

# 1 **Divergent treatment responses in chronic pain: Identifying** 2 **subgroups of patients through cluster analysis.**

3

4 Mienke Rijdsdijk<sup>1\*</sup>, Hidde M. Smits<sup>2</sup>, Hazal R. Azizoglu<sup>1</sup>, Sylvia Brugman<sup>3</sup>, Yoeri van de  
5 Burgt<sup>4</sup> Tessa C. van Charldorp<sup>5</sup>, Dewi J. van Gelder<sup>6</sup>, Janny C. de Grauw<sup>7</sup> Eline A. van  
6 Lange<sup>8</sup>, Frank J. Meye<sup>9</sup>, Madelijn Strick<sup>10</sup>, Hedi Walravens<sup>1</sup>, Laura H.H. Winkens<sup>6</sup>, Frank  
7 Huygen<sup>1,8</sup>, Julia Drylewicz<sup>2</sup>, Hanneke L.D.M. Willemen<sup>2</sup>.

8

## 9 **Affiliations**

- 10 1. Pain Clinic, Department of Anesthesiology, University Medical Center Utrecht,  
11 Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- 12 2. Center for Translational Immunology (CTI), University Medical Center Utrecht,  
13 Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- 14 3. Wageningen University and Research, Animal Sciences Group, Host Microbe  
15 Interactomics, Wageningen, the Netherlands
- 16 4. Microsystems, Institute for Complex Molecular Systems, Eindhoven University of  
17 Technology, Netherlands
- 18 5. Languages, Literature and Communication, Faculty of Humanities, Utrecht  
19 University, Utrecht, the Netherlands.
- 20 6. Consumption and Healthy Lifestyles Chair group, Wageningen University and  
21 Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

22 7. Department of Clinical Sciences, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University,  
23 the Netherlands; Department of Clinical Sciences and Services, Royal Veterinary  
24 College, Hatfield, United Kingdom.

25 8. Pain Clinic, Department of Anesthesiology, Erasmus Medical Center Rotterdam, The  
26 Netherlands. Technical physician, Msc, [e.vanlange@erasmusmc.nl](mailto:e.vanlange@erasmusmc.nl)

27 9. University Medical Center Utrecht , Department of Translational Neuroscience,  
28 Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

29 10. Social, Health, and Organizational Psychology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The  
30 Netherlands.

31

32 **\*Corresponding author.** Dr. M. Rijdsdijk, MD, PhD.

33 Address: Pain Clinic, Department of Anesthesiology, University Medical Center Utrecht,  
34 Heidelberglaan 100, 3584 CX Utrecht, the Netherlands.

35 E-mail: [m.rijdsdijk-2@umcutrecht.nl](mailto:m.rijdsdijk-2@umcutrecht.nl)

36 Telephone number: +31 88 7574408

37

38 Number of text pages:27

39 Number of figures: 2

40 Number of tables: 5

41

42

## 43 **Abstract**

44

45 **Background:** Chronic pain is an ill-defined disease with complex biopsychosocial aspects,  
46 posing treatment challenges. We hypothesize that treatment failure results, at least partly,  
47 from limited understanding of diverse patient subgroups. We aim to identify subgroups  
48 through psychometric data, allowing for more tailored interventions.

49 **Methods:** For this retrospective cohort study, we extracted patient-reported data from two  
50 Dutch tertiary multidisciplinary outpatient pain clinics (2018-2023) for unsupervised  
51 hierarchical clustering. Clusters were defined by anxiety, depression, pain catastrophizing,  
52 and kinesiophobia. Sociodemographics, pain characteristics, diagnosis, lifestyle, health-  
53 related quality of life (HRQoL) and treatment efficacy were compared among clusters. A  
54 prediction model was built utilizing a minimum set of questions to reliably assess cluster  
55 allocation.

56 **Results:** Among 5,454 patients with chronic pain, three clusters emerged. Cluster 1 (n=750)  
57 was characterized by high psychological burden, low HRQoL, lower educational levels and  
58 employment rates, and more smoking. Cluster 2 (n=1,795) showed low psychological burden,  
59 intermediate HRQoL, higher educational levels and employment rates, and more alcohol  
60 consumption. Cluster 3 (n=2,909) showed intermediate features. Pain reduction following  
61 treatment was least in cluster 1 (28.6% after capsaicin patch, 18.2% after multidisciplinary  
62 treatment), compared to >50% in clusters 2 and 3. A model incorporating 15 psychometric  
63 questions reliably predicted cluster allocation.

64 **In conclusion,** our study identifies distinct chronic pain patient clusters through 15  
65 psychometric questions, revealing one cluster with notably poorer response to conventional  
66 treatment. Our prediction model may help clinicians improve treatment by allowing patient-  
67 subgroup targeted therapy according to cluster allocation.

68

69

70 **In brief**

71 Hierarchical clustering of chronic pain patients revealed three clusters based on pain  
72 experience and psychological welfare, with diverse sociodemographics and treatment effects  
73 suggesting potential for tailored interventions.

74 **Keywords:** Chronic pain, Phenotyping, Cluster analysis, Patient-reported measures

75

## 76 **Introduction**

77 Every day, health care providers face challenges treating chronic pain patients, as treatment  
78 effects for this condition are often disappointing. The "numbers needed to treat (NNT)" for  
79 commonly used analgesic drugs, such as anti-neuropathic drugs and opioids, fall within the 3  
80 to 10 range [1]. Recognizing that, depending on the drug, 3 to 10 patients need to be treated  
81 for a 50% pain reduction to be achieved in one patient, can be disheartening, as it entails  
82 treatment failure in the remaining patients. This is especially poignant as analgesic drugs  
83 prescribed for chronic pain can have serious side effects, such as opioid dependency and  
84 substance use disorder, which has contributed to the opioid crisis we are currently facing [2].  
85 Hence, our approach to chronic pain treatment demands a transformation, and a potential  
86 solution involves deepening our understanding of the distinct characteristics found in clinical  
87 subgroups of patients experiencing chronic pain [3,4]. The identification of such subgroups  
88 could improve pain management by allowing treatment to be tailored to the needs and  
89 characteristics of each subgroup, ultimately reducing the NNT for specific analgesic  
90 interventions.

91

92 Identification of such patient subgroups should include biopsychosocial components, as  
93 chronic pain is a complex multi-faceted problem with important biological (e.g., genetics),  
94 psychological (e.g., anxiety, depression, pain catastrophizing), and social (e.g., low  
95 educational attainment, poor social support) factors all determining the experience of chronic  
96 pain. Several studies have supported the hypothesis that different subgroups of patients exist  
97 within different chronic pain populations, such as chronic low back pain [5],  
98 temporomandibular disorder [6] and fibromyalgia [7], whereas other studies have attempted  
99 to cluster patients in heterogenous chronic pain populations with a mix of painful conditions

100 [8–12]. The available studies highly vary in their use of clustering variables, psychometric  
101 instruments and statistical methods. Clusters were based on unidimensional variables of pain-  
102 related characteristics such as pain location [9], or used a more multidimensional approach  
103 [8,10–12]. Combining the main results of these studies, 2 to 4 reliable clusters emerge with  
104 psychiatric symptoms such as anxiety and depression, as well as the psychological construct  
105 of catastrophizing, proving most important for cluster allocation. A clear relation with the  
106 biomedical domain (including pain diagnosis) and the social domain (including lifestyle,  
107 educational level and employment) is still missing. Likewise, it remains unclear whether  
108 different subgroups respond differently to some analgesic therapies than other subgroups.

109

110 The current study aimed to identify different chronic pain subgroups, incorporating aspects  
111 from all three dimensions of the biopsychosocial model. Data were derived from validated  
112 questionnaires that were used to assess mental and social health status variables in a  
113 heterogenous patient population in a tertiary outpatient pain clinic setting. The derived  
114 subgroups were compared in terms of sociodemographic characteristics, lifestyle factors,  
115 perceived health related quality of life (HRQoL), pain diagnosis, and treatment response. A  
116 secondary aim was to alleviate the burden on patients currently tasked with completing  
117 multiple (extensive) pain questionnaires, by identifying those questions that are essential for  
118 cluster allocation, and suggesting a concise questionnaire for this purpose.

119

## 120 **Methods**

### 121 **Study design**

122 In this retrospective observational cohort study all chronic pain patients referred to the tertiary  
123 multidisciplinary outpatient pain clinic of the University Medical Center Utrecht (UMCU)  
124 between May 2018 and May 2021, and of the Erasmus Medical Center Rotterdam (EMC),

125 The Netherlands, between January 2017 and March 2023, were included. The Medical  
126 Research Ethics Committees of the UMCU (MEC-21/358) and of the EMC (MEC-2023-  
127 0161) both approved this study and waived the requirement to obtain informed consent.

