### **Background**

Low back pain is one of the most common causes of pain-related disability worldwide. There are growing recommendations to use psychological approaches in the management of chronic low back pain. Pain education intervention is one such psychological approach aiming at re-conceptualizing pain beliefs and easing the pain threat value. This randomized controlled trial aimed to gain an understanding of the effectiveness of pain education on pain levels, disability, quality of life, and self-efficacy in individuals with chronic low back pain (CLBP).

### **Methods**

A two-arm parallel randomized trial was conducted recruiting 92 participants with CLBP, who were randomly allocated to either standard physiotherapy care with the pain education program, or the control group, and both groups received 6 weeks of intervention. Pain intensity (using NPRS), disability (using RMDQ), self-efficacy (using general self-efficacy scale), and wellbeing (using WHO 5I) were assessed before, and 6 weeks after the study intervention.

### **Findings**

The post-intervention scores comparison between the groups showed that the pain education intervention reduced disability compared to the usual standard care at 6 weeks (mean difference 8.2,  $p < 0.001$ , effect size  $\eta^2 = 0.75$ ), the pain intensity (mean difference 3.5,  $p < 0.001$ , effect size  $\eta^2 = 0.82$ ) and improved the wellbeing index (mean difference 13.7,  $p < 0.001$ , effect size  $\eta^2 = 0.58$ ).

### **Conclusion**

The findings suggested that pain education program enhance the therapeutic benefits of usual standard physiotherapy care among participants with chronic LBP. We conclude that pain education seems to have clinical benefits when delivered along with standard care physiotherapy during the management of chronic low back pain.

**CTRI registration code:** CTRI/2021/08/035963

**Keywords:** Low back pain, Pain education, Disability, Quality of life, Self-efficacy

## Introduction

Chronic low back pain (CLBP) is a pervasive and debilitating condition affecting millions of individuals worldwide. It represents a significant global health burden, causing considerable pain, disability, and reduced quality of life for those affected. Chronic low back pain (CLBP) accounted for a total of 60.1 million person-years lived with disability [1,2]. Addressing the multifaceted nature of CLBP requires comprehensive treatment approaches that go beyond purely pharmacological interventions or a combination of pharmacological and physical rehabilitation [3,4]. Various non-surgical interventions have been provided to aid in the reduction of CLBP. These interventions include techniques like joint manipulation, acupuncture, traditional and contemporary therapeutic exercises, electrotherapy modalities, and medication [5].

However, these interventions have modest to no effect in addressing psychological barriers in recovery from low back pain [6]. The role of psychological factors in an individual's experience of LBP is reported to have a bearing on their function, pain perception, belief in self-efficacy, and quality of life [3,6,7]. The current multimodal interventions in the management of CLBP recommend approaches involving pain education programs delivered with standard physiotherapy care [8,9]. Pain education is a psychological approach that focuses on improving the knowledge and understanding of pain using biological and neurophysiological-biomechanical explanations to impart reconceptualization of beliefs about the experience of pain particularly when it is chronic[10].

Although there is a growing recommendation to use pain education for chronic LBP, the challenge is that the pain education content exhibited variance in effectiveness based on the complexity of the curriculum, ethno-culture, individual pain experience context, and language needing examination [8,9,11]. By providing individuals with the knowledge and tools to better comprehend their pain experience, pain education interventions aim to reduce pain-related disability, improve quality of life, and increase self-efficacy in managing their condition. Since the introduction of this form of pain education ('Pain Neuroscience Education' or 'Explain Pain') [12,13], it has been adopted by several Western countries with mixed findings for the efficacy of education. Further, literature [8,11,14,15] suggests that such psychological approaches that are effective in one culture may not be essentially effective in another. There is a scarce attempt of evaluation or adaptation

of pain education material or implementation of pain education programs in the Eastern cultural context particularly in South Asia [15,16].

On the other hand, the effects of psychological approaches on chronic pain depend largely on the patients' educational, ethnocultural, and social background which further limits the generalizability of the results of existing literature to different contexts, and warrants multi-cultural, contextual investigations in pain catastrophizing conditions like LBP. Therefore, this randomized controlled trial (RCT) seeks to determine the effects of pain education material on pain intensity, disability, quality of life, and self-efficacy among individuals with CLBP in India. The primary objective of this study is to evaluate whether pain education, delivered through a structured intervention, leads to a significant reduction in pain intensity compared to a control group receiving standard care. We also aim to investigate the secondary outcomes of disability, quality of life, and self-efficacy to assess the broader impact of pain education on individuals' overall well-being.

## **Methods**

### **Study design and Ethical consideration**

This randomized controlled trial was conducted using a 2-arm parallel-group (1:1 allocation) design randomized controlled trial. This study used the Standard Protocol Items; Recommendations for Interventional Trials[17] statement during the protocol development (S1 file) and is reported in accordance with the CONSORT 2010 [18] guidelines (Figure 1). The protocol of the trial was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of SKIMS vide RP/114/2021 and was registered with the clinical trial registry of India (CTRI/2021/08/035963). All the methods of this trial were carried out in accordance with Declaration of Helsinki. All the participants were informed about the study purpose and aim, and were informed that the participation and withdrawal is voluntary. After the post-intervention outcome measure recording of the control group participants the pain education manual was provided to the control group with brief lecture for 10 minutes.

