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Multisite pain, pain frequency and pain severity are associated with depression in older adults: results from the ActiFE Ulm study
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Abstract

Background: there is ample literature showing pain and depression are related. However, different dimensions of pain have been used in former studies.

Objective: the objective of the study was to compare the strength of the association of different pain dimensions with depression in older adults.

Methods: assessments including evaluation of pain (severity, frequency, chronicity, quality, pain medication, painful body sites) and depression (measured by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale) were performed in an observational study in community dwelling older adults (sample mean age 76, n = 1130) in Germany. The associations of different dimension of pain with depression were assessed using descriptive and multivariate methods.

Results: the number of painful body areas was most significantly associated with self-reported late life depression (OR 1.20, CI 1.11–1.31). Pain severity and frequency (OR 1.12, CI 1.01–1.23 and OR 1.18, CI 1.01–1.37) were also associated with depression; quality and duration were not. Except for severity (OR 1.12, CI 1.02–1.24) associations of pain dimensions were strongly reduced when controlling for relevant confounders and gender was an effect modifier.

Conclusions: multisite pain, pain severity and frequency were the best predictors of late life depression. Clinicians should be especially aware of depressive disorders when older patients are complaining of pain in multiple areas across the body.
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Introduction

In 2006 Pepersack et al. postulated that Geriatricians failed to recognise more than half of the depressed patients who were later diagnosed by a psychogeriatrician [1]. In general, the association of pain and depression is still highly suspected by clinicians although it has been questioned recently. Strong correlations have mostly been found in women, less so in men [2] while in a recent longitudinal study stronger correlations have been found in men than in women [3]. In 1988, Rudy et al. have challenged the direct relationship and have argued that reduced perceptions of control and personal
mastery were necessary for the development of depressive symptoms in pain patients [4]. This behavioural model has been confirmed in a group of elderly subjects as opposed to younger subjects [5], although other authors have not been able to demonstrate any influence of age [6]. Pain in younger women seemed to be rather mediated by functional impairment, while for older women mastery was more important [7]. More recently, a lower degree of neuroticism was found to mediate the relationship between pain and depression [8]. However, mastery and other confounders might no longer alter the relationship after controlling for time-stable factors such as life experiences and others [9].

What is the reason for the diversity of the results? First, cohorts differed according to sex, age or clinical diagnoses. Second, not all models have been controlled for relevant confounders and third multiple dimensions (mostly severity) of pain have often been used as the clinical pain symptom’ [10]. However, current state of the art pain questionnaires not only evaluate pain severity but also ask for frequency, duration, chronicity, quality and the different body areas involved. We, therefore, examined the relationship of different dimensions of pain with depression in older adults.

Methods
The ActiFE Ulm (Activity and Function in the Elderly in Ulm) study is a population-based cohort study in older people aged 65 years and older, located in Ulm and adjacent regions in Southern Germany. A detailed description of the cohort is published elsewhere [11]. In total, 7,624 inhabitants were randomly contacted by mail and asked for participation. Exclusion criteria were severe deficits in cognition, vision or hearing that precluded the accomplishment of most assessments or serious German language difficulties. Between March 2009 and April 2010, 1,506 non-institutionalised eligible individuals agreed to participate and underwent the baseline assessments. All participants provided written informed consent. The study was approved by the ethical committee (No. 312/08).

Assessments
Affective state was assessed using the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) [12]. Subscores were calculated and the D-HADS (Depression subscore) was used. For logistic regression, a common cut-off score of eight and above was used to classify participants as depressed [13].

Pain was assessed using a structured questionnaire available in German language [14]. The questionnaire includes the following items: a list of 13 body areas including an open question on any missing area and questions on pain

- severity in the last 7 days at the most painful site (visual analogue or numerical rating scale from 0 to 10)
- chronicity (four-point scale: pain since days, weeks, months, years)
- frequency in the last 7 days (six-point scale: from never to always)
- quality (pain attacks/breakthrough pain, continuous pain, both)

For comorbidity, a total number of 21 chronic conditions were used. Prevalent conditions were added up without giving weights and a total count was used as confounder. The score is based on the functional comorbidity index published by Groll et al. [15].

Social network was measured using the 6-item Lubben social network scale [16], a brief instrument designed to evaluate the size, perceived support and perceived confidant social network, differentiating between friends and neighbours.

Other potential confounders considered were age, gender, body mass index, a 10-item activities of daily living score [11] (ADL) and cognition (Mini Mental State Exam, MMSE) [17].

Statistical analysis
Full data with regard to the main outcome and influencing parameters were obtained from 1,130 participants. For continuous variables, means and standard deviations were calculated. Because tests for normality (Kolmogorov–Smirnov, Q–Q plots) revealed no significant difference from the normal distribution and because the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met, parametric tests (t-tests) were performed. For categorical items, frequencies were obtained and a χ² test was performed.

To assess the strengths of the associations, multiple logistic regression analysis was used. Odds ratios, confidence intervals and P-values are reported. The area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve represents the goodness of the model fit [18]. Since no assumptions about differences in influence on the dependent variable can be made a priori and since our approach is of exploratory nature, all variables were included at once.