128

## 129 **Data collection**

130 Data were derived from questionnaires and standard entry boxes in the electronic health  
131 records that were collected as part of routine clinical care. Patients completed online  
132 questionnaires prior to their initial visit to the outpatient pain clinic. A combination of  
133 different patient-reported measures related to pain characteristics, psychological distress and  
134 health related quality of life (HRQoL) variables were included. These are described below.

135

## 136 **Sociodemographics**

137 Sociodemographic variables assessed were age (years), gender, Body Mass Index (BMI;  
138 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), lifestyle behaviors (alcohol consumption, drug use, smoking), having children,  
139 employment status, educational level, marital status and major life events (presence or  
140 absence, open to patients' own definition).

141

## 142 **Pain intensity, characteristics, duration and interference**

143 *Pain intensity* was assessed using a 0 to 10 Numerical Rating Scale (NRS), with 0 equating to  
144 no pain and 10 to the worst imaginable pain, for the average, minimal and maximal pain  
145 intensity in the previous week.

146 We addressed *pain characteristics* in the UMCU using the first two questions of the Douleur  
147 Neuropathique en 4 (DN4) questionnaire comprising seven items (i.e., burning, painful cold,  
148 electric shock, pins and needles, tingling, numbness and pruritus) with a dichotomous yes-no  
149 scale. The total sum scores ranged from 0-7, with a cut-off point of  $\geq 3$  suggesting

150 neuropathic pain [13]. The (Dutch) DN-4 has been validated in the general chronic pain  
151 population [14]. In the EMC, pain characteristics were assessed using the validated  
152 PainDetect, a 9-item self-report screening questionnaire [15]. It measures seven aspects of the  
153 quality of the pain experienced (i.e., burning, tingling, electric shocks, cold and heat  
154 hypersensitivity, numbness and pressure pain), the chronological pattern (time course), and  
155 whether or not the pain radiates. It is scored from 0 to 38, with total scores of less than 12  
156 considered to represent nociceptive pain, 13–18 possible neuropathic pain, and scores  $\geq 19$   
157 representing  $>90\%$  likelihood of neuropathic pain.

158 For *pain duration*, patients indicated whether their pain persisted for more or less than one  
159 year.

160 *Pain interference* was assessed using the short form of Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) including  
161 seven items: general activity, mood, walking ability, normal work, relation with other people,  
162 sleep, and enjoyment of life. Each item was presented separately and was rated on a NRS  
163 scale from 0 to 10, with 0 indicating ‘no interference of pain with daily functioning’ and 10  
164 ‘complete interference’[16,17].

165

## 166 **Pain diagnosis**

167 Patients were diagnosed during their first visit to the outpatient pain clinic by their attending  
168 anesthesiologist-pain specialist, shortly after filling out the questionnaires. Pain diagnoses  
169 were assessed according to the International Classification of Diseases 10 registry (ICD-10)  
170 [18].

171

## 172 **Treatment effect**

173 Treatment effect was assessed using the *Global Perceived Effect (GPE)* questionnaire. The  
174 GPE asks the patient to rate, on a 7-point Likert scale, how much their condition has



175 improved or deteriorated since the start of treatment [19]. In the UMCU cohort a subgroup of  
176 patients with peripheral neuropathic pain or scar pain received a high concentration capsaicin  
177 8% skin patch. Treatment effect was measured 14 days after capsaicin treatment. In the EMC  
178 cohort, treatment effect was measured three months after treatment initiation  
179 (multidisciplinary treatment) at the tertiary pain clinic.

180

### 181 **Psychological distress variables**

182 Psychological distress was measured using three different questionnaires. The *Hospital*  
183 *Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS)* self-assessment questionnaire assesses the level of  
184 anxiety and depression symptoms [20,21]. The *Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS)* assesses  
185 catastrophizing in three dimensions: magnification, rumination and helplessness [22–24]. The  
186 *Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia (TSK)* questionnaire assesses fear of movement and injury  
187 [25].

188

### 189 **Health-related Quality of life**

190 In the UMCU cohort, patients completed either the European Quality of Life instrument  
191 (EQ5D) or 12-item Short Form Health Survey (SF-12), because clinical practice changed  
192 during the study period, with a switch from the EQ5D to the SF-12. In the EMC cohort, the  
193 36-item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) was used. Details of the abovementioned  
194 questionnaires are reported in the Supplementary file to this methods section.

195

### 196 **Statistical analyses**

197 A statistical analysis plan was formalized before accessing the data for the primary outcome.  
198 No statistical power calculation was conducted prior to the study and all available data were  
199 included. Hierarchical clustering was performed on psychometric data using the individual

200 questions of the HADS-A, HADS-D, PCS and TSK questionnaires. We chose these  
201 questionnaires as they were the only questionnaires used by both study centres. We decided to  
202 leave HRQoL out of the cluster analysis, as patients filled out either the EQ5D, the SF12, or  
203 the SF-36, which would lead to exclusion of a large number of patients.

204 All patients with at least one missing value for one of the questions were excluded from this  
205 analysis. No imputation of missing data was performed as this could influence the clustering  
206 analysis.

207 Cluster analysis was performed using squared Euclidean distances to determine the similarity  
208 and Ward's minimum variance as the clustering method to minimize within-cluster  
209 differences.

210 The derived clusters were compared for pain intensity, duration, characteristics and  
211 interference, pain diagnosis, sociodemographic variables, and HRQoL using one-way  
212 ANOVA for normally distributed continuous variables and Pearsons-Chi-square tests for  
213 categorical variables. Continuous data were expressed as mean with 95% confidence  
214 intervals, categorical data as counts and percentages, and medians with interquartile range  
215 were chosen for NRS data. Statistical significance was set at  $p \leq 0.01$  to account for multiple  
216 testing. Subsequently, effect sizes of the observed significant differences were estimated using  
217 eta squared with  $<0.06$  classified as small,  $0.06$  to  $0.14$  as medium and  $\geq 0.14$  as a larger  
218 effect size, or using Cramér's V with  $0.1$  to  $0.3$  as a small,  $0.3$  to  $0.5$  as a medium, and  $\geq 0.5$   
219 as a large effect size (47).

220 The random forest model was used as a prediction model for which the UMCU cohort was the  
221 discovery cohort and the EMC cohort acted as the validation cohort.

222 Differences in treatment effect were based on the results of the GPE and percentage of change  
223 in the NRS score between baseline and follow-up. Answers to the GPE were reduced to a  
224 dichotomous variable of "improved" (including little improvement, much improvement, and

225 fully recovered) or “not improved” (including unchanged, little worse, much worse, and very  
226 bad) after treatment. Differences in treatment effects were analysed using a Pearsons-Chi-  
227 square test with improvement yes/no as outcome parameter, and a paired T-test for pain  
228 decrease (NRS) as outcome measure. Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS  
229 Statistics version 26.0 to compare derived clusters for pain intensity, duration, characteristics  
230 and interference, pain diagnosis, sociodemographic variables, and HRQoL) and R version  
231 4.2.2.

232


## 233 **Results**

### 234 **Sample description**

235 In total, 8,133 patients were included in the study, of whom 2,654 were referred to the UMCU  
236 and 5,479 to the EMC. Of these, 1,043 (UMCU; 39%) and 1,636 (EMC; 30%) were excluded  
237 due to one or more missing values in the questionnaires used for cluster analysis, resulting in  
238 1,611 UMCU patients and 3,843 EMC patients in the final analysis (Fig 1).

239

240 **Fig 1. Flowchart of study population**



241

242

243 The patients in the UMCU cohort were slightly older than in the EMC cohort (mean age 54.5  
 244 years (95% CI 53.7-55.4) versus 49.9 (95% CI 49.4 -50.4)). There were fewer females  
 245 included in the UMCU population (53.9% females versus 64.2% in the EMC). The majority  
 246 in both cohorts was married or cohabiting (UMCU 77.3% and EMC 75.0%) and had children  
 247 (UMCU 71.5% and EMC 68.2%). A minority of patients was employed (UMCU 35.8% and  
 248 EMC 37.1%) (Table 1).