## **Participants and study setting**

This study was conducted from September 2021 to October 2022 as a prospective parallel group active-controlled trial in the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation (PMR), Sher-i-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (SKIMS), a tertiary public healthcare facility in Srinagar Kashmir India. The eligible participants were screened until the required sample of 92 patients were reached. The criteria for inclusion were: participants with nonspecific low back pain of more than 3 months duration diagnosed by the physiatrist based clinical examination and diagnostic procedures, aged between 18 to 60 years with both genders, and able to attend the study setting for all the intervention sessions, were included. The exclusion criteria were withdrawal from the study due to any reasons on voluntary basis, and not attending the intervention sessions more than twice. The participants were blinded to their group assignment, as were the physiotherapists who completed the clinical outcome examinations. All participants were referred by the PMR physicians, they were informed about the voluntary nature of the participation and informed consent was obtained from them. This trial adhered to the guidelines laid down by Helsinki Declaration [19].

## **Sample size calculation**

The required power calculated sample size was calculated using the following assumptions[20]; the confidence interval of 95%, a power of 0.80 (80%), and  $\alpha$  error probability at 0.05 based on the findings of a similar study [21] regarding the mean score of pain intensity in chronic LBP patients (mean1 = 3.76, mean2 = 4.78, SD1 = 1.51, SD2 = + 1.91). Accordingly, the G power software version 3.1.9.4 for Windows the estimated sample was 46 participants per group.

## **Randomization and blinding**

A concealed allocation method using sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes (SNOSE) [22] was used to randomly allocate the participants to the pain education group, or the standard physiotherapy care group. The office clerk of PMR department performed random allocation through block randomization with a block size of 4 and cards labeled A and B. The participants were blinded to the assignment of group, the assessors, and the data analyzer of the outcome measures were blinded about the intervention group assignment.

## **Interventions**

The participants in both the groups received routine standard physiotherapy care 6 weeks for the CLBP which consist of physical exercise and modalities. In addition, the pain education group received a fac-to-face education program consisted of modules defining chronic pain, neurophysiology of pain, and neurobiological aspects of pain including central sensitization, fear avoidance factors, and social factors affecting the experience of low back pain. The contents of the pain education was delivered by the first author to individual participants using powerpoint materials, images, lectures, and question and answer sessions for 2 session per week for the first 3 weeks, followed by question and answer sessions for the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> week reflecting the learning, and at the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> session of pain education, a brief pain education manual was provided to the participants of pain education group. On average, the routine physiotherapy care lasted for 30 minutes for both the group.

### **Pain education manual development**

A context and culture specific pain education manual was developed by the authors MS and BJ in Hindi language according the process recommended by Butler and Moseley [12,13,15]. The co-authors (SM, AC, FZK, NB) reviewed the Hindi pain education manual for the clarity and simplicity of the contents. The authors used literature related to pain education, clinical guidelines to treat LBP, pain stories in Hindi to explain target concepts of pain, and the pain education handbook (Explain Pain) was largely helpful in development of Hindi pain education manual. The final proof reading of the manual (S2 file) was conducted by a clinical psychologist, a physiatrist, a native Hindi speaking person, and a physiotherapist at SKIMS.

## **Outcome measures**

The data related to the socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants were recorded as per the recommendation of the national institute of health (NIH) task force on research standards for chronic LBP [23]. The study outcomes were self-reported tools chosen to reflect the participants pain intensity, disability related to LBP, self-efficacy, and wellbeing.

### *Primary outcome measures*

The primary outcome measures were related to the intensity of pain experienced during activities of daily life (ADL) and disability related to pain. Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire (RMDQ). The visual analogue scale (VAS) was used with the scores ranging from '0' (no pain) to 10 (worst

imaginable pain) on the scale and the participant was asked to mark on the scale. Which they felt represents the intensity of the pain while doing ADL. The 24-item Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire (RMDQ) was used to assess the disability, the RMDQ scores ranged from '0' (no disability) to '24' (high disability) [24].

### *Secondary outcome measures*

The secondary study outcomes were those that potentially assesses the individual's belief in their ability to cope with and succeed in challenging situations (General Self-efficacy Scale) and emotional wellbeing (World Health Organization Five Index) of the participants [25,26]. The General Self-efficacy Scale (GSE) is a self-reported measure of self-efficacy using 10-items, the scores range from '10' to '40' with higher scores indicating more self-efficacy. The GSE is a one dimensional outcome measure that assesses the optimistic self-beliefs of individual in coping with variety of demands in life and the World Health Organization-Five Well Being (WHO-5) is a self-reported 5- item measure of current mental well being. The WHO5 index raw score range from 0 to 25, with '0' representing worst possible quality of life and '25' representing best possible quality of life. The raw score is then multiplied by 4 to compute the percentage of WHO5 index percentage of quality of life (percentage score range 0 - 100). This trial expressed WHO 5 index as percent of quality of life.

