

Personal Danger Signals Reprocessing: New Online Group Intervention for Chronic Pain

Carmit Himmelblau Gat¹, Natalia Polyviannaya¹, Pavel Goldstein¹

1. School of Public Health, University of Haifa, Israel

Abstract

Chronic pain represents a formidable global health issue, affecting a considerable segment of the population. Even with advancements in medical interventions, a notable number of patients persistently suffer from pain in the absence of identifiable organic causes, designating this category of chronic pain as nociplastic pain. In recent years, there has been growing recognition of the significant role that danger signal processing plays in the development and maintenance of chronic pain. In response to this need, an innovative online group-based therapeutic approach was developed. The approach targets the mental mechanisms associated with danger signal processing, using coaching to incorporate therapeutic instruments and reaching a wider audience with an affordable and accessible online group format.

This study aims to investigate the efficacy of online group intervention, termed Personal Danger Signals Reprocessing (PDSR), as a means to alleviate chronic pain and mental health comorbidities.

A cohort of women (N=19, mean age 43) participated in an 8-week online program, receiving weekly sessions. The program encompassed a comprehensive understanding of chronic pain within a systemic framework of PDSR. We collected pain outcomes, mental health comorbidities, and potential psychological mechanisms at three-time points: before, in the middle, and after completing the intervention for a group of 19 participants, while the waiting list group (N=20, mean age 43.5) only completed the self-report assessments on the same timeframe. Finally, we also collected pain levels of the PDSR group 6 months after the formal intervention termination.

The PDSR group experienced significant reductions in pain levels throughout the intervention ($p < .001$). Notably, pain levels in the PDSR group were robustly reduced both at the middle (Cohen's $D = 0.7$) and end (Cohen's $D = 1.5$) of the intervention compared to the waiting list group. Similarly, pain interference showed significant reductions ($p < .01$), with a substantial decrease observed in the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group after the intervention (Cohen's $D = -1.7$, $p < .0001$). Well-being also significantly improved for the PDSR group at both the middle ($p < .001$, Cohen's $D = 1.7$) and end ($p < .001$, Cohen's $D = 1.8$) of the intervention. Secondary outcomes, including pain catastrophizing, sleep interference, anxiety levels, and depressive symptoms, all showed consistent reductions for the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group (all p -values $< .01$).

Findings reveal that the PDSR online intervention holds the potential to significantly reduce pain, enhance functional capabilities, and elevate subjective well-being for individuals grappling with chronic pain. The study underscores the effectiveness of online interventions while emphasizing the need for further research to optimize implementation strategies.

Keywords: *chronic pain management, telemedicine, coaching, personalized danger signals reprocessing.*

Introduction

Approximately 20% of the global population grapples with chronic pain, suffering from migraines, back pain, neck pain, and musculoskeletal conditions ranking among the top 10 causes of disability (Vos et al., 2017). This situation could worsen as chronic pain risk factors — such as stress, poor sleep, and physical inactivity — continue to rise, magnifying suffering and socioeconomic consequences (Jackson et al., 2014; Mills et al., 2019; T. J. Smith & Hillner, 2019; Zelaya et al., 2020).

Recent research has highlighted significant sex and gender differences in chronic pain susceptibility, with women being more affected. Approximately half of all chronic pain conditions are more commonly found in women, with only about 20% of these conditions being more prevalent among men (Melchior et al., 2016; Mills et al., 2019). These differences are influenced by genetic, hormonal, neuroimmune, and sociocultural factors (Presto et al., 2022). Despite the higher prevalence of chronic pain in women, preclinical pain studies have historically focused on male subjects, potentially limiting the applicability of findings to female pain mechanisms (Malfait & Miller, 2020; Presto et al., 2022).

Importantly, in the realm of chronic pain management, a significant proportion of patients continue to experience pain despite the absence of any identifiable organic sources. This phenomenon has been meticulously defined as "nociplastic pain" by the International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP). According to the IASP (2022), nociplastic pain encompasses conditions wherein individuals endure pain as a result of altered nociception without clear evidence of actual tissue damage or any known pathophysiological process that would account for the pain (IASP, 2022).

Intriguingly, there is a notable comorbidity between nociplastic pain and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms, alongside other mental health conditions (Galli, 2023). This interrelation suggests a complex interplay between the perception of pain and psychological distress, underpinning the multifaceted nature of chronic pain. The relationship between nociplastic pain and PTSD is particularly compelling, given that both conditions involve alterations in the brain's processing and interpretation of signals, whether they be related to external threats or internal pain cues (Fitzcharles et al., 2021).

The elevated occurrence of nociplastic pain, especially when aggravated by concurrent mental health complications, underscores the pressing need for efficacious treatment strategies. Recent studies demonstrated that traditional biomedical therapeutic approach has limited efficacy, especially in long-term pain management (Chou et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2018; Thorlund et al., 2015). Moreover, pharmacological solutions are associated with side effects, contraindications, leading to drug tolerance and hyperalgesia (Mercadante et al., 2019; Riediger et al., 2017; Varrassi et al., 2010). These approaches especially fall short for the patients with nociplastic pain, partly because the underlying mechanisms extend beyond the physical domain, necessitating a broader. It is imperative that treatment strategies for nociplastic pain not only address the physical sensations of pain but also the psychological and emotional components that contribute to the pain experience.

The development and implementation of comprehensive treatment modalities that encompass psychological therapies, psychoeducational interventions, could significantly advance the management of nociplastic pain (Ashar et al., 2022; Simons et al., 2014). Such strategies should be aimed at mitigating the pain itself while also addressing the associated mental health symptoms, thereby tackling the issue from an integrative standpoint.

It's essential to recognize that within mixed pain pathophysiology, which may have a substantial nociceptive or neuropathic source, there is frequently a pronounced nociplastic pain component. (Galli, 2023; Mills et al., 2019; Rikard et al., 2023). Due to its frequent coexistence with various chronic pain conditions, accurately determining the prevalence of nociplastic pain presents challenges (Bułdyś et al., 2023; Fitzcharles et al., 2021; Freynhagen et al., 2019). However, the elevated occurrence of this primary pain highlights the urgent need for effective treatment strategies to alleviate the suffering of those impacted. Recognizing the pivotal role of brain neuroplasticity in pain chronification (Hashmi et al., 2013) and the healing process (Ashar et al., 2022), psychological therapeutic approaches may offer valuable avenues for managing and potentially even curing chronic pain.

Psychotherapeutic approaches for chronic pain have been under development since the 1960s, yielding promising findings. However, it remains a challenge to identify a universally effective therapeutic approach for chronic pain (Morley & Williams, 2015). A comprehensive recent analysis of psychological therapies indicates that Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) has demonstrated marginal benefits in reducing chronic pain, albeit often of a small or very small magnitude (Williams et al., 2020). In addition, both Behavioral Therapy (BT) and Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) have not showed exhibited superior efficacy compared to being placed on a waiting list in earlier analysis (Williams et al., 2020), however more recent meta-analysis shows ACT brings small to medium effect for pain intensity reduction (Lai et al., 2023).

Mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) interventions yield promising outcomes, as evidenced by a recent systematic review revealing notable enhancements in pain perception among individuals with chronic low back pain (S. Smith & Langen, 2020). The mindfulness-based approach introduces a holistic self-perception strategy that appears efficacious for managing chronic pain. Delving into mindful interoception experiences could potentially hold the key to alleviating chronic pain (Meehan & Carter, 2021), with a focus on nurturing the body-mind connection becoming pivotal in the design of chronic pain training regimens.

Emotional awareness and expression therapy (EAET) was developed specifically for nociplastic component of chronic pain. It targets the identification, expression, and regulation of emotions in individuals with chronic pain and showcases enhanced efficacy — comparing favorably to CBT (Yarns et al., 2020). EAET exhibits marked clinical improvement, particularly for conditions frequently associated with nociplastic chronic pain, such as fibromyalgia, endometriosis, irritable bowel syndrome, pelvic pain, and medically unexplained symptoms (Lumley & Schubiner, 2019a).

The most promising contemporary approach to comprehend numerous cases of chronic pain, particularly within the context of nociplastic pain, involves a paradigm shift anchored in the

recognition of the absence of ongoing tissue damage (Lumley & Schubiner, 2019a). Drawing from recent advancements in the field of neuroscience that underscore the clinical validity of fear-avoidance model in development of chronic pain (Kroska, 2016; Markfelder & Pauli, 2020), neuroplastic nature of chronic pain (Mansour et al., 2014), the concept of chronic pain being amenable to reversal holds the potential to attenuate the activation of pain triggered by emotional and cognitive factors (Lumley & Schubiner, 2019b). The concept that chronic pain is reversible offers a valuable strategy for mitigating nociplastic pain, contributing to the alleviation of pain (Lumley & Schubiner, 2019b)

Under the umbrella of this approach, Pain Reprocessing Therapy (PRT) emerges with encouraging outcomes. PRT is a multifaceted strategy that integrates cognitive, somatic, and exposure-based techniques. Additionally, it dismantles the perception of pain as a direct indicator of tissue damage, replacing it with the notion that chronic pain stems from non-hazardous cerebral activity. A recent study demonstrated that 66% of patients with lower back pain experienced either complete pain relief or substantial pain reduction post-treatment, in stark contrast to the 20% response rate observed in the placebo group and the 10% rate in the usual care group (Ashar et al., 2022). The treatment's efficacy was further underscored by its one-year follow-up, highlighting the sustained benefits.