249

250 **Table 1. Sociodemographics, pain intensity, duration, character, interference and**  
 251 **health-related quality of life in the study population (University Medical Center Utrecht**  
 252 **and Erasmus Medical Center Rotterdam).**

Variables	Total sample	Total ample
-----------	--------------	-------------

	<b>UMCU (n=1,611)</b>	<b>EMC (n=3,855)</b>
Age (y)	54.5 (53.7-55.4)	49.9 (49.4-50.4)
Gender (female)	829 (53.9%)	2478 (64.2%)
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	26.7 (25.9-27.5)	24.2 (23.2-25.1)
Daily smoking (yes)	269 (17.3%)	638 (23.6%)
Regular alcohol consumption (>3 days per week yes/no)	273 (17.5%)	NA
Drugs (used once or more, yes/no)	102 (6.6%)	NA
Highest educational level		
-Primary education	40 (2.9%)	318 (8.3%)
-Secondary education	578 (41.8%)	825 (21.4%)
-Vocational education	388 (27.9%)	1727 (44.9%)
-University	87 (6.3%)	897 (23.3%)
-Education not specified	291 (21.1%)	80 (2.1%)
Employment status		
-Student	38 (2.5%)	114 (4.2%)
-Retired	397 (25.7%)	468 (17.3%)
-Homemaker	49 (3.2%)	256 (9.5%)
-Volunteer	34 (2.2%)	NA
-Unemployed	462 (29.9%)	811 (30.0%)
-Employed	552 (35.8%)	1003 (37.1%)
-Other	11 (0.7%)	50 (1.8%)
Marital status		
-Single	353 (22.7%)	956 (24.9%)

-Cohabitation/marriage	1200 (77.3%)	2891 (75%)
Children (yes)	1114 (71.5%)	1842 (68.2%)
Life-changing events (yes)	830 (54.2%)	NA
Average pain (NRS)	7 (2)	8 (2)
Minimum Pain (NRS)	4 (3)	5 (4)
Maximum Pain (NRS)	9 (2)	9 (1)
Pain duration (%) $\geq$ 1 year	71.3%	86.4%
Neuropathy (DN4)		
Median	5 (3)	NA
Score >3 (%)	71.4%	NA
Neuropathy (PD)	NA	39.9%
>90% Certainty (%)		
Brief Pain Inventory		
General Activity	7 (3)	7 (2)
Mood	6 (4)	7 (3)
Walking ability	7 (5)	7 (5)
Normal Work	7 (3)	8 (3)
Relations with other people	5 (5)	6 (5)
Sleep	7 (4)	7 (4)
Enjoyment of life	6 (5)	7 (5)
Health-Related Quality of Life		
SF12 Physical	25.4 (24.8-26.0)	NA
SF12 Mental	42.8 (42.3-43.3)	NA
SF36 Physical	NA	31.9 (31.6-32.1)
SF36 Mental	NA	45.1 (44.8-45.4)

EQ5D-VAS (0-100)	42.8 (40.8-44.8)	NA
EQ5D Index	0.74 (0.73-0.75)	NA

253 **Table 1 Legend.** Sociodemographics, pain intensity, duration, character, interference and  
 254 health-related quality of life in the study population (University Medical Center Utrecht and  
 255 Erasmus Medical Center Rotterdam).

256 Data expressed as mean (95% confidence interval), median (IQR) or count (%).

257 BMI: Body Mass Index; DN4: Douleur Neuropathique en 4; EMC: Erasmus Medical Center  
 258 Rotterdam; EQ5D: European Quality of Life instrument 5; EQ5DVAS: European Quality of  
 259 Life instrument 5-Visual Analogue Scale; NRS: Numeric Rating Scale; PD: PainDetect;  
 260 SF12: Short Form-12; SF36: Short Form-36; UMCU: University Medical Center Utrecht.

261

262 In the EMC cohort, more patients had experienced pain for more than 1 year (86.4% versus  
 263 71.3% in the UMCU cohort), with no difference in pain intensity between the cohorts (median  
 264 NRS in the past week in UMCU cohort was 7 (IQR= 5-9) versus 8 (IQR= 6-10) in the EMC).

265 We cannot meaningfully compare presence of neuropathic pain characteristics between both  
 266 cohorts as two different questionnaires (DN4 and PainDetect) were used (Table 1). In the  
 267 UMCU cohort, the most common diagnoses were radicular syndrome (24.7%), mechanical  
 268 spine related pain (11.6%), and mononeuropathy (8.1%) (Table 2). In the EMC, this was  
 269 “other neuropathic pain“ (17.5%), radicular syndrome (17.0%) and tendomyogenic pain  
 270 (12.1%) (S1 Table).

271

272 **Table 2. Frequencies of the 10 most common diagnoses in each cluster for the discovery**  
 273 **cohort (UMCU)**

	Total	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	X <sup>2</sup> (df)	p-value
Top 10 Diagnoses (%)					79.1 (62)	0.070

1. Radicular syndrome	24.7%	17.1%	26.5%	24.6%
2. Mechanical spine related pain	11.6%	11.0%	10.5%	13.2%
3. Mononeuropathy	8.1%	8.8%	8.8%	7.1%
4. Joint pain	7.3%	8.3%	7.4%	6.9%
5. Polyneuropathy	5.7%	6.6%	4.8%	6.4%
6. Post-surgical pain	5.6%	5.5%	5.2%	6.1%
7. Orofacial pain	4.4%	3.9%	4.3%	4.7%
8. Abdominal pain	4.2%	3.3%	4.8%	3.7%
9. Myofascial pain	4.2%	5.0%	4.5%	3.7%
10. Widespread pain	2.4%	6.1%	2.0%	1.8%

---

274 **Table 2 Legend.** *Frequencies of the 10 most common diagnoses in each cluster for the*  
275 *discovery cohort (UMCU). Data expressed as percentage per cluster. Significance levels*  
276 *computed by Pearson-Chi square. There is no missing data.*

277


### 278 **Hierarchical clustering revealed 3 clusters of patients.**

279 We first performed a hierarchical clustering on the combined datasets (UMCU and EMC)  
280 using the individual questions of the HADS-A, HADS-D, PCS and TSK questionnaires. We  
281 identified 3 distinct clusters of patients: Cluster 1 included 750 patients (13.8%), Cluster 2  
282 1,795 patients (32.9%), and Cluster 3 comprised of 2,909 patients (53.3%) (Fig 2). When  
283 performing separate hierarchical clustering on the datasets (i.e., UMCU data separate from  
284 EMC data), we found that more than 75% of the patients were assigned to the same cluster  
285 (not shown).

286



287 **Fig 2. Hierarchical clustering dendrogram of the cohorts combined (UMCU and EMC).**



*Hierarchical cluster analysis showing three clusters: Cluster 1 (red), Cluster 2 (blue) and Cluster 3 (green). X-axis representing the individual questions of three questionnaires (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS), and Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia (TSK). Y-axis representing included patients.*

Cluster 1 was characterized by higher scores for anxiety (HADS-A mean 13.4; 95%CI=13.1-13.7), depression (HADS-D mean 13.6 (95%CI=13.3-13.9)), catastrophizing (PCS mean 43.6; 95%CI=43.2-44.0) and kinesiophobia or pain related fear (TSK mean 46.9; 95%CI=46.4-47.4). Cluster 2 on the other hand was characterized by the lowest scores for each of these characteristics (HADS-A mean 3.7; 95%CI=3.6-3.8, HADS-D mean 4.1; 95%CI=4.0-4.3, PCS mean 10.3; 95%CI=10.0-10.6 and TSK 34.0; 95%CI=33.7-34.3), while cluster 3 showed intermediate scores, at or just passing the cut-off scores for anxiety, depression,

302 catastrophizing and kinesiophobia (HADS-A 7.1; 95%CI=6.9-7.2, HADS-D 7.9; 95%CI=7.7-  
303 8.0, PCS 26.8; 95%CI=26.5-27.1 and TSK 40.1; 95%CI=39.9-40.4) (Table 3).