## **Data analysis**

The patient characteristics at the baseline of this pain education intervention trial is presented as mean (SD), or frequency with percentage. The normality of the score distribution of all the outcome measures was tested with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Levene's was used to check the assumption of homogeneity. Unadjusted mean (SD), and standard error (SE) of the mean difference (MD) between the groups with associated 95% confidence interval and p-value were computed for the outcome measures at baseline and post-intervention. Literature reported potential prognostic variables like educational status, BMI, smoking, chronicity of symptoms (months), pain at baseline, disability (RMDQ) at baseline, WHO 5 Index, and GSE at baseline were included in the prognostic model. We performed a prognostic model logistic regression analysis by categorizing (dichotomous) the post-intervention scores at the closest value to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (to represent 25% of those who did not improve versus 75% representing those who improved) [27]. The Post-intervention RMDQ score was dichotomized at  $\geq 13$ , VAS at  $\geq 5$ , WHO-5 well-



being index at  $\geq 60$ , and GSF at  $\geq 33$ . These cutoffs used are designed to differentiate LBP patients who considered themselves not recovered versus those with high-level recovery and this method is recommended in literature in the absence of meaningful cut-off. The level of significance was set at 0.20 and 0.05 for univariate and multivariate logistic regression respectively to determine the main effect of potential prognostic variables (independent variables) on the outcome variable. The effect size of the intervention was calculated as the mean difference using Cohen's *d* effect size. The level of significance was set at 5%. The IBM SPSS version 21 for Windows was used for analysis.

## Results

### Baseline characteristics

A total of ninety-two respondents diagnosed with chronic LBP by clinical examination or imaging, agreed to participate in this trial and until the completion of the intervention schedule period, none of them dropped out. Recruitment ran from 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2021 to 9<sup>th</sup> October 2022 prospectively. Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of the experimental and control group participants. The mean age of patients in the experimental group was 42.0 years and that of the control group was 42.5 years. The variables exhibited statistical similarity between the experimental and control groups at baseline, except for the smoking habits and RMDQ scores. At baseline, the experimental group had a better mean score of RMDQ (RMDQ = 15.02,  $p$  0.019, mean difference (MD) = 2.37), and also had more smokers than the control group ( $n = 11$  (23.9%) versus  $n = 4$  (8.7%),  $p$  0.044). Participants of both the groups self-reported a statistically similar pain intensity of above 5 out of 10 in VAS at baseline (control group 5.98 and experimental group 5.7). The mean duration of chronicity of LBP among the participants was 7.4 and 7.8 months for the control and experimental group respectively. The secondary outcome measures WHO5 index and GSE were statistically similar between groups at baseline Table 1.

Table 1 Baseline characteristics on demographic factors, behavioural characteristics, clinical characteristics, and study outcome measures ( $n = 92$ )

Variables	Control ( $n = 46$ )	Experimental ( $n = 46$ )	<i>P</i>
Age (years)	42.5 $\pm$ 13.3	42.0 $\pm$ 8.2	0.829
Gender (male/female) <sup>†</sup>	11/35	20/26	0.077
Occupation <sup>†</sup>			0.531
Self-employed	14 (30.4)	22 (47.8)	
Housewife	29 (63.0)	15 (32.6)	
Employee	0	2 (4.3)	



Student	3 (6.6)	7 (15.2)	
Duration of LBP in months	7.4 ± 1.2	7.8 ± 1.3	0.768
Level of activity †			0.681
Very active	9 (19.6)	8 (17.4)	
Moderate	23 (50.0)	20 (43.5)	
Light	14 (30.4)	18 (39.1)	
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	26.9 (4.0)	27.8 (4.2)	0.858
Comorbidity †			0.314
None	33 (71.7)	37 (80.4)	
Hypertension	4 (8.7)	5 (10.9)	
Diabetes mellitus	9 (19.6)	4 (8.7)	
Smoker †			
Yes	4 (8.7)	11 (23.9)	0.044
No	42 (91.3)	35 (76.1)	
Hours of sleep	6.3 (1.7)	6.7 (1.3)	0.549
Pain intensity (VAS 0-10)	5.98±1.7	5.7±1.65	0.423
Disability RMDQ ( 0-24)	15.02±4.7	12.65±4.7	0.019
WHO5I (0-100)	54.4±18.6	53.5±17.5	0.804
GSF (10-40)	25.78±6.4	25.82±5.6	0.972

†Categorical variables are expressed as frequency and percentage, continuous data as mean and ± Standard deviation, † Chi-square test, LBP: low back pain, RMDQ: Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire, WHO5I: WHO-5 Well-being Index, GSF: General Self-efficacy Scale

## Intervention findings

### *Primary outcomes*

#### *Disability*

The patient education intervention using a structured booklet seemed to largely reduce disability, measured by RMDQ, and intensity of pain, measured by VAS. The RMDQ score change within the group between baseline and post-intervention of both the groups were statistically significant (Experimental group; the mean difference (MD) 6.8, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.4, 0.6,  $p < 0.01$  and control group; MD 1.0, 95% CI 0.6, 1.3,  $p < 0.01$ ) Figure 2.