Psychotherapeutic approaches present an avenue of promise for chronic pain management, yet their effectiveness is not without limitations and potential. Some of them might appear overly structured, not enough motivating, with too much focus on emotional, cognitive or introspective components, or missing the “big picture”. Yet, access to these therapies can be encumbered by financial constraints, limited availability, or a shortage of trained professionals within certain regions. In some instances, waning motivation to persist with psychological therapy might undermine treatment efficacy, further highlighting the multifaceted landscape of chronic pain management. Indeed, only 1.6% of Americans with chronic pain tried any kind of “talk” psychotherapy for chronic pain (Yong et al., 2022).

In light of the modest effectiveness of traditional individual psychological therapies in reducing pain intensity coupled with the associated costs and limited accessibility, the quest for novel, potent psychological programs catering to individuals with chronic pain has become imperative (ref?). Such programs should be designed for accessibility, scalability, motivation boosting, and ease of delivery by various healthcare professionals, all while maintaining a clear, structured approach.

An approach grounded in coaching may serve as a pivotal layer to sustain motivation and guide individuals through their journeys, offering a roadmap to potential solutions. A recent study evaluating health and wellness coaching for chronic pain patients showcased reductions in pain intensity and interference over a year-long intervention, alongside improvements in both physical and psychological functioning tied to pain intensity (Rethorn et al., 2020). Many chronic pain sufferers do not expect to participate in long-term therapy and need additional motivational factors. Coaching techniques may serve as practical tools, boosting the patients' motivation (Losch et al., 2016; Mühlberger & Traut-Mattausch, 2015). The delivery of coaching-based approach through online platforms presents a promising avenue improving the availability of the therapeutic approach (Bartley et al., 2022). To optimize efficacy, coaching programs should be tailored, integrating motivational therapeutic mechanisms within a robust training framework. This approach should not only support and inspire participants but also cater to their unique needs. Recent empirical evidence underscores this, revealing that diverse therapeutic approaches may yield differential benefits across individuals. (Bułdyś et al., 2023; Cohen et al., 2021; Fitzcharles et al., 2021). Personalizing the therapeutic approach to individual needs has the potential to significantly enhance its effectiveness. (McCracken, 2023; Morley & Williams, 2015).

Recent studies also highlighted limited motivation of the patients involved in chronic pain-focused therapy (Ankawi et al., 2019). Higher levels of hope and lower levels of hopelessness predict better outcomes in pain interference, anxiety, and depression after interdisciplinary multimodal pain treatment (Scheidegger et al., 2023). In group sessions, participants engage

with peers who share similar struggles, gaining fresh perspectives on their own pain-related challenges. The collective experience in group settings allows participants to feel understood and facilitates emotional expression (Cosciuella et al., 2021). Narrative practice approaches in group settings have been found to help individuals acknowledge their pain experiences and identify coping strategies, such as refocusing, distraction, and perspective-taking (Lew & Xin, 2020). Crucially, group therapy reinforces the idea that individuals are not alone in their pain management journey. Sharing personal narratives and coping strategies empowers the members, fostering innovative approaches to chronic pain management and instilling hope. This collective experience underscores the belief that if others have made progress, they too can embark on a path toward pain reduction and improved well-being (Kang et al., 2024). A meta-analysis review (Veehof et al., 2016) further accentuates the positive impact of group therapy on various aspects of chronic pain management, including pain reduction, emotional well-being, and overall quality of life. Additionally, other study highlights the robust case for group-based methodologies, as they offer clinical and logistical advantages (Wilson, 2017). Group work allows the “normalization” of pain experiences within social settings, a pivotal factor in driving behavioral change (Von Mensenkampff et al., 2015), and the anticipated motivational benefits inherent in group-oriented interventions. More recent research highlights that participants in group-based treatments at multidisciplinary pain centers found the group experience valuable and enriching, thus can be helpful as part of positive expectations from treatment (Nøst et al., 2022). Collectively, these studies suggest that group component may play a meaningful role in chronic pain management.

Due to low widespreadness of psychotherapeutic approaches for chronic pain, it may not be available for many chronic pain sufferers. Online group interventions extend auxiliary services beyond traditional clinical settings, often at reduced costs and greater feasibility than standard care. Virtual group psychotherapy, while modifying social interactions, still enables participants to connect through their shared experiences of chronic pain (Moore et al., 2023). This way they may be also recognized as a form of teletherapy. A systematic review highlights the efficacy of internet interventions, particularly within women (Ariza-Mateos et al., 2021). The accessibility

and potential productivity of online group interventions underscore their promise, particularly when anchored in a robust psychological framework.

Translating the best therapeutic tools into personalized coaching techniques, optimizing their efficacy, and delivering them in an online group format can significantly enhance availability and motivation, offering a promising avenue. Personal Danger Signals Reprocessing (PDSR) a) introduces the patients with most updated psychoeducational knowledge regarding chronic pain mechanisms and our ability to affect them, focusing on clinical and neuroscientific aspects; b) the interoceptive techniques target reevaluation of body sensations and emotion processing; c) role models, coaching training and the group dynamics boosts the long-term motivation and reduces resistance. In this quasi-experimental study, we are, for the first time, assessing the effectiveness of Personal Danger Signals Reprocessing (PDSR) for women suffering from chronic pain conditions.

Methods

Participants

Participants with non-cancerous and non-neuropathic chronic pain were recruited through social media, showing interest in an innovative 8-week pain management course using Personal Danger Signals Reprocessing (PDSR). Following recruitment, participants were randomly assigned to either the PDSR group or the waiting list.

Study design

The study was designed to assess the effectiveness of the Personal Danger Signals Reprocessing (PDSR) intervention in managing chronic pain, well-being and mental health conditions. A randomized cohort of 19 participants undergoing the PDSR treatment and a control group of 20 individuals assigned to a waiting list. The assessment framework involved systematic data collection at three critical time points: baseline (pre-intervention), halfway through the program (mid-intervention), and immediately following the program's completion (post-

intervention). and a longitudinal follow-up six months post-intervention to measure persistent effects on pain levels within the PDSR treatment group.

Participants in the waiting-list control group were subsequently provided with a recorded version of the PDSR intervention and other course materials, ensuring all study participants eventually received access to the intervention, adhering to ethical standards of research conduct.

The PDSR intervention was delivered as an 8-week structured online program, consisting of weekly two-hour sessions complemented by intensive support via chat and guided self-practice exercises. This intervention was specifically developed to incorporate a comprehensive approach to chronic pain management. Key components included psychoeducational material to deepen participants' understanding of chronic pain mechanisms, coaching techniques aimed at enhancing motivation and self-efficacy, mindfulness-based to foster emotional and psychological resilience, and somatosensory exercises to improve interoceptive awareness and modulate pain perception. See the PDSR Intervention Overview at [Appendix 1](#).

Outcome Measures: Pain levels, pain interference and well-being were defined as primary outcomes. Depression, anxiety, sleep quality and pain catastrophizing are the secondary outcomes.

Research Tools:

1. **Pain intensity** was evaluated using the Numeric Rating Scale for Pain (NRS Pain), which has been validated for pain (Hawker et al., 2011; Thong et al., 2018).
2. **Pain interference** was evaluated using the Pain Interference Subscale of the Brief Pain Inventory-Short Form (BPI-Short). The BPI-Short is widely acknowledged as a valid and reliable instrument for both clinical assessment and research purposes. Specifically, the Pain Interference Subscale is designed to measure the extent to which pain hampers the patient's daily functioning across several dimensions, including mood, physical activity, work, social

interaction, and enjoyment of life. This subscale has demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha between 0.84 and 0.94, indicating a high level of reliability in capturing the impact of pain on an individual's daily activities (Gjeilo et al., 2007) .