304 **Table 3. Clustering characteristics in the total study population (UMCU and EMC) and comparison among the clusters.**

Variables	Total sample (n=5454)	Cluster 1 (n=750, 13.8%)	Cluster 2 (n=1795, 32.9%)	Cluster 3 (n=2909, 53.3 %)	<i>p</i> -value	<i>Effect size</i> <i>Eta-squared</i>
Anxiety (HADS-A)	6.8 (6.7-7.0)	13.4 (13.1-13.7)	3.7 (3.6-3.8)	7.1 (6.9-7.2)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.455</b>
-Signs of anxiety disorder (Score >8 (%))	30.6%	87.3%	3.7%	32.7%		
-Clinical significant anxiety disorder (Score >10 (%))	20.4%	78.3%	1.0%	17.4%		
Depression (HADS-D)	7.4 (7.3-7.6)	13.6 (13.3-13.9)	4.1 (4.0-4.3)	7.9 (7.7-8.0)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.373</b>
-Signs of depression (Score >8 (%))	39.3%	89.5%	11.8%	43.4%		
-Clinical significant depression (Score >10 (%))	27.4%	78.3%	5.0%	28.2%		

Pain catastrophizing (PCS) Total score	23.7 (23.3-24.0)	43.6 (43.2-44.0)	10.3 (10.0-10.6)	26.8 (26.5-27.1)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.703</b>
Rumination	8.8 (8.7-9.0)	14.5 (14.4-14.6)	4.5 (4.3-4.6)	10.1 (10.0-10.2)		
Magnification	3.4 (3.3-3.4)	8.5 (8.3-8.7)	0.9 (0.8-0.9)	3.6 (3.5-3.7)		
Helplessness	11.5 (11.3-11.6)	20.6 (20.4-20.8)	5.0 (4.8-5.1)	13.1 (13.0-13.3)		
Pain-related fear (TSK)	39.0 (38.8-39.2)	46.9 (46.4-47.4)	34.0 (33.7-34.3)	40.1 (39.9-40.4)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.273</b>

305 **Table 3 Legend.** Clustering characteristics in the total study population (UMCU and EMC) and comparison among the clusters.

306 Data expressed as mean (95% confidence interval) or percentage (%) of count data. Statistics computed by one-way ANOVA and effect sizes are  
307 calculated with eta squared with  $<0.06$  as small,  $0.06$  to  $0.14$  as medium and  $\geq 0.14$  as a larger effect size,

308 EMC: Erasmus Medical Center Rotterdam; HADS-A and HADS-D: Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; PCS: Pain Catastrophizing Scale;

309 TSK: Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia; UMCU: University Medical Center Utrecht.

310 PCS subcategories represent the sum of following items 'Rumination' 8,9, 10 and 11; Magnification 6, 7 and 13; 'Helplessness' 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and

311 12. Percentage of missing data: HADS 0%, PCA 0%, TSK 0%

312

313

314 Signs of a clinically significant anxiety and/or depression disorder (HADS-A and HADS-D  
315 above 12, for which patients may be referred to a psychiatrist for additional diagnostic testing)  
316 were far more frequently observed in cluster 1 (78.3% anxiety disorder and 78.3% depression  
317 disorder; p-value <0.001) compared to cluster 2 (anxiety disorder 1.0% and depression  
318 disorder 5%, p-value <0.001) and cluster 3 (anxiety disorder 17.4% and depression disorder  
319 28.2%; p-value <0.001) (Table 3).

320

321 **Differences between the clusters in sociodemographic**  
322 **characteristics, lifestyle behaviors, and pain characteristics.**

323 Regarding *sociodemographic characteristics and lifestyle behaviors*, patients in cluster 1  
324 smoked tobacco more often, and were more often single. Patients in cluster 2 consumed more  
325 alcohol (in UMCU cohort; this was not recorded in the EMC cohort), had the highest  
326 educational levels, and the highest employment rates (Table 4, and S2 Table).

**Table 4. Sociodemographics, pain intensity, duration, character, interference and health-related quality of life in the discovery cohort (UMCU) and comparison among the clusters.**

Variables	Total sample (n=1,611)	Cluster 1 (n=181, 11.2%)	Cluster 2 (n=807, 50.1%)	Cluster 3 (n=623, 38.7%)	$\chi^2$ (df)	p-value	Effect size
Age (y)	54.5 (53.7-55.4)	53.7 (51.3-56.1)	54.7 (53.5-55.9)	54.6 (53.2-56.0)		0.776	
Gender (female)	829 (53.9%)	50%	56.1%	52.3%		0.202	
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	26.7 (25.9-27.5)	26.9 (25.5-28.3)	27.1 (25.6-28.5)	26.2 (25.4-27.0)		0.578	
Daily smoking (yes)	269 (17.3%)	26.0%	11.8%	21.8%	34.5 (2)	<0.001	0.149
Regular alcohol consumption (>3 days per week yes/no)	273 (17.5%)	9.0%	20.9%	15.7%	16.4 (2)	<0.001	0.103
Drugs (used once or more, yes/no)	102 (6.6%)	7.3%	5.5%	7.7%	2.8 (2)	0.250	
Highest educational level					108.5 (8)	<0.001	0.198
-Primary education	40 (2.9%)	13.5%	0.9%	2.2%			

-Secondary education	578 (41.8%)	47.2%	36.0%	47.4%	
-Vocational education	388 (27.9%)	24.5%	29.7%	26.8%	
-University	87 (6.3%)	5.0%	7.9%	4.7%	
-Education not specified	291 (21.1%)	9.8%	25.5%	18.9%	
Employment status					136.9 (18) <0.001 0.211
-Student	38 (2.5%)	1.1%	2.6%	2.7%	
-Retired	397 (25.7%)	25.3%	26.9%	24.3%	
-Homemaker	49 (3.2%)	4.0%	2.1%	4.4%	
-Volunteer	34 (2.2%)	2.9%	1.9%	2.4%	
-Unemployed	462 (29.9%)	48.9%	21.4%	35.6%	
-Employed	552 (35.8%)	14.9%	44.7%	30.2%	
-Other	11 (0.7%)	2.9%	0.4%	0.5%	
Marital status					15.7 (2) <0.001 0.101
-Single	353 (22.7%)	33.3%	19.7%	23.6%	
-Cohabitation/marriage	1200 (77.3%)	66.6%	80.3%	76.4%	
Children (yes)	1114 (71.5%)	73.4%	70.6%	72.2%	0.7 (2) 0.690

Life-changing events (yes)	830 (54.2%)	50.9%	58.3%	49.9%	10.4 (2)	0.006	0.006
Average pain (NRS)	7 (2)	9 (1)	7 (2)	8 (1)	236.3 (20)	<0.001	0.275
Minimum Pain (NRS)	4 (3)	6 (3)	4 (3)	5 (3)	201.4 (20)	<0.001	0.254
Maximum Pain (NRS)	9 (2)	10 (1)	8 (1)	9 (2)	184.3 (20)	<0.001	0.243
Pain duration (%) $\geq$ 1 year	71.3%	76.8%	67.8%	74.1%	8.3 (2)	0.015	0.079
Neuropathy (DN-4) Total score	5 (3)	5 (3)	3 (3)	4 (3)	70.0 (20)	<0.001	0.150
Score >3 (%)	71.4%	83.6%	67.3%	73.2%			
Brief Pain Inventory							
General Activity	7 (3)	8 (2)	6 (3)	7 (2)	258.7 (20)	<0.001	0.288
Mood	6 (4)	8 (2)	5 (4)	7 (3)	<b>441.3 (20)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.376</b>
Walking ability	7 (5)	8 (2)	5 (6)	7 (3)	167.7 (20)	<0.001	0.232
Normal Work	7 (3)	9 (2)	7 (4)	8 (2)	239.6 (20)	<0.001	0.277
Relations with other	5 (5)	8 (3)	3 (6)	6 (4)	<b>321.7 (20)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.321</b>



people							
Sleep	7 (4)	8 (3)	6 (5)	7 (3)	189.7 (20)	<0.001	0.247
Enjoyment of life	6 (5)	8 (3)	5 (5)	7 (3)	<b>415.2 (20)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.365</b>
Health-Related Quality of life							
SF12 Physical	25.4 (24.8-26.0)	20.6 (19.2-22.0)	27.9 (27.0-28.8)	23.3 (22.5-24.1)		<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.089</b>
SF12 Mental	42.8 (42.3-43.3)	39.2 (38.0-40.4)	44.1 (43.4-44.8)	42.0 (41.2-42.7)		<0.001	0.048
EQ5D-VAS (0-100)	42.8 (40.8-44.8)	29.5 (23.5-35.6)	49.0 (46.2-51.8)	39.0 (36.0-42.1)		<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.070</b>
EQ5D Index	0.74 (0.73-0.75)	0.64 (0.63-0.66)	0.78 (0.78-0.79)	0.72 (0.71-0.73)		<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.334</b>