### **Figure 2 Mean difference of pre-test and post-test scores of RMDQ, VAS, GSF, and WHO5QI of the participants in the control group and experimental group.**

The between-group mean difference in RMDQ score change at the post-intervention was 8.0,  $p < 0.001$ , with a large effect size ( $\eta^2 = 0.75$ ). The clinical change of RMDQ over time (6 months) was computed using  $((\text{baseline score} - \text{post-intervention score}) / \text{baseline score}) \times 100$ . For the experimental group, at the start of the intervention, the RMDQ score was 12.65 and the

immediate post-intervention score was 5.8. The calculated improvement of 6.85 points or 54.15% decrease in the level of disability. The mean RMDQ score of the participants in the control group was 15.02 at the start of the intervention and 14.0 immediately after the intervention period. The clinical change over time (6 weeks) was 1.02 points improvement or 6.8%. Pain education program led to a notable and statistically significant decline in disability related to LBP as reported by participants in the experimental group at 6 months post-intervention (Table 2).

**Table 02 Unadjusted means, standard deviations, standard error, and 95% CI of the mean difference of the continuous outcome measures for control and experimental group (n =92)**

Outcome measures	Experimental (n = 46)	Control (n = 46)	p-value ( $\eta^2$ value)
VAS			
Post intervention	2.1 (1.0)	5.6 (1.5)	p <0.001 (0.82) <sup>a</sup>
Improvement (95%CI of MD)	3.6 (3.2, 4.0)	0.34 (0.2, 0.4)	
SE of mean	0.18	0.87	
Within-group difference p-value	p<0.01 <sup>b</sup>	p<0.01 <sup>b</sup>	
RMDQ Score			
Post intervention	5.8 (3.4)	14.0 (4.6)	p <0.001 (0.75) <sup>a</sup>
Improvement (95%CI of MD)	6.8 (0.4, 0.6)	1.0 (0.6, 1.3)	
SE of mean	0.40	0.15	
Within-group difference p-value	p < 0.01 <sup>b</sup>	p < 0.01 <sup>b</sup>	
WHO-5 Score			
Post intervention	70.1 (14.7)	56.4 (17.8)	p <0.001 (0.58) <sup>a</sup>
Improvement (95%CI of MD)	17.1 (14.3, 20.0)	2.0 (1.1, 2.8)	
SE of mean	1.41	0.41	
Within-group difference p-value	p < 0.01 <sup>b</sup>	p < 0.01 <sup>b</sup>	
GSF			
Post intervention	28.8 (5.4)	30.22 (4.36)	p 0.97 (-0.035) <sup>a</sup>
Improvement (95%CI of MD)	-3.04 (-4.11, -1.98)	-4.39 (-5.6, -3.09)	
SE of mean	0.52	0.64	
Within-group difference p-value	p < 0.01 <sup>b</sup>	P<0.001 <sup>b</sup>	

VAS-Visual analog scale; RMDQ-Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire; WHO-5-The World Health Organization-Five Well-Being Index, GSF: General Self-efficacy Scale, CI of MD- Confidence Interval of mean difference, <sup>a</sup> Between- group comparison of post intervention with analysis of covariance and effect size was assessed using the  $\eta^2$  value, <sup>b</sup>within- group comparison before and after intervention with Paired Samples *t*-test.

*Pain*

The intensity of pain was measured using the self-reported measurement tool (VAS), the scale can be completed in less than 1 min and the 10 cm horizontal line was labeled “no pain” on the left (assigned ‘0’), “worst imaginable excruciating pain” on the right (assigned ‘10’). The pre-/post-test scores of pain (VAS) between the experimental and control groups are shown in Table 2. Pain significantly alleviated within the experimental (mean difference 2.20. 95% CI; 1.55, 2.85,  $p < 0.01$ ), and control groups (mean difference 2.435. 95% CI; 1.87, 2.99,  $p < 0.01$ ), and a significant main effect with large effect size ( $p < 0.001$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.82$ ) between the two groups at post-intervention.

### *Secondary outcomes*

WHO-5 well-being index differed significantly between baseline and 6 months intervention in favor of the pain education group with a moderate effect size ( $p < 0.001$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.58$ ). No significant difference was found for the GSE Table 2.

### *Regression model for prognostic predictors*

Self-reported higher RMDQ at baseline increased the odds of elevated disability at 6 weeks (OR 1.99, 95% CI 1.42, 3.86), and higher educational status of the participants was protective against the higher disability at post-intervention (OR 0.75, 95% CI 0.41, 0.89). A higher VAS score at the baseline was associated with 1.69 folds (OR 1.69, 95% CI 1.31, 2.03) increased odds of higher pain intensity at 6 weeks. Better well-being and self-efficacy outcomes at 6 weeks were predicted by higher age (OR 2.20, 95% CI 1.47, 3.81), and female gender (OR 1.34, 95% CI 1.09, 2.22), higher self-efficacy at baseline (OR 1.84. 95% CI 1.46, 2.75) Table 03.