3. **Well-being** was assessed using the World Health Organization-Five (WHO-5) Well-Being Index. The WHO-5 Well-Being Index is a globally recognized self-report measure that evaluates subjective psychological well-being. Comprising five items, this index asks respondents to rate aspects of their well-being over the past two weeks, including mood, vitality, and general interests. Responses are scored on a 6-point scale from 0 (at no time) to 5 (all of the time), with higher scores indicating greater well-being. The WHO-5 Well-Being Index is noted for its brevity, ease of use, and strong psychometric properties. It has been validated across a wide range of populations and settings, proving to be a sensitive and specific tool for detecting states of depression and anxiety. It exhibits high internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha typically exceeding 0.84, affirming its reliability as a comprehensive gauge of individual well-being (Sischka et al., 2020).
4. **Anxiety** levels were measured employing the General Anxiety Disorder 7-item scale (GAD-7). The GAD-7 questionnaire is recognized for its validity and reliability in both clinical settings and research contexts. It effectively quantifies the severity of general anxiety symptoms, offering a succinct yet comprehensive overview of an individual's anxiety status. The scale has demonstrated robust psychometric properties, including a high degree of internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.92, underscoring its reliability for assessing general anxiety disorders (Spitzer et al., 2006).
5. **Depression** levels were assessed using the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9). The PHQ-9 is a widely utilized and validated instrument designed to screen for the presence and severity of depressive symptoms. The questionnaire is esteemed for its clinical and research utility, providing a reliable measure of depression severity over the previous two weeks. It has demonstrated internal consistency and reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.83, affirming its effectiveness as a diagnostic and evaluative tool for depression (Costantini et al., 2021).
6. **Sleep disturbances** were evaluated using the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) using sleep disturbances subscale. The PSQI is an established self-report questionnaire that assesses sleep

quality. It encompasses seven components including sleep disturbances. The PSQI is considered a comprehensive and reliable tool for measuring sleep quality in clinical and research settings, offering insights into aspects of sleep health. It has shown high internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.83, validating its efficacy in distinguishing between good and poor sleepers (Buysse et al., 1989).

7. **Pain catastrophizing** was evaluated with Pain catastrophizing scale (PCS) which is a 13-item questionnaire that quantifies an individual's tendency to focus on and magnify pain sensations and to feel helpless in the face of pain, as well as the degree to which they ruminate about their pain. Respondents rate statements based on their experiences on a 5-point scale, ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (all the time), with higher scores indicating a greater level of pain catastrophizing. The PCS has demonstrated internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.87 to 0.95 across various studies, validating its efficacy as a reliable measure of pain catastrophizing (Leung, 2012).

Data analysis

All the outcomes were analyzed using mixed models to test the differences between the PDSR and waiting list group over time, testing an interaction between time and intervention type, Pairwise contrasts were used to compare group differences at each time point using Tukey-corrected post-hoc analysis. Subject-based random intercepts and time slopes were defined. Effect sizes, as measured by Cohen's D were computed to quantify the magnitude of observed changes. See all the data at [Appendix 2](#).

Results

Sample Characteristics

The final sample included 39 participants (19 in the PDSR group and 20 in the waiting list control group). Demographic characteristics, years with chronic pain, and baseline pain levels were comparable between groups (all p-values > 0.35; Table 1). Participants had a mean age of

40.74 years (SD = 7.10), reported chronic pain for an average of 4.21 years (SD = 2.34), and had an average of 15.51 years of education (SD = 2.84).

Table 1. Sample description by group.

	PDSR (N=19)	Waiting List (N=20)	Overall (N=39)
Age (years)	41.68 (6.96)	39.85 (7.30)	40.74 (7.10)
Years with Chronic Pain	4.47 (2.78)	3.95 (1.88)	4.21 (2.34)
Years of Education	15.58 (2.73)	15.45 (3.00)	15.51 (2.84)
Baseline Pain Levels	5.79 (1.99)	5.20 (1.94)	5.49 (1.96)

*No differences between the groups (all p 's > 0.35).

Primary outcomes

Pain Levels

A mixed-effects model analysis revealed a significant interaction between time and group for pain levels ($F(2, 58.2) = 6.933, p = 0.002$), indicating differing patterns of change in pain levels across time between the PDSR and waiting list groups. Post-hoc analyses showed that, at baseline, pain levels were similar between the PDSR ($M = 5.56, SE = 0.439$) and waiting list groups ($M = 5.17, SE = 0.429; t(46.6) = 0.7, p = 0.459; Cohen's D = 0.316, 95\% CI [-0.536, 1.169]$). By the middle of the intervention, pain levels in the PDSR group had significantly decreased compared to the waiting list group (M difference = $-1.081, SE = 0.515; t(46.5) = -2.1, p = 0.041; Cohen's D = -0.857, 95\% CI [-1.687, -0.027]$). This difference was even more pronounced at the post-intervention time, where the PDSR group reported significantly lower pain levels ($M = 2.91, SE = 0.345$) compared to the waiting list group ($M = 5.07, SE = 0.336; M$ difference = $-2.164, SE = 0.456; t(48.2) = -4.7, p < 0.001; Cohen's D = -1.716, 95\% CI [-2.481, -0.951]$). (Figure 1A).

Pain Interference

A mixed-effects model analysis revealed a significant interaction between time and group for pain interference ($F(2, 65.8) = 6.746, p = 0.002$), indicating that the change in pain interference over time differed significantly between the PDSR and waiting list groups. Post-hoc analyses showed that, at baseline, pain interference levels were similar between the PDSR ($M = 4.72, SE = 0.260$) and waiting list groups ($M = 4.72, SE = 0.253; t(49.4) = 0.002, p = 0.999; Cohen's D = 0.001, 95\% CI [-0.746, 0.748]$). At the midpoint of the intervention, there was a trend toward reduced pain interference in the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group, but the difference was not statistically significant (M difference = $-0.408, SE = 0.379; t(48.5) = -1.08, p = 0.287; Cohen's D = -0.446, 95\% CI [-1.279, 0.388]$). By the post-intervention time, the PDSR group reported significantly lower pain interference levels ($M = 2.78, SE = 0.256$) compared to the waiting list group ($M = 4.54, SE = 0.249; M$ difference = $-1.765, SE = 0.338; t(49.7) = -5.22, p < 0.001; Cohen's D = -1.926, 95\% CI [-2.713, -1.138]$) (Figure 1B).

Well-Being

A mixed-effects model analysis revealed a significant interaction between time and group for well-being ($F(2, 48.4) = 11.753, p < 0.001$), indicating differing patterns of change in well-being scores over time between the PDSR and waiting list groups. Post-hoc analyses revealed that, at baseline, well-being scores were comparable between the PDSR ($M = 2.52, SE = 0.160$) and waiting list groups ($M = 2.68, SE = 0.155; t(51.8) = -0.719, p = 0.475; Cohen's D = -0.263, 95\% CI [-0.997, 0.471]$). By the midpoint of the intervention, well-being scores in the PDSR group had significantly increased compared to the waiting list group (M difference = $0.982, SE = 0.213; t(51.5) = 4.619, p < 0.001; Cohen's D = 1.682, 95\% CI [0.915, 2.450]$). This improvement persisted at the post-intervention time, where the PDSR group reported significantly higher well-being scores ($M = 3.35, SE = 0.156$) compared to the waiting list group ($M = 2.27, SE = 0.152; M$ difference = $1.080, SE = 0.211; t(51.9) = 5.131, p < 0.001; Cohen's D = 1.850, 95\% CI [1.082, 2.618]$) (Figure 1C).




Figure 1. Changes in primary outcomes across time for the PDSR and waiting list groups. (A) Pain levels: Participants in the PDSR group experienced significant reductions in pain levels compared to the waiting list group, particularly at the midpoint and post-intervention assessments. (B) Pain interference: The PDSR group showed significant reductions in pain interference over time, with large differences emerging by the post-intervention time point.

(C) Well-being: Well-being scores significantly improved in the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group, with large and sustained effects observed at both the midpoint and post-intervention time points. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Secondary outcomes

Pain Catastrophizing

A mixed-effects model analysis revealed a significant interaction between time and group for pain catastrophizing ($F(2, 78.7) = 9.264, p < 0.001$), indicating differing patterns of change between the PDSR and waiting list groups over time. Post-hoc analyses showed that, at baseline, pain catastrophizing levels were comparable between the PDSR ($M = 2.90, SE = 0.112$) and waiting list groups ($M = 3.06, SE = 0.109; t(54.1) = -1.05, p = 0.298; Cohen's D = -0.37, 95\% CI [-1.08, 0.34]$). By the midpoint of the intervention, pain catastrophizing in the PDSR group had significantly decreased compared to the waiting list group (M difference = $-0.767, SE = 0.156; t(54.4) = -4.93, p < 0.001; Cohen's D = -1.78, 95\% CI [-2.55, -1.02]$). This reduction was even more pronounced at the post-intervention time, where the PDSR group reported significantly lower pain catastrophizing levels ($M = 1.93, SE = 0.102$) compared to the waiting list group ($M = 2.91, SE = 0.099; M$ difference = $-0.976, SE = 0.143; t(53.4) = -6.84, p < 0.001; Cohen's D = -2.27, 95\% CI [-3.00, -1.53]$).