327 **Table 4 Legend.** Sociodemographics, pain intensity, duration, character, interference and health-related quality of life in the discovery cohort  
328 (UMCU) and comparison among the clusters.  
329 Sociodemographic data expressed as mean (95% confidence interval) or count (%). Questionnaire scores are expressed as median (interquartile  
330 range) or count (%). Statistics computed by one-Way ANOVA Test or Pearson Chi-Square test. Effect sizes for continuous data were estimated  
331 using eta squared with <0.06 as small, 0.06 to 0.14 as medium and  $\geq 0.14$  as a larger effect size. Effect sizes for categorical data are calculated  
332 with Cramer's V. Significance levels computed by Pearson Chi-Square test and effect sizes with Cramer's V indicating small 0.1 to 0.3, medium  
333 0.3 to 0.5 and large >0.5 effect sizes. **Significant differences with medium to large effect size are in bold.**

334 *Percentage of missing data: age 0.3%, gender 4.6%, BMI 76.0%, daily smoking 3.4%, regular alcohol 3.4%, drugs 3.4%, highest educational*  
335 *level 14.3%, employment status 4.3%, marital status 3.7%, children 3.4%, life-changing events 5.1%, pain NRS 0.2%, DN4 0,2%, BPI items*  
336 *0.2%, TSK, HADS 0.3%, PCS 0.2%, SF12 43.8%, EQ5D 59.5%.*

337 *BMI: Body Mass Index; DN4: Douleur Neuropathique en 4; EQ5D: European Quality of Life instrument 5; EQ5D`-VAS: European Quality of*  
338 *Life instrument 5-Visual Analogue Scale; NRS: Numeric Rating Scale; SF12: Short Form-12; UMCU: University Medical Center Utrecht.*

339

340

341 In the UMCU cohort, *pain* was most severe in cluster 1 with the highest intensity (median pain during the past week NRS 9; IQR= 8-10), longest  
342 duration (76.8% over one year) and highest prevalence of neuropath (83.6%). Cluster 2 showed lowest pain severity scores (NRS 7; IQR= 5-9,  
343 pain duration > 1 year in 67.8% of patients, 67.3% show signs of neuropathy) and cluster 3 intermediate scores (NRS 8; IQR= 7-9, pain duration  
344 > 1 year in 74.1% of patients, 73.2% signs of neuropathy). Differences were significant between groups (Table 4).

345 In the EMC cohort, some different observations were made. Pain intensity and duration were comparable between clusters. Signs of neuropathic  
346 pain however were most often observed in cluster 2 (50.8%), compared with 31.9% in cluster 1 and 39.5% in cluster 3. All differences had a  
347 small effect size (S2 Table).

348 In cluster 1, widespread pain (UMCU cohort) and tendomyogenic pain (EMC cohort) were most prevalent, and radicular syndrome least  
349 prevalent (both cohorts). Complex regional pain syndrome (EMC cohort) was most prevalent in cluster 2. For all other diagnoses, there were no  
350 clinically relevant differences in prevalence among clusters (Table 2, S1 Table). Pain influenced HRQoL most in cluster 1 in both cohorts (Table  
351 4, S2 Table).

352

### 353 **Treatment efficacy differs between clusters**

354 Next, we tested whether medical treatment efficacy was different between the three subgroups. In n=104 patients referred to the UMCU and  
355 receiving a Capsaicin 8% patch for peripheral neuropathic pain or scar pain, 28.6% of those in cluster 1 experienced improvement at 14 days  
356 follow up after treatment, compared to , 58.9% and 55.9% in cluster 2 and 3 respectively. In cluster 1, although patients reported a small

357 improvement on the GPE, maximum pain scores did not decrease significantly (NRS mean 8.9 (95%CI=8.4-9.5) to 8.6 (95%CI=8.0-9.3),  
358 p=0.391) at 14 days follow-up, while in cluster 2 and 3 a significant reduction in maximum pain scores was observed (cluster 2 NRS mean 8.1  
359 (95%CI=7.8-8.4) to 6.2 (95%CI=5.5-6.9), p<0.001; cluster 3 NRS mean 8.2 (95%CI=7.8-8.5) to 6.5 (95%CI=5.7-7.3), p<0.001) (Table 5).

360 Treatment outcome was assessed three months after baseline in n=497 (12.9%) patients who were referred to the EMC and received  
361 multidisciplinary pain treatment (all treatment options in the EMC are included). Improvement was reported in 18.2% of patients in cluster 1,  
362 compared to 51.0% in cluster 2, and 51.5% in cluster 3 (Table 5).

363

364 **Table 5. Treatment effect differs between cluster**

	<b>Cluster 1</b>	<b>Cluster 2</b>	<b>Cluster 3</b>	<b>Pearson Chi Square p-value</b>	<b>Cramer's <math>\phi</math></b>
<b>UMCU – Capsaicin 8% patch</b>	<i>N=14</i>	<i>N=56</i>	<i>N=34</i>		0.366
GPE improved	4 (28.6%)	33 (58.9%)	19 (55.9%)	Cluster 1 vs 2 p=0.119 Cluster 1 vs 3 p=0.267 Cluster 2 vs 3 p=0.992	0.367
Max NRS before treatment (mean)	8.9 (8.4-9.5)	8.1 (7.8-8.4)	8.2 (7.8-8.5)	NA	
Max NRS after treatment (mean)	8.6 (8.0-9.3)	6.2 (5.5-6.9)	6.5 (5.7-7.3)	NA	
<i>Paired t-test</i>	<i>0.391</i>	<i>&lt;0.001</i>	<i>&lt;0.001</i>		
<b>EMC-multidisciplinary pain treatment</b>	<i>N=11</i>	<i>N=257</i>	<i>N=229</i>		
GPE improved	2 (18.2%)	131 (51.0%)	118 (51.5%)	Cluster 1 vs 2 p=0.033 Cluster 1 vs 3	0.130 0.139

				p=0.031	368
				Cluster 2 vs 3	
				p=0.903	369

370 **Table 5 Legend.** *Treatment effect differs between cluster*

371 *Treatment effect (global perceived effect and pain numeric rating scale) were assessed two weeks after application of a capsaicin 8% patch in*  
372 *patients with peripheral neuropathic pain or scar pain in a subgroup of patient in the UMCU cohort. Treatment effect (global perceived effect)*  
373 *was assessed three months after baseline after a multidisciplinary treatment in the EMC cohort. All available data was used.*

374 *The global perceived effect was categorized to “improved” of “not improved (including no change)”. Data expressed as count (%).Significance*  
375 *levels computed by Pearson Chi-Square test and effect sizes with Cramer’s V indicating small 0.1 to 0.3, medium 0.3 to 0.5 and large >0.5 effect*  
376 *sizes.*

377 *The pain numeric rating scale was calculated as mean and baseline and follow up NRS scores were calculated within clusters using a paired-*  
378 *sample t-test. P-values <0.05 were regarded as significant.*

379

## 380 **Cluster membership prediction is accurate using only 15 questions**

381 In a post-hoc analysis, we next aimed to predict cluster membership by using the UMCU  
382 dataset as a discovery cohort and the EMC dataset as a validation cohort. Each patient (from  
383 the discovery and validation cohort) was assigned to the cluster defined in the analysis  
384 pooling both datasets together. We used a random forest approach to classify the patients of  
385 the discovery cohort and reached an overall accuracy of 86%, with overall high sensitivity and  
386 specificity for each cluster (S3A Table). The defined prediction model was then used on the  
387 validation cohort and the predicted memberships were compared to the ones assigned by the  
388 previously performed hierarchical clustering. When using all the questions (n=44), the  
389 accuracy was 72.6% and cluster specific sensitivity and specificity were high for cluster 1 and  
390 2 (S3A Table).

391 To reduce patients' burden in having to answer multiple lengthy questionnaires, we next  
392 investigated whether we could reduce the number of questions and still obtain adequate  
393 accuracy, sensitivity and specificity for the prediction model. An advantage of a random  
394 forest model is that it tells one which variables are most important to accurately predict  
395 classes. Hence, we again used the validation cohort, but this time with only the 20 most  
396 important questions (S1 Fig). This new model showed an accuracy of 70.3%, again with good  
397 sensitivity and specificity (S3B Table). Using the 15 most important questions resulted in an  
398 accuracy of 70.0% (S3C Table), while using the 10 most important questions yielded an  
399 accuracy of 69.6% but lower balanced accuracy (S3D Table). Overall, using the 15 most  
400 important questions seems to provide the best balance between number of questions and  
401 desired prediction accuracy. The balanced accuracy with 15 questions for clusters 1, 2 and 3  
402 was 91%, 84% and 68% respectively. The prediction model has an approximate sensitivity for  
403 cluster 1, 2 and 3 of 96%, 74% and 58%, and specificity of 86%, 95% and 77%, respectively.