**Table 03**

**A backward stepwise logistic regression model with p values for each model variable predicting the main effects of prognostic variable (independent) on the outcome variable (post-intervention scores) at 6 weeks among the chronic LBP patients (n = 92) controlled for group allocation.**

Outcomes (at 6 weeks)	Prognostic predictors at baseline	$\beta$	OR (95% CI)	R <sup>2</sup>	p-value for each model
Final disability (RMDQ $\geq$ 13/24)	Education status	0.689	1.99 (1.42, 3.86)	0.21	0.008
	Disability	-0.29	0.75 (0.41, 0.89)		0.012

Final pain ( $\geq 5/10$ )	Pain intensity	0.525	1.69 (1.31, 2.03)	0.24	0.036
Final WHO5 I ( $\geq 60/100$ )	Age	0.79	2.20 (1.47, 3.81)	0.19	0.002
Final GSES ( $\geq 33/40$ )	Sex	0.29	1.34 (1.09, 2.22)	0.31	0.000
	Self-efficacy	0.61	1.84 (1.46, 2.75)		

## Discussion

The pain education intervention to the chronic LBP patients has resulted in better outcomes in terms of pain, disability, and wellbeing among people with chronic LBP with effect sizes moderate to larger in 6 weeks term. The improvement of pain, wellbeing, and disability can be explained by the hypothesis that the pain education of LBP patients in the experimental group about realizing that most often pain is present without tissue damage due to central sensitization and thinking more about movement than pain [28,29]. This would have probably led to a shift of patients opinion about LBP and develop a self-management bio-psychosocial approach which is claimed to reduce pain LBP by decreasing central sensitivity [30,31]. Additionally, higher self-reported disability and high pain intensity were found to be indicators of poor prognosis in this trial [32,33].

Participants with higher educational attainment and females had higher probability reporting better wellbeing and self-efficacy at 6 weeks of intervention. This is rather not surprising, because higher education would give more insight and better understanding into the pain education program, helping them to cope pain, and annihilate the challenges related to LBP [34,35]. However, overall there was a significant improvement in the primary outcomes (RMDQ and VAS) and wellbeing in the pain intervention group compared to the control group. Surprisingly, no meaningful association was found in logistic regression model between the prognosis of outcome measure scores and smoking habits, whereas few literatures [27,32,36] identified smoking as a prognostic indicator in LBP patients. Similar to the findings of this study, a cognition targeted intervention study [37] reported improvement of pain and disability in individuals with spinal pain. Their education based intervention demonstrated larger ES (0.66 and 0.81 for pain and disability respectively). Likewise, in this study the results after 6 weeks intervention showed ES of 0.82 for pain, and 0.75 for disability.

The ES for pain and disability followed by pain education intervention varied across trials, Malfliet et al [14] reported a lower ES of 0.52 for pain and 0.49 disability at 3 month follow-up compared

to this trial. In contrast, a pilot trial by Ibrahim et al [38] reported a larger ES for disability (2.22) and pain (1.66) employing group patient education combined with motor control exercise as intervention to low resource rural community dwelling adults with chronic LBP. The clinical change in RMDQ scores demonstrated a substantial improvement in our experimental group, with a 54.15% decrease in disability levels compared to a 6.8% improvement in the control group. Notably, an improvement of 30% and more in RMDQ score is rated as clinically relevant [39]. This findings further strengthens the claim on the effectiveness of the pain education intervention in reducing disability related to CLBP which is similar to studies reporting efficacy of pain education interventions [10,21,35,37]. Regarding pain intensity, as measured by the Visual Analog Scale (VAS), both the experimental and control groups showed a significant decrease following the intervention. However, the mean difference in pain intensity score change between the groups remained statistically significant after adjusting for confounding variables, with a larger effect size observed in the experimental group. This indicates that the pain education program led to a notable and statistically significant decline in pain intensity reported by participants in the experimental group at the 6-month post-intervention assessment.

Furthermore, the pain education intervention had a positive impact on the well-being of participants, as indicated by the WHO-5 well-being index. The experimental group in this trial demonstrated a significant improvement in well-being from baseline to the 6-month intervention period, with a moderate effect size. This positive effect on well-being remained consistent even after accounting for potential confounders and evidence suggest that psychological interventions being effective in improving wellbeing [40]. However, in this study there were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups in terms of general self-efficacy. Further, studies report association of low self-efficacy among adults with CLBP and the need for interventions [41].