Anxiety

A mixed-effects model analysis revealed a significant interaction between time and group for anxiety levels ($F(2, 69.3) = 8.212, p < 0.001$), indicating that changes in anxiety levels over time differed significantly between the PDSR and waiting list groups. Post-hoc analyses revealed that, at baseline, anxiety levels were similar between the PDSR ($M = 1.806, SE = 0.126$) and waiting list groups ($M = 1.730, SE = 0.123; t(53.7) = 0.438, p = 0.663; Cohen's D = 0.150, 95\% CI [-0.538, 0.839]$). By the midpoint of the intervention, anxiety levels in the PDSR group had significantly decreased compared to the waiting list group (M difference = $-0.499, SE = 0.186; t(54.5) = -2.685, p = 0.010; Cohen's D = -0.986, 95\% CI [-1.734, -0.237]$). This reduction was even

more pronounced at the post-intervention time, where the PDSR group reported significantly lower anxiety levels ($M = 0.572$, $SE = 0.120$) compared to the waiting list group ($M = 1.443$, $SE = 0.117$; M difference = -0.871 , $SE = 0.168$; $t(52.9) = -5.197$, $p < 0.001$; Cohen's $D = -1.720$, 95% CI $[-2.425, -1.014]$).

Depression

A mixed-effects model analysis revealed a non-significant interaction between time and group for depression levels ($F(2, 68.8) = 2.851$, $p = 0.065$), indicating no statistically significant differences in the pattern of change between the PDSR and waiting list groups over time. Significant main effects were observed for time ($F(2, 40.9) = 12.354$, $p < 0.001$) and group ($F(1, 79.8) = 4.967$, $p = 0.029$), suggesting overall changes in depression levels over time and between groups. Post-hoc analyses revealed that, at baseline, depression levels were similar between the PDSR ($M = 1.675$, $SE = 0.120$) and waiting list groups ($M = 1.626$, $SE = 0.117$; $t(50.9) = 0.300$, $p = 0.766$; Cohen's $D = 0.104$, 95% CI $[-0.591, 0.798]$). At the midpoint, there was a non-significant trend toward lower depression levels in the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group (M difference = -0.237 , $SE = 0.195$; $t(49.4) = -1.220$, $p = 0.228$; Cohen's $D = -0.501$, 95% CI $[-1.329, 0.327]$). By the post-intervention time, the PDSR group reported significantly lower depression levels ($M = 0.858$, $SE = 0.127$) compared to the waiting list group ($M = 1.337$, $SE = 0.124$; M difference = -0.479 , $SE = 0.171$; $t(51.8) = -2.808$, $p = 0.007$; Cohen's $D = -1.012$, 95% CI $[-1.748, -0.275]$).

Sleep Quality

A mixed-effects model analysis revealed a significant interaction between time and group for sleep quality ($F(2, 67.2) = 8.275$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that changes in sleep quality over time differed significantly between the PDSR and waiting list groups. Post-hoc analyses showed that, at baseline, sleep quality was comparable between the PDSR ($M = 1.336$, $SE = 0.086$) and waiting list groups ($M = 1.425$, $SE = 0.084$; $t(52.3) = -0.743$, $p = 0.461$; Cohen's $D = -0.247$, 95% CI $[-0.916, 0.422]$). By the midpoint of the intervention, sleep quality had significantly improved in

the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group (M difference = -0.581, SE = 0.125; $t(53.4) = -4.642$, $p < 0.001$; Cohen's $D = -1.614$, 95% CI [-2.346, -0.881]). This improvement was even more pronounced at the post-intervention time, where the PDSR group reported significantly better sleep quality (M = 0.640, SE = 0.102) compared to the waiting list group (M = 1.384, SE = 0.099; M difference = -0.744, SE = 0.135; $t(53.8) = -5.517$, $p < 0.001$; Cohen's $D = -2.069$, 95% CI [-2.873, -1.264]).




Figure 2. Changes in secondary outcomes across time for the PDSR and waiting list groups. (A) Pain catastrophizing: Pain catastrophizing decreased significantly in the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group, with large effect sizes observed at both the midpoint and post-intervention time points. (B) Anxiety: Anxiety levels showed significant reductions in the PDSR group relative to the waiting list group, with moderate to large effect sizes observed at the midpoint and post-intervention time points.

(C) Depression: Depression levels showed consistent decreases in the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group, with statistically significant differences and moderate effect sizes observed at the post-intervention time point.

(D) Sleep quality: Sleep quality significantly improved in the PDSR group compared to the waiting list group, with large effect sizes observed at the midpoint and post-intervention time points. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

longitudinal follow-up six months post-intervention

Discussion

This study evaluates the initial efficacy of the Personal Danger Signals Reprocessing (PDSR) intervention, an online group therapeutic approach for women with nociplastic chronic pain. The results indicate significant improvements across various domains including pain levels, pain interference, wellbeing, pain catastrophizing, anxiety, depression, and sleep disturbances among participants who underwent the PDSR intervention compared to a waiting list control group. Importantly, the decrease in pain levels remained significant in measurements taken six months after treatment.

Interpreting the Findings:

Our results further reinforce the importance of therapeutic strategies that target the mental processing of pain signals, consistent with the conceptual framework of nociplastic pain as driven by aberrant neural processing rather than solely tissue damage (Fitzcharles et al., 2021; Galli, 2023).

The study's findings align with existing evidence supporting psychotherapeutic approaches such as mindfulness-based interventions (MBSR) (S. Smith & Langen, 2020), emotional awareness and

expression therapy (EAET) (Yarns et al., 2020), and PRT (Ashar et al., 2022) for chronic pain management.

The Longitudinal reduction in pain levels that maintained after 6 month aligns with previous results of long-term efficacy of various psychological treatments for chronic pain. Pain Reprocessing Therapy (PRT), focusing on reappraising pain as non-threatening, led to significant and lasting pain reduction compared to placebo and usual care (Ashar et al., 2022). Similarly, complementary biopsychosocial treatments, including self-hypnosis and cognitive-behavioral therapy, showed long-term benefits in pain reduction and quality of life improvements up to 12 months post-treatment (Bicego et al., 2021). These findings highlight the significance of lasting pain relief achieved through PDSR group interventions, along with other psychological approaches, which support sustained pain reduction and improvements in quality of life for individuals with chronic pain.

Moreover, the improvements in sleep and reduction in anxiety levels observed in this study are noteworthy, as disturbed sleep and anxiety are known to exacerbate chronic pain (Chen et al., 2022; Sheng et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2007). This suggests that PDSR's holistic approach not only directly targets pain but also addresses these comorbid conditions, potentially interrupting the vicious cycle of pain and its exacerbating factors.

Potential Therapeutic Mechanisms:

The therapeutic mechanisms at the core of PDSR involve a nuanced interplay of cognitive, emotional, and physiological processes. Rooted in Pain Reprocessing Therapy (PRT) (Ashar et al., 2022), PDSR integrates a diverse array of approaches, including psychoeducation, coaching, mindfulness, and interoceptive techniques. This comprehensive blend of methods forms the foundation of PDSR, which is delivered online as a form of teletherapy.

PDSR features a structured curriculum designed to employ the concept of danger signal reprocessing, guiding participants in reframing their interpretations of pain signals. This process facilitates a shift away from potentially catastrophic or threatening appraisals towards a more

neutral and accepting perspective. Indeed, the significant reduction in pain catastrophizing observed in this study support previous findings (Petrini & Arendt-Nielsen, 2020) indicating that modifying maladaptive pain perceptions can lead to better pain outcomes. This aligns with PDSR's focus on reframing individuals' interpretations of pain signals, which may facilitate neural plasticity and pain reduction (Doan et al., 2015; Mansour et al., 2014; Woolf, 2011).

Complemented by mindfulness and interoceptive practices, as well as coaching techniques, this cognitive reframing not only aids in emotional and physiological regulation but also significantly diminishes the distress associated with pain. Moreover, by addressing components such as anxiety, depression, sleep disturbances, and overall well-being, PDSR offers a holistic approach to chronic pain management, promoting comprehensive relief.

The psychoeducation component, serving as the foundational framework of PDSR, demonstrated the role of participants' awareness regarding the nature of pain (De et al., n.d.; Gómez-De-regil, 2021). This educational approach guides participants through a progressive journey beginning with a limited understanding and evolving into active exploration and self-reflection regarding their own pain experiences. By introducing key concepts such as neuroplasticity of the brain, the dynamic relationship between pain and emotions, catastrophizing, the expectation management and other relevant ideas form clear and aware mindset and shift to a paradigm of biopsychosocial awareness.

Coaching techniques can help increase mental resilience and empower individuals to translate theoretical knowledge into precise actions for effective pain management. A previous study highlights the potential of coaching interventions to enhance mental resilience and well-being across various populations. A school-based health coaching program for middle school students significantly improved youth resilience (Lee et al., 2020). In the mental health field, coaching is proposed as a strategy to empower clients and assist healthcare professionals in implementing the recovery approach (McSharry & O'Grady, 2020). These studies collectively demonstrate the effectiveness of coaching techniques in building mental resilience and translating knowledge into actionable strategies across different contexts. In our study, the use of coaching techniques

may have played a key role in contributing to the reduction of pain and other related symptoms.