404 The top three most important questions for cluster allocation were 1. “I still enjoy the things I  
405 used to enjoy”, 2 “Worrying thoughts go through my mind”, and 3. When I’m in pain it’s  
406 awful and I feel that it overwhelms me.”

407

## 408 **Discussion**

409 Treatment failure in chronic pain patients is very common. Our aim was to identify subgroups  
410 of patients that are more or less likely to respond to certain interventions, so we can tailor  
411 subgroup-specific treatments to improve pain management. Based on the HADS, PCS and  
412 TSK questionnaires, we identified three chronic pain subgroups in a heterogeneous patient  
413 population (n=5,454) in two tertiary outpatient settings using hierarchical cluster analysis.  
414 Cluster 1 was characterized by high psychological burden, more tobacco smoking, lower  
415 educational levels, lower employment rates and more singles. Cluster 2 showed low  
416 psychological burden, more alcohol consumption, higher educational levels and higher  
417 employment rates. Cluster 3 showed intermediate features compared to the other clusters.  
418 Pain intensity and pain characteristics did not differ appreciably between the clusters in both  
419 cohorts. Regarding pain diagnosis, in cluster 1 widespread pain (UMCU cohort) and  
420 tendomyogenic pain (EMC cohort) were most prevalent. We hypothesize that patients with  
421 these diagnoses belong to a comparable diagnosis group with multifocal poorly defined  
422 chronic pain and that due to challenges in the classification of this pain syndrome this was  
423 either classified as widespread pain or tendomyogenic pain in the two centers. Complex  
424 regional pain syndrome (EMC cohort) was most prevalent in cluster 2. For all other  
425 diagnoses, there were no clinically relevant differences in prevalence among clusters.  
426 Importantly, treatment success was comparable between clusters 2 and 3, but was consistently  
427 and significantly lower in cluster 1. We hypothesize that patients identified as belonging to  
428 cluster 1 may need a different treatment approach, with suggestions provided below.

429

430 When comparing our findings with the current literature on cluster analyses of populations  
431 with chronic pain, the majority of studies also report differences observed in the  
432 psychological domain. Some of these studies found similar ‘extreme’ groups regarding  
433 psychological characteristics and pain experience, similar to our clusters 1 and 2, along with  
434 one or more intermediate group(s) like our cluster 3 [5,7–12,26]. The number of clusters  
435 differs between studies, varying from 2 to 9 clusters. Discrepancies in the number of clusters  
436 between different studies might be due to differences in the study populations or clustering  
437 variables used as input variables. Our identification of three clusters in a heterogenous chronic  
438 pain population (in the combined dataset and in both cohorts separately; see S2A and S2B  
439 Fig) is consistent with the findings of Gerdle et al. [12] and Gilam et al[26]. Gerdle et al.  
440 identified three groups based on variables of pain intensity, emotional distress, acceptance and  
441 life impacts. Their study revealed a group with overall ‘worst’ characteristics that included  
442 fewer subjects with a university education, similar to our cluster 1; a contrasting group with  
443 ‘best’ characteristics and with the highest proportion of subjects with university education,  
444 similar to our cluster 2, and an intermediate group similar to our cluster 3. Gilam et al.  
445 identified three groups based on three domains: physical, mental and social. In line with our  
446 clusters, the three groups showed graded severity in all of these domains and associated pain  
447 characteristics. Moreover, mental symptoms of anxiety, depression and anger were found to  
448 be the key determinants of subgroup assignment. Similarly, in our study, anxiety and  
449 depression belonged to the variables with the highest determinant value between all groups.  
450 Some studies added pain diagnoses in the clustering analysis. In contrast to our study,  
451 Bäckryd et al. [10] identified four subgroups and found an asymmetrical distribution of  
452 different diagnoses across groups, although these differences were small. Reviewing all these  
453 studies and including the observations in our own two large cohorts, we conclude that

454 identification of three subgroups with a graded severity of psychological symptoms appears to  
455 be a robust finding.

456 Associated with these psychological symptoms are elements within the social domain,  
457 including educational level, employment status, life style factors and marital status.  
458 Unemployment, reducing socioeconomic status, may induce psychological stress [27,28].  
459 Several studies have also shown that lower education levels and lower socioeconomic status  
460 correlate with higher pain prevalence and lower health status [29–31]. There are several  
461 hypothetical explanations for this phenomenon: People with less extensive education are more  
462 likely to be exposed to clinical, behavioral and environmental risk factors; they might have  
463 more physically demanding jobs and/or more unhealthy lifestyle behaviours; they might not  
464 have access to health care; and they might be more exposed to stress factors while also having  
465 poorer coping skills [32]. Health literacy possibly also plays a role in the underlying  
466 mechanism driving the interaction between low level of education and poor health [33]. A  
467 study on health literacy with n=131 chronic pain patients found that 54% had an inadequate  
468 health literacy and that this was associated with lower education level and lower monthly  
469 income [30]. In our study we also observed that cluster 1 was most associated with lower  
470 educational degree and least associated with university education and paid employment, in  
471 stark contrast to cluster 2. Our subgroups also differed regarding marital status, with more  
472 singles in cluster 1 compared to cluster 2. It has been previously suggested that social support  
473 by romantic partners might have an analgesic effect [31]. This study suggested that distress  
474 during pain exposure could be relieved by partner empathy, even solely with a partner's  
475 physical presence, thereby reducing pain sensitivity and facilitating pain coping. Therefore,  
476 the lack of social support from a partner could perhaps be of influence on the pain experience  
477 of the patients in cluster 1. Furthermore, both psychological symptoms and high severity of  
478 pain can lead to a decreased HRQoL [34]. It is therefore not surprising that the identified

479 groups showed such a pattern and that two groups (cluster 1 and cluster 2) emerged with  
480 highly contrasting characteristics.

481

482 In the current study the prevalence of most pain diagnoses did not differ between the three  
483 clusters, and the difference in pain intensity and characteristics between clusters were small  
484 and only significant in one of our two cohorts. This suggests that the actual initial inciting  
485 stimulus or painful condition may be of lesser importance to the chronic pain experience  
486 (duration, impact and severity) than psychosocial factors are. While the psychosocial factors  
487 may not be exclusive or specific for chronic pain, pain treatment outcomes were significantly  
488 different between cluster 1 and the other two clusters. This suggests that patients from cluster  
489 1 present with a unique set of psychosocial factors that may need a different treatment  
490 approach. Possible changes in pain management could include pain education tailored to the  
491 educational level of the patient to improve understanding of their disease, lifestyle coaching  
492 including cessation of smoking (which is associated with higher pain intensity, pain  
493 interference and pain-related fear [35]), and support by social workers in finding a job and  
494 improving socioeconomic status to reduce stress that is associated with worse chronic pain.  
495 Naturally, patients with signs of a clinically significant anxiety or depressive disorder should  
496 be referred for psychiatric care, but we want to emphasize that this alone might not be  
497 enough, as the multidisciplinary treatment offered at the EMC (and also UMCU) included  
498 psychological and/or psychiatric referral when indicated.

499

500 There were three diagnoses: widespread pain, tendomyogenic pain and CRPS, which were not  
501 equally distributed across the clusters. Tendomyogenic pain and widespread pain are known  
502 to be associated with depression [36], which may explain the higher prevalence in cluster 1.  
503 CRPS is more often diagnosed in women which provides an explanation for the sex difference

504 observed between both cohorts. In cluster 2, CRPS was overrepresented, for which no clear  
505 underlying cause could be identified. This overrepresentation warrant further investigation  
506 into possible underlying factors or covariates within this specific cluster (e.g. lifestyle factors,  
507 educational level influencing coping strategy).

508 The differences in the overall diagnosis distribution between the two centers seem mainly  
509 related to differences in research focus and healthcare expertise; the EMC is an expertise  
510 centre for CRPS, explaining the larger number of CRPS patients in their cohort.