Pain education programs delivered along with conventional treatment has shown significant improvement in pain reduction[10,14] as compared to the other group. Similarly, two reviews [10,42] reported that pain education enhances pain reconceptualization, which might facilitates patient's ability to cope with their conditions. However, one of those review[42] found that pain education has only short-term effects when used long side physiotherapy interventions in CLBP. Unfortunately, this study did not record the outcome measures at follow up to investigate the retention effects of pain education intervention. The group with pain education has shown

significant improvement showing that the comprehensive approach targeting both physical and psychological aspects of pain management offers promise for improving disability in individuals with chronic low back pain. Similar findings were reported by the studies conducted by Saracoglu et al, 2020 and Malfliet, A et al, 2017 [14,43] addressing that psychological and neurophysiological aspects of pain education enhances the understanding and management of pain, resulting in reduced pain levels, improved physical function, and decreased disability.

The pain education is reported to be effective in reducing self-reported disability and pain in chronic conditions like cancer, osteoarthritis, post-operative, and associated symptoms based on the findings of previous literature[44,45]. The findings of this study also demonstrated that the participants quality of life and wellbeing improved with pain education. A better quality of life and an improved ability to engage in daily activities and pursue meaningful goals in need of patients with chronic low back pain. The importance of educating patients about the underlying mechanisms of pain to improve their pain management and overall quality of life by pain education was emphasized by Louw and others [46]. The study by Mosely et al. 2014, highlighted the effectiveness of intensive neurophysiology education in reducing pain intensity and improving physical functioning and psychological well-being in individuals with chronic low back pain thus promoting overall well-being [47]. Malfliet et al, also reported that quality of life can be improved by delivering pain education with motor control training in patients with low back pain [14]. Similarly, a cross-sectional study, reported that pain self-efficacy accounts for a greater degree of variation in disability compared to fear of movement. Further, it was observed that changes in self-efficacy, rather than changes in fear of movement, serve as a mediator between changes in pain intensity and changes in disability over the course of one year [48]. More importantly, pain education intervention can be tailored for individuals or to suit a particular group of individuals experiencing chronic pain. Interventions by pain education could be delivered outside the healthcare system at a very low resource set up, these characteristics of pain education suggest that it can be effective, versatile, and alternative to current practice.

#### *Strength and limitations*

To the best of our knowledge, this trial is one of the fewest adequately powered study in India to have prospectively registered, with design featured to minimize possible bias and provide insight into the possible changes the pain education has on the pain, disability, and wellbeing among chronic LBP patients. Further, this study had a control group treated with a standardized plan of

care in contrast to a few trials which offered minimal or usual care control interventions. There are a few limitations worthy of discussion and will help execute caution while interpreting the findings of this study. First, the linguistically and culturally diverse population in India may demand tailored pain education program specific to the population, emphasizing diverse needs for most behavioral treatment options. Further, the feasibility constraints did not allow follow up data recording, and hence the retention effect of the pain education program in this study is not known.

## **Conclusions**

LBP has always been a significant source of disability and develops into chronic pain more often than not. Pain education seems to be a favorable intervention in alleviation of pain and reducing disability in chronic LBP. Yet future studies are warranted to conclude the efficacy of pain education among different socio-economic, ethno-culturally diversified strata of individuals, people with different educational attainment, and even examine the feasibility of online or tele delivery of pain education.

## **Declaration**

**Author contributions:** MS conceptualized, designed, and developed the pain education manual package. MS, SM and TM were involved in training the data collectors, BJ and MS conducted data curation, the analyses, and interpretation of data, MS, BJ, and SM drafted the article. All the authors critically revised the article and provided important intellectual content. All the authors discussed the results, and approved the final version of the manuscript.

**Conflict of interest:** Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

**Acknowledgment:** Authors would like to thank the Sher-i- Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (SKIMS) for the permission and support to conduct this study. We are thankful to the physiotherapists involved in the interventions and the assessors for helping in data collection. Finally, we express our gratitude to the researchers of SKIMS for their valuable suggestions, and all the technical staffs associated with this study.

**Funding:** The authors haven't declared any grant for this research from any agencies or organization in the public, commercial, or non-profit sectors. This study was supported by the Sher-i- Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (SKIMS).

**Data sharing statement;** All the data supporting the findings of this trial is presented and the full dataset are available from the principal investigator on request.