The structured format of the program enables participants to gradually acquire new insights and develop essential skills, with intervals between sessions providing valuable opportunities to digest and implement learned material effectively. However, it's crucial to recognize that this journey unfolds uniquely for each participant, highlighting the personalized nature of pain perception and management within the program. Additionally, mindfulness practice, an integral element of PDSR, has garnered attention for its capacity to improve attentional control and modulate pain processing pathways in the brain (Zeidan et al., 2011). In PDSR mindfulness techniques likely contribute to the observed reductions in both pain intensity and interference, offering participants valuable tools for managing their pain more effectively.

The group format of the intervention capitalizes on social support and shared experiences, bolstering its therapeutic impact as evidenced by research on group therapy in chronic pain management (Nøst et al., 2022). Within the PDSR group context, the provision of group support and expert guidance through chat facilitates the exchange of insights and cultivates a strong sense of community. This inclusive environment may enable participants to embark on their journey of self-discovery with a sense of security, contributing to the reduction of anxiety levels. Through active engagement, participants could feel acknowledged, supported, and empowered to share valuable advice and experiences.

PDSR introduces a novel approach that not only integrates seamlessly into the therapeutic landscape but also offers a personalized perspective, presenting a pragmatic and effective solution for reducing chronic pain and associated mental comorbidities.

The positive impact of PDSR on both primary and secondary outcomes carries significant implications for healthcare policy and practice. Given the considerable burden of chronic pain on individuals and healthcare systems (T. J. Smith & Hillner, 2019), the integration of accessible and effective interventions like PDSR holds promise for improving patient outcomes and alleviating healthcare costs.

Limitations and Future Directions:

While this study provides promising evidence for the efficacy of PDSR, some limitations need to be considered. The participants in our study were exclusively women, and therefore, the generalizability of our results to a broader population is constrained. Future research endeavors should address the call for larger sample sizes, consider individual differences in response to the intervention, and explore the potential influence of PDSR on other related conditions. Longitudinal studies with follow-ups after treatment could also shed light on the sustainability of the observed pain reductions over an extended duration.

Conclusion:

In summary, our investigation into the PDSR online intervention demonstrates its potential as a transformative approach in the realm of chronic pain management. The positive outcomes observed in pain reduction and mental health comorbidities within the PDSR group align with the broader trend in recognizing the limitations of traditional biomedical approaches and the importance of addressing psychological components associated with chronic pain. Study contributes to the growing body of evidence supporting the integration of digital and psychological interventions in pain management strategies. Further research is warranted to optimize PDSR and elucidate its long-term impact on individuals living with chronic pain.

References

- Ankawi, B., Kerns, R. D., & Edmond, S. N. (2019). Enhancing Motivation for Change in the Management of Chronic Painful Conditions: a Review of Recent Literature. In *Current Pain and Headache Reports* (Vol. 23, Issue 10). Current Medicine Group LLC 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11916-019-0813-x>
- Ariza-Mateos, M. J., Cabrera-Martos, I., Prados-Román, E., Granados-Santiago, M., Rodríguez-Torres, J., & Carmen Valenza, M. (2021). A systematic review of internet-based interventions for women with chronic pain. In *British Journal of Occupational Therapy* (Vol. 84, Issue 1, pp. 6–14). SAGE Publications Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308022620970861>

- Ashar, Y. K., Gordon, A., Schubiner, H., Uipi, C., Knight, K., Anderson, Z., Carlisle, J., Polisky, L., Geuter, S., Flood, T. F., Kragel, P. A., Dimidjian, S., Lumley, M. A., & Wager, T. D. (2022). Effect of Pain Reprocessing Therapy vs Placebo and Usual Care for Patients with Chronic Back Pain: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *79*(1), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2021.2669>
- Bartley, E. J., Fanning, J., DelVentura, J., & Carrington Reid, M. (2022). *A mobile health + health coaching application for the management of chronic non-cancer pain in older adults: Results from a pilot randomized controlled study.*
- Bicego, A., Monseur, J., Collinet, A., Donneau, A. F., Fontaine, R., Libbrecht, D., ... & Vanhauzenhuysse, A. (2021). Complementary treatment comparison for chronic pain management: A randomized longitudinal study. *PLoS One*, *16*(8), e0256001.
- Bułydyś, K., Górnicki, T., Kałka, D., Szuster, E., Biernikiewicz, M., Markuszewski, L., & Sobieszczkańska, M. (2023). What Do We Know about Nociceptive Pain? *Healthcare*, *11*(12), 1794. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11121794>
- Buysse, D. J., Reynolds, C. F., Monk, T. H., Berman, S. R., Kupfer, D. J., & R., & K. D. J. (1989). The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index: A New Instrument for Psychiatric Practice and Research. In *Psychiatry Research* (Vol. 28).
- Casale, R., Atzeni, F., Bazzichi, L., Beretta, G., Costantini, E., Sacerdote, P., & Tassorelli, C. (2021). Pain in women: a perspective review on a relevant clinical issue that deserves prioritization. *Pain and therapy*, *10*, 287-314.
- Chen, T., Wang, J., Wang, Y. Q., & Chu, Y. X. (2022). Current Understanding of the Neural Circuitry in the Comorbidity of Chronic Pain and Anxiety. In *Neural Plasticity* (Vol. 2022). Hindawi Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/4217593>
- Chou, R., Turner, J. A., Devine, E. B., Hansen, R. N., Sullivan, S. D., Blazina, I., Dana, T., Bougatsos, C., & Deyo, R. A. (2015). The effectiveness and risks of long-term opioid therapy for chronic pain: A systematic review for a national institutes of health pathways to prevention workshop. In *Annals of Internal Medicine* (Vol. 162, Issue 4, pp. 276–286). American College of Physicians. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M14-2559>
- Cohen, S. P., Vase, L., & Hooten, W. M. (2021). Chronic pain: an update on burden, best practices, and new advances. In *The Lancet* (Vol. 397, Issue 10289, pp. 2082–2097). Elsevier B.V. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00393-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00393-7)

- Costantini, L., Pasquarella, C., Odone, A., Colucci, M. E., Costanza, A., Serafini, G., Aguglia, A., Belvederi Murri, M., Brakoulas, V., Amore, M., Ghaemi, S. N., & Amerio, A. (2021). Screening for depression in primary care with Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9): A systematic review. In *Journal of Affective Disorders* (Vol. 279, pp. 473–483). Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.09.131>
- De, M., Salvetti, G., Cobelo, A., De Moura Vernalha, P., Ilca De Almeida Vianna, C., Carvalho Costa, L. C., Canarezi, C., Gomes, R., & Calegare, L. (2012). Effects of a psychoeducational program for chronic pain management Efeitos de um programa psicoeducativo no controle da dor crônica. *SP, Brazil. 5 Occupational Therapist, Specialist in Pediatric Neurology and Hand Therapy*, 20(5), 896–902. www.eerp.usp.br/rlae
- Doan, L., Manders, T., & Wang, J. (2015). Neuroplasticity underlying the comorbidity of pain and depression. In *Neural Plasticity* (Vol. 2015). Hindawi Publishing Corporation. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/504691>
- Fitzcharles, M. A., Cohen, S. P., Clauw, D. J., Littlejohn, G., Usui, C., & Häuser, W. (2021). Nociplastic pain: towards an understanding of prevalent pain conditions. In *The Lancet* (Vol. 397, Issue 10289, pp. 2098–2110). Elsevier B.V. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00392-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00392-5)
- Freyenhagen, R., Parada, H. A., Calderon-Ospina, C. A., Chen, J., Rakhmawati Emril, D., Fernández-Villacorta, F. J., Franco, H., Ho, K. Y., Lara-Solares, A., Li, C. C. F., Mimenza Alvarado, A., Nimmaanrat, S., Dolma Santos, M., & Ciampi de Andrade, D. (2019). Current understanding of the mixed pain concept: a brief narrative review. In *Current Medical Research and Opinion* (Vol. 35, Issue 6, pp. 1011–1018). Taylor and Francis Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2018.1552042>
- Galli, F. (2023). Understanding Nociplastic Pain: Building a Bridge between Clinical Psychology and Medicine. In *Journal of Personalized Medicine* (Vol. 13, Issue 2). MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm13020310>
- Gatchel, R. J., Peng, Y. B., Peters, M. L., Fuchs, P. N., & Turk, D. C. (2007). The Biopsychosocial Approach to Chronic Pain: Scientific Advances and Future Directions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(4), 581–624. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.4.581>
- Gjeilo, K. H., Stenseth, R., Wahba, A., Lydersen, S., & Klepstad, P. (2007). Validation of the Brief Pain Inventory in Patients Six Months After Cardiac Surgery. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 34(6), 648–656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2007.01.010>
- Gómez-De-regil, L. (2021). Psychoeducation for patients with fibromyalgia: A systematic review. In *Healthcare (Switzerland)* (Vol. 9, Issue 6). MDPI AG. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9060737>