511

512 This study has several strengths, including a large heterogenous chronic pain sample included  
513 at two multidisciplinary tertiary pain centres, with variables representing the different  
514 potential drivers of chronic pain according to the biopsychosocial model. However, this study  
515 also has several limitations that must be considered. First, approximately one third of patients  
516 had to be excluded from the hierarchical cluster analysis due to one or more missing values in  
517 the questionnaires. This large proportion of missing data might have biased the results, when  
518 patients not willing or not able to fill out all the questions are overrepresented in the excluded  
519 group. Second, the present results are based on a group of patients referred to a tertiary  
520 academic pain clinic, which tend to represent the most complex cases. Therefore, our findings  
521 may not generalize to other chronic pain populations and should be verified across different  
522 chronic pain patients and in different clinical settings. Third, due to the cross-sectional design  
523 of this study, causality cannot be determined. Lastly, the results are based on self-reported  
524 outcomes and could be biased by social desirability. People with higher educational levels  
525 may be more successful in manipulating their answers to questionnaires (such as the HADS,  
526 PCS and TCK) to reduce their psychological burden result and prevent a possible referral to  
527 the psychiatrist or psychologist when the patient is not motivated or open to such intervention.

528

529 Regarding clinical implications, the present study underlines the importance of  
530 acknowledging that the chronic pain population is not a homogenous group, and indicates that  
531 therapeutic interventions should be adjusted to individual patient characteristics rather than  
532 only to pain diagnoses. Subgroup assignment through psychometric questionnaires can  
533 potentially help support clinical decision making by clinicians: Using the knowledge of  
534 subgroup patterns, it can be decided which treatment options are most likely to be successful  
535 and therefore would be more preferable for the individual patient. It seems particularly  
536 important to identify patients that belong to cluster 1, as patients with this subset of  
537 characteristics are likely at risk of high-impact chronic pain, which is associated with the most  
538 suffering, most unfavourable health outcomes, increased medical costs and increased opioid  
539 use and dosage [37,38]. With our prediction model we can reliably predict cluster 1 allocation  
540 with an optimal number of questions of 15, leading to an accuracy for cluster 1 of 91% with a  
541 sensitivity of 96% and specificity of 86%. In future trials, the clinical relevance and treatment  
542 responses of subgroup-specific pain management approaches must be further evaluated.

543

## 544 **Conclusion**

545 In conclusion, using hierarchical cluster analysis on two population cohorts, this study  
546 identified three chronic pain subgroups with different psychological and sociodemographic  
547 characteristics based on patient-reported measures. Remarkably, these groups were largely  
548 unrelated to specific pain diagnoses. This knowledge can be potentially useful for tailoring  
549 subgroup specific treatment plans to improve chronic pain management for individual  
550 patients. Using our prediction model including 15 questions only, we can reliably predict  
551 cluster allocation, especially to cluster 1, identifying patients who need a biopsychosocial  
552 approach with tailored pain education. It would be useful to validate these results in different  
553 pain populations and clinical settings, to determine whether these subgroups are widely

554 clinically relevant, and to compare subgroup responses to different pain management  
555 strategies.

556

## 557 **Acknowledgments**

558 We want to thank Ilona van Gent-Bijen, George Groeneweg, and Max Brenninkmeijer for  
559 their support with the data extraction; Pain clinic secretaries for providing technical support to  
560 patients when filling out the digital questionnaires; Patients for their efforts filling in the  
561 questionnaires.

562

## 563 **References**

- 564 [1] Finnerup NB, Attal N, Haroutounian S, McNicol E, Baron R, Dworkin RH, et al.  
565 Pharmacotherapy for neuropathic pain in adults: A systematic review and meta-  
566 analysis. *Lancet Neurol* 2015. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(14\)70251-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(14)70251-0).
- 567 [2] Dowell D, Haegerich TM, Chou R. CDC guideline for prescribing opioids for chronic  
568 pain-United States, 2016. *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association*  
569 2016;315:1624–45. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.1464>.
- 570 [3] Cohen SP, Vase L, Hooten WM. Chronic pain: an update on burden, best practices, and  
571 new advances. *The Lancet* 2021;397:2082–97. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00393-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00393-7).
- 572
- 573 [4] Edwards RR, Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Angst MS, Dionne R, Freeman R, et al. Patient  
574 phenotyping in clinical trials of chronic pain treatments: IMMPACT recommendations.  
575 *Pain* 2016;157:1851–71. <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000602>.
- 576 [5] Langenmaier A-M, Amelung VE, Karst M, Krauth C, Püschner F, Urbanski D, et al.  
577 Subgroups in chronic low back pain patients - a step toward cluster-based, tailored

- 578 treatment in inpatient standard care: On the need for precise targeting of treatment for  
579 chronic low back pain. *Ger Med Sci* 2019;17:Doc09. <https://doi.org/10.3205/000275>.
- 580 [6] Bair E, Gaynor S, Slade GD, Ohrbach R, Fillingim RB, Greenspan JD, et al.  
581 Identification of clusters of individuals relevant to temporomandibular disorders and  
582 other chronic pain conditions: the OPPERA study. *Pain* 2016;157:1266–78.  
583 <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000518>.
- 584 [7] Estévez-López F, Segura-Jiménez V, Álvarez-Gallardo IC, Borges-Cosic M, Pulido-  
585 Martos M, Carbonell-Baeza A, et al. Adaptation profiles comprising objective and  
586 subjective measures in fibromyalgia: the al-Ándalus project. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*  
587 2017;56:2015–24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/kex302>.
- 588 [8] Larsson B, Gerdle B, Bernfort L, Levin L-Å, Dragioti E. Distinctive subgroups derived  
589 by cluster analysis based on pain and psychological symptoms in Swedish older adults  
590 with chronic pain - a population study (PainS65+). *BMC Geriatr* 2017;17:200.  
591 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-017-0591-4>.
- 592 [9] Alter BJ, Anderson NP, Gillman AG, Yin Q, Jeong J-H, Wasan AD. Hierarchical  
593 clustering by patient-reported pain distribution alone identifies distinct chronic pain  
594 subgroups differing by pain intensity, quality, and clinical outcomes. *PLoS One*  
595 2021;16:e0254862. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0254862>.
- 596 [10] Bäckryd E, Persson E, Larsson A, one MF-P, 2018 undefined. Chronic pain patients  
597 can be classified into four groups: Clustering-based discriminant analysis of  
598 psychometric data from 4665 patients referred to a. *JournalsPlosOrg* 2018:1–19.
- 599 [11] Strigo IA, Simmons AN, Giebler J, Schilling JM, Moeller-Bertram T. Unsupervised  
600 learning for prognostic validity in patients with chronic pain in transdisciplinary pain  
601 care. *Sci Rep* 2023;13:7581. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-34611-z>.



- 602 [12] Gerdle B, Åkerblom S, Stålnacke BM, Brodda Jansen G, Enthoven P, Ernberg M, et al.  
603 The importance of emotional distress, cognitive behavioural factors and pain for life  
604 impact at baseline and for outcomes after rehabilitation - A SQRP study of more than  
605 20,000 chronic pain patients. *Scand J Pain* 2019;19:693–711.  
606 <https://doi.org/10.1515/sjpain-2019-0016>.
- 607 [13] Bouhassira D, Attal N, Alchaar H, Boureau F, Brochet B, Bruxelle J, et al. Comparison  
608 of pain syndromes associated with nervous or somatic lesions and development of a  
609 new neuropathic pain diagnostic questionnaire (DN4). *Pain* 2005;114:29–36.  
610 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2004.12.010>.
- 611 [14] van Seventer R, Vos C, Giezeman M, Meerding W-J, Arnould B, Regnault A, et al.  
612 Validation of the Dutch Version of the DN4 Diagnostic Questionnaire for Neuropathic  
613 Pain. *Pain Practice* 2013;13:390–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/papr.12006>.
- 614 [15] Freynhagen R, Baron R, Gockel U, Tölle TR. pain *DETECT* : a new screening  
615 questionnaire to identify neuropathic components in patients with back pain. *Curr Med  
616 Res Opin* 2006;22:1911–20. <https://doi.org/10.1185/030079906X132488>.
- 617 [16] Tan G, Jensen MP, Thornby JI, Shanti BF. Validation of the brief pain inventory for  
618 chronic nonmalignant pain. *J Pain* 2004;5:133–7.  
619 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2003.12.005>.
- 620 [17] Cleeland CS, Ryan KM. Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. *Ann  
621 Acad Med Singap* 1994;23:129–38.
- 622 [18] World Health Organization. ICD-10 : international statistical classification of diseases  
623 and related health problems : tenth revision, 2nd ed. 2004.
- 624 [19] Hudak PL, Wright JG. The characteristics of patient satisfaction measures. *Spine (Phila  
625 Pa 1976)* 2000;25:3167–77. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00012>.