## References

1. Ferreira ML, de Luca K, Haile LM, Steinmetz JD, Culbreth GT, Cross M, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of low back pain, 1990–2020, its attributable risk factors, and projections to 2050: a systematic analysis of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *The Lancet Rheumatology*. 2023;5(6):e316–29.
2. Alnaami I, Awadalla NJ, Alkhairy M, Alburidy S, Alqarni A, Algarni A, et al. Prevalence and factors associated with low back pain among health care workers in southwestern Saudi Arabia. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*. 2019;20:1–7.
3. Clauw DJ, Essex MN, Pitman V, Jones KD. Reframing chronic pain as a disease, not a symptom: rationale and implications for pain management. *Postgraduate medicine*. 2019;131(3):185–98.
4. El-Tallawy SN, Nalamasu R, Salem GI, LeQuang JAK, Pergolizzi JV, Christo PJ. Management of musculoskeletal pain: an update with emphasis on chronic musculoskeletal pain. *Pain and therapy*. 2021;10:181–209.
5. Ibrahim T, Tleyjeh I, Gabbar O. Surgical versus non-surgical treatment of chronic low back pain: a meta-analysis of randomised trials. *International orthopaedics*. 2008;32:107–13.
6. Ho EKY, Chen L, Simic M, Ashton-James CE, Comachio J, Wang DXM, et al. Psychological interventions for chronic, non-specific low back pain: systematic review with network meta-analysis. *bmj*. 2022;376.
7. Vorensky M, Murray T, McGovern AF, Patel YY, Rao S, Batavia M. Effect of integrated exercise therapy and psychosocial interventions on self-efficacy in patients with chronic low back pain: A systematic review. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. 2022;111:126.
8. Ferlito R, Blatti C, Lucenti L, Boscarino U, Sapienza M, Pavone V, et al. Pain Education in the Management of Patients with Chronic Low Back Pain: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Functional Morphology and Kinesiology*. 2022;7(4):74.
9. Slatman S, Ostelo R, van Goor H, Staal JB, Knoop J. Physiotherapy with integrated virtual reality for patients with complex chronic low back pain: protocol for a pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial (VARIETY study). *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*. 2023;24(1):132.
10. Watson JA, Ryan CG, Cooper L, Ellington D, Whittle R, Lavender M, et al. Pain neuroscience education for adults with chronic musculoskeletal pain: a mixed-methods systematic review and meta-analysis. *The journal of pain*. 2019;20(10):1140–e1.
11. Hainline B, Turner JA, Caneiro J, Stewart M, Moseley GL. Pain in elite athletes—neurophysiological, biomechanical and psychosocial considerations: a narrative review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2017;51(17):1259–64.
12. Mosley GL, Butler DS. Explain pain supercharged. NOI; 2017.
13. Moseley GL, Butler DS. The explain pain handbook: protectometer. Noigroup; 2015.
14. Malfliet A, Kregel J, Coppieters I, De Pauw R, Meeus M, Roussel N, et al. Effect of pain neuroscience education combined with cognition-targeted motor control training on chronic spinal pain: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA neurology*. 2018;75(7):808–17.
15. Sharma S, Jensen MP, Moseley GL, Abbott JH. Pain education for patients with non-specific low back pain in Nepal: protocol of a feasibility randomised clinical trial (PEN-LBP Trial). *BMJ open*. 2018;8(8):e022423.
16. Chaudakshetrin P, Cardosa MS, Goh CR, Javier FO, Musba AMT, Prateepavanich P, et al. Establishment of multidisciplinary pain management clinics and training programs in the developing world: experiences from Southeast Asia. *Pain*. 2020;161:S87–94.

17. Moher D, Chan A. SPIRIT (standard protocol items: recommendations for interventional trials). Guidelines for Reporting Health Research: a user's manual. 2014;56–67.
18. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *Journal of Pharmacology and pharmacotherapeutics*. 2010;1(2):100–7.
19. General Assembly of the World Medical Association. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *The Journal of the American College of Dentists*. 2014;81(3):14–8.
20. Eldridge S, Cryer C, Feder G, Underwood M. Sample size calculations for intervention trials in primary care randomizing by primary care group: an empirical illustration from one proposed intervention trial. *Statistics in medicine*. 2001;20(3):367–76.
21. Shaygan M, Jaber A, Firozian R, Yazdani Z. Comparing the effects of multimedia and face-to-face pain management education on pain intensity and pain catastrophizing among patients with chronic low back pain: A randomized clinical trial. *Plos one*. 2022;17(6):e0269785.
22. Doig GS, Simpson F. Randomization and allocation concealment: a practical guide for researchers. *Journal of critical care*. 2005;20(2):187–91.
23. Deyo RA, Dworkin SF, Amtmann D, Andersson G, Borenstein D, Carragee E, et al. Report of the NIH Task Force on research standards for chronic low back pain. *Physical therapy*. 2015;95(2):e1–18.
24. Roland M, Fairbank J. The Roland–Morris disability questionnaire and the Oswestry disability questionnaire. *Spine*. 2000;25(24):3115–24.
25. Luszczynska A, Scholz U, Schwarzer R. The general self-efficacy scale: multicultural validation studies. *The Journal of psychology*. 2005;139(5):439–57.
26. Lara-Cabrera ML, Bjørkly S, De las Cuevas C, Pedersen SA, Mundal IP. Psychometric properties of the Five-item World Health Organization Well-being Index used in mental health services: Protocol for a systematic review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2020;76(9):2426–33.
27. Manderlier A, de Foz M, Patris S, Berquin A. Modifiable lifestyle-related prognostic factors for the onset of chronic spinal pain: a systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Annals of physical and rehabilitation medicine*. 2022;65(6):101660.
28. Wijma AJ, van Wilgen CP, Meeus M, Nijs J. Clinical biopsychosocial physiotherapy assessment of patients with chronic pain: The first step in pain neuroscience education. *Physiotherapy theory and practice*. 2016;32(5):368–84.
29. Nijs J, Clark J, Malfliet A, Ickmans K, Voogt L, Don S, et al. In the spine or in the brain? Recent advances in pain neuroscience applied in the intervention for low back pain. *Clin Exp Rheumatol*. 2017;35(5):108–15.
30. Nijs J, Malfliet A, Ickmans K, Baert I, Meeus M. Treatment of central sensitization in patients with ‘unexplained’ chronic pain: an update. *Expert opinion on pharmacotherapy*. 2014;15(12):1671–83.
31. Nijs J, Torres-Cueco R, Van Wilgen P, Lluch Girbés E, Struyf F, Roussel N, et al. Applying modern pain neuroscience in clinical practice: criteria for the classification of central sensitization pain. *Pain physician*. 2014;17(5):447–57.
32. Cruz EB, Canhão H, Fernandes R, Caeiro C, Branco JC, Rodrigues AM, et al. Prognostic indicators for poor outcomes in low back pain patients consulted in primary care. *Plos one*. 2020;15(3):e0229265.