- Hashmi, J. A., Baliki, M. N., Huang, L., Baria, A. T., Torbey, S., Hermann, K. M., Schnitzer, T. J., & Apkarian, A. V. (2013). Shape shifting pain: Chronification of back pain shifts brain representation from nociceptive to emotional circuits. *Brain*, *136*(9), 2751–2768. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awt211>
- Hawker, G. A., Mian, S., Kendzerska, T., & French, M. (2011). Measures of adult pain: Visual Analog Scale for Pain (VAS Pain), Numeric Rating Scale for Pain (NRS Pain), McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ), Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire (SF-MPQ), Chronic Pain Grade Scale (CPGS), Short Form-36 Bodily Pain Scale (SF-36 BPS), and Measure of Intermittent and Constant Osteoarthritis Pain (ICOAP). *Arthritis Care and Research*, *63*(SUPPL. 11). <https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.20543>
- Jackson, T. P., Stabile, V. S., & McQueen, K. A. K. (2014). The Global Burden Of Chronic Pain. *ASA Newsletter*, *78*(6), 24–27.
- Kang, Y., Trewern, L., Jackman, J., Irani Nee Soni, A., & McCartney, D. (2024). Chronic pain: supported self-management. *BMJ*, *384*. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38167273/>
- Krebs, E. E., Gravely, A., Nugent, S., Jensen, A. C., DeRonne, B., Goldsmith, E. S., Kroenke, K., Bair, M. J., & Noorbaloochi, S. (2018). Effect of opioid vs nonopioid medications on pain-related function in patients with chronic back pain or hip or knee osteoarthritis pain the SPACE randomized clinical trial. *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association*, *319*(9), 872–882. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.0899>
- Kroska, E. B. (2016). A meta-analysis of fear-avoidance and pain intensity: The paradox of chronic pain. In *Scandinavian Journal of Pain* (Vol. 13, pp. 43–58). Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjpain.2016.06.011>
- Lai, L., Liu, Y., McCracken, L. M., Li, Y., & Ren, Z. (2023). The efficacy of acceptance and commitment therapy for chronic pain: A three-level meta-analysis and a trial sequential analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *165*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2023.104308>
- Lee, J. A., Heberlein, E., Pyle, E., Caughlan, T., Rahaman, D., Sabin, M., & Kaar, J. L. (2021). Evaluation of a resiliency focused health coaching intervention for middle school students: building resilience for healthy kids program. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *35*(3), 344–351.
- Leung, L. (2012). Pain catastrophizing: An updated review. In *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine* (Vol. 34, Issue 3, pp. 204–217). <https://doi.org/10.4103/0253-7176.106012>
- Losch, S., Traut-Mattausch, E., Mühlberger, M. D., & Jonas, E. (2016). Comparing the effectiveness of individual coaching, self-coaching, and group training: How leadership makes the difference. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*(MAY). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00629>

- Lumley, M. A., & Schubiner, H. (2019a). Emotional Awareness and Expression Therapy for Chronic Pain: Rationale, Principles and Techniques, Evidence, and Critical Review. In *Current Rheumatology Reports* (Vol. 21, Issue 7). Current Medicine Group LLC 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11926-019-0829-6>
- Lumley, M. A., & Schubiner, H. (2019b). Psychological Therapy for Centralized Pain: An Integrative Assessment and Treatment Model. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *81*(2), 114–124. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0000000000000654>
- Malfait, A. M., & Miller, R. E. (2020). Why we should study osteoarthritis pain in experimental models in both sexes. *Osteoarthritis and cartilage*, *28*(4), 397-399.
- Mansour, A. R., Farmer, M. A., Baliki, M. N., & Apkarian, A. V. (2014). Chronic pain: The role of learning and brain plasticity. *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*, *32*(1), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.3233/RNN-139003>
- Markfelder, T., & Pauli, P. (2020). Fear of pain and pain intensity: Meta-analysis and systematic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *146*(5), 411–450. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000228>
- McCracken, L. M. (2023). Personalized pain management: Is it time for process-based therapy for particular people with chronic pain? In *European Journal of Pain (United Kingdom)*. John Wiley and Sons Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejp.2091>
- McCracken, L. M., Yu, L., & Vowles, K. E. (2022). New generation psychological treatments in chronic pain. *BMJ*, *376*, e057212. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2021-057212>
- Mc Sharry, P., & O'Grady, T. (2021). How coaching can assist the mental healthcare professional in the operationalization of the recovery approach. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, *57*(2), 844-851.
- Meehan, E., & Carter, B. (2021). Moving With Pain: What Principles From Somatic Practices Can Offer to People Living With Chronic Pain. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.620381>
- Melchior, M., Poisbeau, P., Gaumond, I., & Marchand, S. (2016). Insights into the mechanisms and the emergence of sex-differences in pain. In *Neuroscience* (Vol. 338, pp. 63–80). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2016.05.007>
- Mercadante, S., Arcuri, E., & Santoni, A. (2019). Opioid-Induced Tolerance and Hyperalgesia. *CNS Drugs*, *33*(10), 943–955. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40263-019-00660-0>
- Mills, S. E. E., Nicolson, K. P., & Smith, B. H. (2019). Chronic pain: a review of its epidemiology and associated factors in population-based studies. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, *123*(2), e273–e283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2019.03.023>

- Moore, E., Paré, C., Carde, E., & Pagé, M.G. (2023). Virtual Group Psychotherapy for Chronic Pain: Exploring the Impact of the Virtual Medium on Participants' Experiences. *Pain medicine*.
- Morley, S., & Williams, A. (2015). New Developments in the Psychological Management of Chronic Pain. In *CanJPsychiatry* (Vol. 60, Issue 4). www.TheCJP.ca
- Mühlberger, M. D., & Traut-Mattausch, E. (2015). Leading to Effectiveness: Comparing Dyadic Coaching and Group Coaching. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 51(2), 198–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886315574331>
- Nøst, T. H., Woodhouse, A., Dale, L. O., Hara, K. W., & Steinsbekk, A. (2022). Participants' experiences from group-based treatment at multidisciplinary pain centres - A qualitative study. *Scandinavian Journal of Pain*, 22(2), 365–373. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sjpain-2021-0099>
- Petrini, L., & Arendt-Nielsen, L. (2020). Understanding Pain Catastrophizing: Putting Pieces Together. In *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 11). Frontiers Media S.A. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.603420>
- Presto, P., Mazzitelli, M., Junell, R., Griffin, Z., & Neugebauer, V. (2022). Sex differences in pain along the neuraxis. *Neuropharmacology*, 210, 109030.
- Rethorn, Z. D., Pettitt, R. W., Dykstra, E., & Pettitt, C. D. (2020). Health and wellness coaching positively impacts individuals with chronic pain and pain-related interference. *PLoS ONE*, 15(7 July). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236734>
- Riediger, C., Schuster, T., Barlinn, K., Maier, S., Weitz, J., & Siepmann, T. (2017). Adverse effects of antidepressants for chronic pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 8(JUL). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2017.00307>
- Rikard, S. M., Strahan, A. E., Schmit, K. M., Gery, J., & Guy, P. (2023). *MMWR, Chronic Pain Among Adults — United States, 2019–2021*. <https://www.cdc.gov/>
- Scheidegger, A., Gómez Penedo, J. M., Blättler, L. T., Aybek, S., Bischoff, N., & grosse Holtforth, M. (2024). How Treatment Motivation Predicts Favorable Outcomes in Interdisciplinary Multimodal Pain Treatment Among Patients with Chronic Primary Pain. *Journal of clinical psychology in medical settings*, 31(1), 48-57.
- Sheng, J., Liu, S., Wang, Y., Cui, R., & Zhang, X. (2017). The Link between Depression and Chronic Pain: Neural Mechanisms in the Brain. In *Neural Plasticity* (Vol. 2017). Hindawi Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/9724371>
- Simons, L. E., Elman, I., & Borsook, D. (2014). Psychological processing in chronic pain: A neural systems approach. In *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* (Vol. 39, pp. 61–78). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.12.006>