- 626 [20] LoMartire R, Äng BO, Gerdle B, Vixner L. Psychometric properties of Short Form-36  
627 Health Survey, EuroQol 5-dimensions, and Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale in  
628 patients with chronic pain. *Pain* 2020;161:83–95.  
629 <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001700>.
- 630 [21] Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr*  
631 *Scand* 1983;67:361–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1983.tb09716.x>.
- 632 [22] Osman A, Barrios FX, Kopper BA, Hauptmann W, Jones J, O’Neill E. Factor structure,  
633 reliability, and validity of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale. *J Behav Med* 1997;20:589–  
634 605. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025570508954>.
- 635 [23] van Damme S, Crombez G, Bijttebier P, Goubert L, van Houdenhove B. A  
636 confirmatory factor analysis of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale: invariant factor  
637 structure across clinical and non-clinical populations. *Pain* 2002;96:319–24.  
638 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3959\(01\)00463-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3959(01)00463-8).
- 639 [24] Sullivan MJL BSPJ. The Pain Catastrophizing Scale: Development and validation.  
640 *Psychol Assess* 1995;7:524–32.
- 641 [25] Vlaeyen JWS, Kole-Snijders AMJ, Boeren RGB, van Eek H. Fear of  
642 movement/(re)injury in chronic low back pain and its relation to behavioral  
643 performance. *Pain* 1995;62:363–72. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3959\(94\)00279-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3959(94)00279-N).
- 644 [26] Gilam G, Cramer EM, Webber KA, Ziadni MS, Kao M-C, Mackey SC. Classifying  
645 chronic pain using multidimensional pain-agnostic symptom assessments and  
646 clustering analysis. *Sci Adv* 2021;7. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abj0320>.
- 647 [27] McKee-Ryan F, Song Z, Wanberg CR, Kinicki AJ. Psychological and Physical Well-  
648 Being During Unemployment: A Meta-Analytic Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*  
649 2005;90:53–76. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.53>.

- 650 [28] Paul KI, Moser K. Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. *J Vocat*  
651 *Behav* 2009;74:264–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.01.001>.
- 652 [29] Latza U, Kohlmann T, Deck R, Raspe H. Influence of Occupational Factors on the  
653 Relation Between Socioeconomic Status and Self-Reported Back Pain in a Population-  
654 Based Sample of German Adults With Back Pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*  
655 2000;25:1390–7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200006010-00011>.
- 656 [30] Mackey LM, Blake C, Casey M-B, Power CK, Victory R, Hearty C, et al. The impact  
657 of health literacy on health outcomes in individuals with chronic pain: a cross-sectional  
658 study. *Physiotherapy* 2019;105:346–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physio.2018.11.006>.
- 659 [31] Duschek S, Nassauer L, Montoro CI, Bair A, Montoya P. Dispositional empathy is  
660 associated with experimental pain reduction during provision of social support by  
661 romantic partners. *Scand J Pain* 2019;20:205–9. [https://doi.org/10.1515/sjpain-2019-](https://doi.org/10.1515/sjpain-2019-0025)  
662 0025.
- 663 [32] Dionne C, Koepsell TD, Korff M Von, Deyo RA, Barlow WE, Checkoway H. Formal  
664 Education and Back-Related Disability. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1995;20:2721–30.  
665 <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-199512150-00014>.
- 666 [33] van der Heide I, Wang J, Droomers M, Spreuwenberg P, Rademakers J, Uiters E. The  
667 Relationship Between Health, Education, and Health Literacy: Results From the Dutch  
668 Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey. *J Health Commun* 2013;18:172–84.  
669 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2013.825668>.
- 670 [34] Meints SM, Edwards RR. Evaluating psychosocial contributions to chronic pain  
671 outcomes. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry* 2018;87:168–82.  
672 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2018.01.017>.
- 673 [35] Patterson AL, Gritzner S, Resnick MP, Dobscha SK, Turk DC, Morasco BJ. Smoking  
674 Cigarettes as a Coping Strategy for Chronic Pain Is Associated With Greater Pain

- 675 Intensity and Poorer Pain-Related Function. *J Pain* 2012;13:285–92.
- 676 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2011.11.008>.
- 677 [36] Edwards RR, Dworkin RH, Sullivan MD, Turk DC, Wasan AD. The Role of
- 678 Psychosocial Processes in the Development and Maintenance of Chronic Pain. *J Pain*
- 679 2016;17:T70-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2016.01.001>.
- 680 [37] Herman PM, Broten N, Lavelle TA, Sorbero ME, Coulter ID. Health Care Costs and
- 681 Opioid Use Associated With High-impact Chronic Spinal Pain in the United States.
- 682 *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2019;44:1154–61.
- 683 <https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0000000000003033>.
- 684 [38] Dahlhamer J, Lucas J, Zelaya , Carla, Nahin R, Mackey S, DeBar L, et al. Prevalence
- 685 of Chronic Pain and High-Impact Chronic Pain Among Adults — United States, 2016.
- 686 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2018;67:1001–6.
- 687 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6736a2>.
- 688
- 689

## 690 **Supporting information**

691 **S1 Fig. Top 20 questions.** The 20 most important questions for accurate cluster prediction.

692 **S2A Fig. Hierarchical clustering dendrogram of the development cohort University**

693 **Medical Center Utrecht.** Hierarchical cluster analysis showing three clusters: Cluster 1 (red),

694 Cluster 2 (blue) and Cluster 3 (green). X-axis representing the individual questions of three

695 questionnaires (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), Pain Catastrophizing Scale

696 (PCS), and Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia (TSK). Y-axis representing included patients.

697 **S2B Fig. Hierarchical clustering dendrogram of the validation cohort Erasmus MC**

698 Hierarchical cluster analysis showing three clusters: Cluster 1 (red), Cluster 2 (blue) and

699 Cluster 3 (green). X-axis representing the individual questions of three questionnaires

700 (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS), and

701 Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia (TSK). Y-axis representing included patients.

702 **S1 Table. Frequencies of the 10 most common diagnoses in each cluster (validation**

703 **cohort Erasmus MC)**

704 Data expressed as percentage per cluster. Significance levels computed by Pearson-Chi

705 square.

706 **S2 Table. Sociodemographics, pain intensity, duration, character, interference and**

707 **health-related quality of life in the validation cohort (Erasmus Medical Center**

708 **Rotterdam) and comparison among the clusters**

709 Data expressed as mean (95% confidence interval), median (interquartile range) or count (%).

710 Statistics computed by one-Way ANOVA Test or Pearson Chi Square. P-values  $\leq 0.01$  are in

711 bold. Effect sizes for categorical data are calculated with Eta-squared test or Cramer's V.

712 Effect sizes computed by Eta-squared test indicate a small effect 0.01 to 0.06, medium 0.06 to

713 0.14 and large effect  $\geq 0.14$ . Effect sizes with Cramer's V indicate a small effect 0.1 to 0.3,

714 medium 0.3 to 0.5 and large effect >0.5. Significant differences with medium to large effect  
715 size are in bold.

716

717 Percentage of missing data: age 0%, gender 0%, BMI 29.9%, daily smoking 29.9%, highest  
718 educational level 0.2%, employment status 29.9%, marital status 0.2%, children 29.9%, pain  
719 NRS 29.9%, pain duration 1.3%, neuropathy (PD) 3.2%, BPI 28.8%, SF36 0%.

720

721 BMI: Body Mass Index; BPI: Brief Pain Inventory; HADS-A and HADS-D: Hospital Anxiety  
722 and Depression Scale; NRS: Numeric Rating Scale; PCS: Pain Catastrophizing Scale; PD:  
723 Pain Detect; SF36: Short Form-36; TSK: Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia.

724 PCS subcategories represent the sum of following items ‘Rumination’ 8,9, 10 and 11;

725 Magnification 6, 7 and 13; ‘Helplessness’ 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 12. RAND-36 represent the sum of

726 the following items ‘General’ 1,11a ,11b ,11c ,11d; ‘Physical’ 3a, 3b,3c,3d,3e,3f,3g,3h,3i,3j;

727 ‘Mental’ 9b,9c,9d,9f,9h.

728 **S3A Table. Prediction characteristics for the validation cohort Erasmus MC using the**  
729 **44 questions**

730 **S3B Table. Prediction characteristics for the validation cohort Erasmus MC using the**  
731 **20 questions**

732 **S3C Table. Prediction characteristics for the validation cohort Erasmus MC using the**  
733 **15 questions**

734 **S3D Table. Prediction characteristics for the validation cohort Erasmus MC using the**  
735 **10 questions**

736 **S1 File. Methods section questionnaires**

737