33. Rabey M, Smith A, Beales D, Slater H, O'Sullivan P. Multidimensional prognostic modelling in people with chronic axial low back pain. *The Clinical Journal of Pain*. 2017;33(10):877–91.
34. Fernández-Gualda MÁ, Ariza-Vega P, Lozano-Lozano M, Cantarero-Villanueva I, Martín-Martín L, Castro-Martín E, et al. Persistent pain management in an oncology population through pain neuroscience education, a multimodal program: PaiNEd randomized clinical trial protocol. *Plos one*. 2023;18(8):e0290096.
35. Bilterys T, Kregel J, Nijs J, Meeus M, Danneels L, Cagnie B, et al. Influence of education level on the effectiveness of pain neuroscience education: A secondary analysis of a randomized controlled trial. *Musculoskeletal Science and Practice*. 2022;57:102494.
36. Mattila VM, Sahi T, Jormanainen V, Pihlajamäki H. Low back pain and its risk indicators: a survey of 7,040 Finnish male conscripts. *European Spine Journal*. 2008;17:64–9.
37. Rabiei P, Sheikhi B, Letafatkar A. Comparing Pain Neuroscience Education Followed by Motor Control Exercises With Group-Based Exercises for Chronic Low Back Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Pain Practice*. 2021;21(3):333–42.
38. Ibrahim AA, Akindele MO, Ganiyu SO. Motor control exercise and patient education program for low resource rural community dwelling adults with chronic low back pain: a pilot randomized clinical trial. *Journal of exercise rehabilitation*. 2018;14(5):851.
39. Jordan K, Dunn KM, Lewis M, Croft P. A minimal clinically important difference was derived for the Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire for low back pain. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2006;59(1):45–52.
40. Topp CW, Østergaard SD, Søndergaard S, Bech P. The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*. 2015;84(3):167–76.
41. Ferrari S, Vanti C, Pellizzer M, Dozza L, Monticone M, Pillastrini P. Is there a relationship between self-efficacy, disability, pain and sociodemographic characteristics in chronic low back pain? A multicenter retrospective analysis. *Archives of Physiotherapy*. 2019;9:1–9.
42. Wood L, Hendrick PA. A systematic review and meta-analysis of pain neuroscience education for chronic low back pain: Short-and long-term outcomes of pain and disability. *European Journal of Pain*. 2019;23(2):234–49.
43. Saracoglu I, Arik MI, Afsar E, Gokpınar HH. The short-term effects of neuroscience pain education on quality of life in patients with chronic low back pain: a single-blinded randomized controlled trial. *European Journal of Integrative Medicine*. 2020;33:101046.
44. Sun JN, Chen W, Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Feng S, Chen XY. Does cognitive behavioral education reduce pain and improve joint function in patients after total knee arthroplasty? A randomized controlled trial. *International Orthopaedics*. 2020;44:2027–35.
45. Bilmiç E, Selçukbiricik F, Bağcivan G. The effectiveness of an online pain management education on the patients related barriers to cancer pain management: A randomized control trial. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing*. 2023;102422.
46. Louw A, Diener I, Butler DS, Puentedura EJ. The effect of neuroscience education on pain, disability, anxiety, and stress in chronic musculoskeletal pain. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*. 2011;92(12):2041–56.
47. Moseley GL, Nicholas MK, Hodges PW. A randomized controlled trial of intensive neurophysiology education in chronic low back pain. *The Clinical journal of pain*. 2004;20(5):324–30.

48. Costa L da CM, Maher CG, McAuley JH, Hancock MJ, Smeets RJ. Self-efficacy is more important than fear of movement in mediating the relationship between pain and disability in chronic low back pain. *European Journal of Pain*. 2011;15(2):213–9.



Figure

**CONSORT 2010 Flow Diagram**



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297833>; this version posted October 31, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**Figure 1 Consort participants flow diagram**