- Sischka, P. E., Costa, A. P., Steffgen, G., & Schmidt, A. F. (2020). The WHO-5 well-being index – validation based on item response theory and the analysis of measurement invariance across 35 countries. *Journal of Affective Disorders Reports*, 1, 100020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadr.2020.100020>
- Smith, S., & Langen, W. (2020). A systematic review of mindfulness practices for improving outcomes in chronic low back pain. *International Journal of Yoga*, 13(3), 177. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijoy.ijoy_4_20
- Smith, T. J., & Hillner, B. E. (2019). The Cost of Pain. In *JAMA network open* (Vol. 2, Issue 4, p. e191532). NLM (Medline). <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.1532>
- Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. W., & Löwe, B. (2006). *A Brief Measure for Assessing Generalized Anxiety Disorder The GAD-7*. <http://archinte.jamanetwork.com/>
- Sturgeon, J. A. (2014). Psychological therapies for the management of chronic pain. In *Psychology Research and Behavior Management* (Vol. 7, pp. 115–124). DOVE Medical Press Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S44762>
- Tang, N. K. Y., WRIGHT, K. J., & SALKOVSKIS, P. M. (2007). Prevalence and correlates of clinical insomnia co-occurring with chronic back pain. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 16(1), 85–95.
- Taylor, S. J. C., Carnes, D., Homer, K., Kahan, B. C., Hounsborne, N., Eldridge, S., Spencer, A., Pincus, T., Rahman, A., & Underwood, M. (2016). Novel Three-Day, Community-Based, Nonpharmacological Group Intervention for Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain (COPERS): A Randomised Clinical Trial. *PLoS Medicine*, 13(6). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002040>
- Thong, I. S. K., Jensen, M. P., Miró, J., & Tan, G. (2018). The validity of pain intensity measures: What do the NRS, VAS, VRS, and FPS-R measure? *Scandinavian Journal of Pain*, 18(1), 99–107. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sjpain-2018-0012>
- Thorlund, J. B., Juhl, C. B., Roos, E. M., & Lohmander, L. S. (2015). Arthroscopic surgery for degenerative knee: Systematic review and meta-analysis of benefits and harms. In *BMJ (Online)* (Vol. 350). BMJ Publishing Group. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h2747>
- Varrassi, G., Müller-Schwefe, G., Pergolizzi, J., Ornska, A., Morlion, B., Mavrocordatos, P., Margarit, C., Mangas, C., Jaksch, W., Huygen, F., Collett, B., Berti, M., Aldington, D., & Ahlbeck, K. (2010). Pharmacological treatment of chronic pain the need for CHANGE. In *Current Medical Research and Opinion* (Vol. 26, Issue 5, pp. 1231–1245). <https://doi.org/10.1185/03007991003689175>
- Veehof, M. M., Trompetter, H. R., Bohlmeijer, E. T., & Schreurs, K. M. G. (2016). Acceptance- and mindfulness-based interventions for the treatment of chronic pain: a meta-analytic review. In

- Cognitive Behaviour Therapy* (Vol. 45, Issue 1, pp. 5–31). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2015.1098724>
- Von Mensenkampff, B., Ward, M., Kelly, G., Cadogan, S., Fawsit, F., & Lowe, N. (2015). The value of normalization: Group therapy for individuals with brain injury. *Brain Injury*, 29(11), 1292–1299.
<https://doi.org/10.3109/02699052.2015.1042407>
- Vos, T., Abajobir, A. A., Abate, K. H., Abbafati, C., Abbas, K. M., Abd-Allah, F., Abdulkader, R. S., Abdulle, A. M., Abebo, T. A., Abera, S. F., Aboyans, V., Abu-Raddad, L. J., Ackerman, I. N., Adamu, A. A., Adetokunboh, O., Afarideh, M., Afshin, A., Agarwal, S. K., Aggarwal, R., ... Murray, C. J. L. (2017). Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet*, 390(10100), 1211–1259. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)32154-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32154-2)
- Williams, A. C. de C., Fisher, E., Hearn, L., & Eccleston, C. (2020). Psychological therapies for the management of chronic pain (excluding headache) in adults. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (Vol. 2020, Issue 8). John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD007407.pub4>
- Wilson, I. R. (2017). Management of chronic pain through pain management programmes. In *British Medical Bulletin* (Vol. 124, Issue 1, pp. 55–64). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldx032>
- Woolf, C. J. (2011). Central sensitization: Implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain. In *Pain* (Vol. 152, Issue SUPPL.3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2010.09.030>
- Yarns, B. C., Lumley, M. A., Cassidy, J. T., Steers, W. N., Osato, S., Schubiner, H., & Sultzer, D. L. (2020). Emotional Awareness and Expression Therapy Achieves Greater Pain Reduction than Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in Older Adults with Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain: A Preliminary Randomized Comparison Trial. *Pain Medicine (United States)*, 21(11), 2811–2822.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/PM/PNAA145>
- Yong, R. J., Mullins, P. M., & Bhattacharyya, N. (2022). Prevalence of chronic pain among adults in the United States. *PAIN*, 163(2).
https://journals.lww.com/pain/fulltext/2022/02000/prevalence_of_chronic_pain_among_adults_in_the.31.aspx
- Zelaya, C. E., Dahlhamer, J. M., Lucas, J. W., & Connor, E. M. (2020). Key findings Data from the National Health Interview Survey. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/index.htm>.

Appendix 1

PDSR Intervention Overview

The PDSR intervention comprised an 8-week online group program designed to provide participants with a comprehensive approach to chronic pain management. Led by experienced pain management educators, the program integrated psychoeducation, coaching techniques, and mindfulness tools. The primary objective was to enhance participants' understanding of chronic pain, its underlying mechanisms, and its effects on daily life. Additionally, the course aimed to equip participants with non-pharmacological pain management strategies. These strategies were not only educational but also practical, emphasizing the importance of self-regulation and mental well-being.

Participants engaged in sessions conducted via Zoom, allowing for real-time interaction and seamless delivery of the course material. Each session spanned approximately 1.5 to 2 hours, ensuring ample time for participants to delve deeply into the content. This extended duration facilitated comprehensive coverage of the material and provided opportunities for in-depth discussions and active participation.

Design of the curriculum included this range of critical topics:

1. **Physiology of Pain:** Participants delved into the fundamental understanding of pain, its awareness, and the statistics related to chronic pain. They explored how pain becomes chronic and the potential secondary benefits of perceiving pain.
2. **Pain and Fear:** Session emphasized the connection between pain and fear, the importance of controlling pain, and the rational interpretation of pain perception. Body-oriented techniques and strategies for shifting attention were introduced.
3. **Neuroplasticity and Chronic Pain:** The course delved into the concept of neuroplasticity and its role in chronic pain. Participants learned about chronic pain scenarios, central sensitization, and factors contributing to neuroplastic pain.

4. **Placebo and Nocebo:** Participants explored the placebo effect, its connection to the mind and body, and its role in pain management. The session also addressed the phenomenon of nocebo.
5. **Pain as Feedback:** This session focused on the concept of pain as feedback and introduced an algorithm for managing neuroplastic pain. Participants learned to identify and address the five attention traps in mindfulness and engage in basic mindfulness training.
6. **Resource Conditions:** Participants worked on developing resource conditions, managing emotions, and recognizing cognitive and bodily signals of safety. They practiced safety signals and attention-shifting techniques.
7. **Somatic Tracking and Exposition Therapy:** The course explored somatic tracking and the principles of exposition therapy. Participants learned to work with intense sensations, the relationship between pain and touch, and the concept of safe avoidance. They also discussed the refocusing of attention and different types of threat alerts.
8. **Resistance and Habit Formation:** The final session emphasized overcoming resistance to change and creating new habits for pain management. Participants developed a personal set of keys to living pain-free, highlighting the importance of individual responsibility.

To create a supportive and inclusive learning environment, participants were given access to a private chat group on Telegram. This group chat served as a virtual meeting place where participants could connect, share their experiences, ask questions, and provide valuable feedback. It was a space where both trainers and fellow participants actively interacted, fostering a sense of community and support throughout 8 weeks of the course.

Appendix 2

Pain Levels (BPI-SF)

```
> anova(pain_s)
```

Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)
time_point	21.687	10.844	2	30.898	5.9866	0.0063476 **
group	11.972	11.972	1	72.120	6.6097	0.0122054 *
time_point:group	30.841	15.421	2	57.292	8.5135	0.0005792 ***

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

> em_pain

\$emmeans

time_point = Before:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	5.80	0.411	110	4.99	6.61
Waiting list	5.20	0.400	109	4.41	6.00

time_point = Middle:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	4.17	0.411	110	3.35	4.98
Waiting list	5.10	0.400	109	4.31	5.90

time_point = After:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	2.96	0.411	110	2.14	3.77
Waiting list	5.00	0.400	109	4.21	5.80

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

Confidence level used: 0.95

\$contrasts

time_point = Before:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	0.595	0.562	107	1.059	0.2921

time_point = Middle:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.937	0.562	107	-1.667	0.0984

time_point = After:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-2.047	0.562	107	-3.644	0.0004

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

> eff_size(em_pain, sigma = sigma(pain_s), edf = df.residual(pain_s))

time_point = Before:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	0.442	0.419	107	-0.388	1.272

time_point = Middle:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-0.696	0.420	107	-1.529	0.137

time_point = After:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-1.521	0.431	107	-2.375	-0.668

Pain Interference (BPI-SF)

> anova(interf_s)

Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)
time_point	9.9741	4.9870	2	28.038	5.9339	0.0070962 **
group	12.0641	12.0641	1	57.269	14.3548	0.0003657 ***
time_point:group	11.3388	5.6694	2	65.770	6.7459	0.0021634 *

\$emmeans

time_point = Before:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	4.72	0.260	45.2	4.20	5.25
Waiting list	4.72	0.253	44.6	4.21	5.23

time_point = Middle:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
-------	--------	----	----	----------	----------

PDSR	4.03	0.305	45.4	3.41	4.64
------	------	-------	------	------	------

Waiting list	4.44	0.298	44.5	3.83	5.04
--------------	------	-------	------	------	------

time_point = After:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
-------	--------	----	----	----------	----------

PDSR	2.78	0.256	45.0	2.26	3.29
------	------	-------	------	------	------

Waiting list	4.54	0.249	44.5	4.04	5.04
--------------	------	-------	------	------	------

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

Confidence level used: 0.95

\$contrasts

time_point = Before:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
----------	----------	----	----	---------	---------

PDSR - Waiting list	0.000511	0.341	49.4	0.001	0.9988
---------------------	----------	-------	------	-------	--------

time_point = Middle:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
----------	----------	----	----	---------	---------

PDSR - Waiting list	-0.408463	0.379	48.5	-1.077	0.2868
---------------------	-----------	-------	------	--------	--------

time_point = After:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
----------	----------	----	----	---------	---------

PDSR - Waiting list	-1.765278	0.338	49.7	-5.222	<.0001
---------------------	-----------	-------	------	--------	--------

Effect sizes Cohen's D

_point = Before:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
----------	-------------	----	----	----------	----------

(PDSR - Waiting list)	0.000558	0.372	49.4	-0.746	0.748
-----------------------	----------	-------	------	--------	-------

time_point = Middle:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
----------	-------------	----	----	----------	----------

(PDSR - Waiting list)	-0.445557	0.415	48.5	-1.279	0.388
-----------------------	-----------	-------	------	--------	-------

time_point = After:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-1.925591	0.392	49.7	-2.713	-1.138

Wellbeing (SWLS)

> anova(wb_s)

Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)
time_point	0.7646	0.3823	2	26.512	1.1212	0.3408
group	8.7518	8.7518	1	46.996	25.6693	6.717e-06 ***
time_point:group	8.0143	4.0072	2	48.438	11.7532	6.901e-05 ***

emmeans

time_point = Before:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	2.53	0.156	109	2.22	2.84
Waiting list	2.68	0.152	109	2.38	2.98

time_point = Middle:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	3.27	0.156	109	2.97	3.58
Waiting list	2.30	0.152	109	2.00	2.60

time_point = After:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	3.35	0.156	109	3.04	3.66
Waiting list	2.28	0.152	109	1.98	2.58

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

Confidence level used: 0.95

\$contrasts

time_point = Before:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.150	0.213	107	-0.702	0.4843

time_point = Middle:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	0.978	0.213	107	4.586	<.0001

time_point = After:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	1.071	0.213	107	5.025	<.0001

Effect sizes

time_point = Before:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-0.256	0.366	107	-0.981	0.468

time_point = Middle:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	1.674	0.383	107	0.915	2.434

time_point = After:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	1.835	0.387	107	1.068	2.601

Pain Catastrophizing (PCS)

```
> anova(pcs_s)
```

Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)
time_point	7.7905	3.8952	2	54.385	20.9654	1.78e-07 ***
group	9.4009	9.4009	1	85.579	50.5988	3.23e-10 ***
time_point:group	3.4424	1.7212	2	78.743	9.2641	0.0002437 ***

\$emmeans

time_point = Before:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
-------	--------	----	----	----------	----------

PDSR	2.90	0.1120	45.1	2.68	3.13
------	------	--------	------	------	------

Waiting list	3.06	0.1091	44.8	2.84	3.28
--------------	------	--------	------	------	------

time_point = Middle:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
-------	--------	----	----	----------	----------

PDSR	2.05	0.1165	45.3	1.82	2.29
------	------	--------	------	------	------

Waiting list	2.82	0.1135	44.8	2.59	3.05
--------------	------	--------	------	------	------

time_point = After:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
-------	--------	----	----	----------	----------

PDSR	1.93	0.1023	44.3	1.73	2.14
------	------	--------	------	------	------

Waiting list	2.91	0.0995	44.3	2.71	3.11
--------------	------	--------	------	------	------

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

Confidence level used: 0.95

\$contrasts

time_point = Before:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
----------	----------	----	----	---------	---------

PDSR - Waiting list	-0.159	0.152	54.1	-1.051	0.2981
---------------------	--------	-------	------	--------	--------

time_point = Middle:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
----------	----------	----	----	---------	---------

PDSR - Waiting list	-0.767	0.156	54.4	-4.926	<.0001
---------------------	--------	-------	------	--------	--------

time_point = After:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
----------	----------	----	----	---------	---------

PDSR - Waiting list	-0.976	0.143	53.4	-6.843	<.0001
---------------------	--------	-------	------	--------	--------

Effect sizes

ime_point = Before:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
----------	-------------	----	----	----------	----------

(PDSR - Waiting list) -0.37 0.353 54.1 -1.08 0.337

time_point = Middle:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-1.78	0.382	54.4	-2.55	-1.015

time_point = After:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-2.27	0.366	53.4	-3.00	-1.531

Anxiety (GAD-7)

```
> anova(gad_s)
```

Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)
time_point	10.7524	5.3762	2	39.125	20.9831	6.428e-07 ***
group	4.7882	4.7882	1	74.425	18.6881	4.705e-05 ***
time_point:group	4.2082	2.1041	2	69.314	8.2122	0.0006299 ***

emmeans

time_point = Before:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	1.806	0.126	44.5	1.552	2.060
Waiting list	1.730	0.123	44.3	1.483	1.977

time_point = Middle:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	0.954	0.139	45.1	0.674	1.234
Waiting list	1.453	0.135	44.6	1.180	1.726

time_point = After:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	0.572	0.120	44.2	0.330	0.814
Waiting list	1.443	0.117	44.2	1.208	1.678

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

Confidence level used: 0.95

\$contrasts

time_point = Before:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	0.0761	0.174	53.7	0.438	0.6630

time_point = Middle:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.4989	0.186	54.5	-2.685	0.0096

time_point = After:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.8706	0.168	52.9	-5.197	<.0001

time_point = Before:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	0.150	0.343	53.7	-0.538	0.839

time_point = Middle:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-0.986	0.373	54.5	-1.734	-0.237

time_point = After:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-1.720	0.352	52.9	-2.425	-1.014

Depression (PHQ-9)

```
> anova(phq_s)
```

Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)
time_point	5.5477	2.77385	2	40.909	12.3540	6.35e-05 ***
group	1.1152	1.11516	1	79.794	4.9666	0.02865 *
time_point:group	1.2803	0.64015	2	68.757	2.8511	0.06464 .

\$emmeans

time_point = Before:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	1.675	0.120	44.7	1.433	1.92
Waiting list	1.626	0.117	44.4	1.390	1.86

time_point = Middle:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	1.200	0.158	45.7	0.883	1.52
Waiting list	1.438	0.154	44.8	1.127	1.75

time_point = After:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	0.858	0.127	44.8	0.602	1.11
Waiting list	1.337	0.124	44.4	1.088	1.59

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

Confidence level used: 0.95

\$contrasts

time_point = Before:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	0.0491	0.164	50.9	0.300	0.7657

time_point = Middle:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.2373	0.195	49.4	-1.220	0.2283

time_point = After:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.4793	0.171	51.8	-2.808	0.0070

Sleep Disturbances (PSQI)

Type III Analysis of Variance Table with Satterthwaite's method

	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	NumDF	DenDF	F value	Pr(>F)
time_point	4.0810	2.0405	2	31.497	15.755	1.811e-05 ***
group	5.7146	5.7146	1	66.154	44.124	6.902e-09 ***
time_point:group	2.1434	1.0717	2	67.216	8.275	0.0006127 ***

\$emmeans

time_point = Before:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	1.336	0.0861	44.2	1.162	1.509
Waiting list	1.425	0.0838	44.1	1.256	1.593

time_point = Middle:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	0.635	0.0913	44.5	0.451	0.819
Waiting list	1.216	0.0889	44.3	1.037	1.395

time_point = After:

group	emmean	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
PDSR	0.640	0.1021	45.2	0.434	0.845
Waiting list	1.384	0.0994	44.6	1.184	1.584

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

Confidence level used: 0.95

\$contrasts

time_point = Before:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.089	0.120	52.3	-0.743	0.4611

time_point = Middle:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.581	0.125	53.4	-4.642	<.0001

time_point = After:

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
PDSR - Waiting list	-0.744	0.135	53.8	-5.517	<.0001

time_point = Before:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-0.247	0.334	52.3	-0.916	0.422

time_point = Middle:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-1.614	0.365	53.4	-2.346	-0.881


time_point = After:

contrast	effect.size	SE	df	lower.CL	upper.CL
(PDSR - Waiting list)	-2.069	0.401	53.8	-2.873	-1.264

Appendix 3

Primary Outcomes

Figure 1a: Comparison of Pain Levels, Pain Interference, and Well-Being Between the PDSR and Waiting List Groups at 3 Time Points.



Secondary Outcomes

Figure 1b: Comparison of Anxiety, Depression, Pain Catastrophizing, and Sleep Disturbances Between the PDSR and Waiting List Groups at 3 Time Points.