Because of the cross-sectional nature of the study disentangling mediation and confounding effects would rely mostly on conceptual theories. We, therefore, decided to address confounding issues before paying attention to potential mediation concerns [19]. Established criteria for confounding were used [20]. Potential confounders considered are reported above. Only comorbidity and social network satisfied all three conditions for confounding, apart from age and gender, and were included in the full model. Anxiety, although available and mentioned in former models as associated with pain and depression, was not considered a confounder because of its high correlation with depression (r = 0.47). All analyses were performed using SAS 9.2.

Results
In bivariate analyses (Table 1), individuals classified as depressed had significantly higher pain severity scores (M = 4.8, SD = 2.27 versus M = 4.0, SD = 2.21; T = 4.36; P < 0.001), more multisite pain (M = 3.7, SD = 2.85 versus
Table 1. Patient characteristics (n = 1130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Depression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO (n = 959)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anthropometric characteristics**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body mass index, mean (±SD)</td>
<td>27.84 (±4.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, mean (±SD)</td>
<td>75.74 (±6.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male sex, n (%)</td>
<td>545 (56.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comorbidity (disease counts)*, mean (±SD)</th>
<th>5.75 (±3.18)</th>
<th>9.08 (±3.41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic activities of daily living* , n (%)</td>
<td>32 (3.34%)</td>
<td>13 (7.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent in one or more ADLs</td>
<td>126 (13.14%)</td>
<td>35 (20.47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mental health**

| Depression (DHADS), mean (±SD) | 3.72 (±2.71) | 5.71 (±3.44) |

**Pain dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pain severity, mean (±SD)</th>
<th>4.1 (±2.19)</th>
<th>4.9 (±2.26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multisite pain, mean (±SD)</td>
<td>3.25 (±2.01)</td>
<td>4.26 (±2.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicity, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td>30 (3.1%)</td>
<td>3 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>63 (6.6%)</td>
<td>15 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months</td>
<td>180 (18.8%)</td>
<td>30 (17.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>686 (71.5%)</td>
<td>123 (71.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality, n (%)**

| Breakthrough pain | 720 (75.1%) | 121 (70.8%) |
| Continuous pain    | 101 (10.5%) | 22 (12.9%)  |
| Continuous and breakthrough pain | 138 (14.4%) | 28 (16.4%) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (last seven days), n (%)</th>
<th>335 (35.0%)</th>
<th>41 (23.9%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never/rare</td>
<td>335 (35.0%)</td>
<td>41 (23.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes/often</td>
<td>442 (46.1%)</td>
<td>79 (46.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often/always</td>
<td>182 (18.9%)</td>
<td>51 (29.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multisite pain was asked using a list of 14 body areas. Pain severity was rated on an 11-point scale, chronicity on a 4-point Likert scale and frequency on a 6-point Likert scale. The dimensions of pain quality are shown.

DHADS, depression subscale of the HADS; depression was defined as having a score of 6-point Likert scale. The dimensions of pain quality are shown.

* Extended functional comorbidity index (Groll et al. [15]).

**Discussion**

Multisite pain, pain frequency and severity were the best predictors of depression in a population of community dwelling older adults. When controlling for relevant confounders, however, pain severity was the only dimension that remained significantly associated in the whole cohort. When looking at gender as an effect modifier, these results could be confirmed in females, while in males pain frequency became more important.

Studies examining the relationship of pain and depression mostly use different definitions of overall chronic pain, often influenced by duration and severity [10]. In our population of community dwelling older adults, pain severity seemed less important than multisite pain when only controlling for age and sex. A similar finding has been reported recently in a paper with a slightly different focus from the MOBILIZE-Boston study [21]. In this report, multisite pain showed stronger associations with depression than pain severity. Unfortunately, this relationship was not further examined in multivariate analyses. Another study in patients with fibromyalgia demonstrated that multisite pain was a better predictor of clinical pain intensity than the number of tender points [22]. However, depression was not used as an outcome measure.

The reduction of the association of pain and depression after accounting for relevant confounders is not surprising. Confounding by comorbidity and social network has been reported before [6, 23]. In the initially mentioned article, the authors concluded that uncontrolled comorbidity (including pain) and therapeutics might have been misleading factors [1]. Notably, the reduction was most pronounced for multisite pain. Therefore, multisite pain could be the dimension that is mostly linked to other disease entities, while pain severity is the most stable 'independent' predictor of depression, at least in females. In males, pain frequency seems to take the place of pain severity, while multisite pain also takes the back seat. The influence of gender has been demonstrated before [24] and it has been shown to even moderate the association between depression and pain-related disability [25]. Our study adds the idea of using a differential approach in males and females with respect to different types of pain in older adults. Yet, recent literature suggests that the previously established link between depression and pain might not withstand controlling for time-stable factors [9], although, in this article, the author did not disentangle different pain dimensions.

While pain severity and frequency are of importance with regard to pathological pathways the identification of multisite pain...
pain seems important with respect to the diagnostic process. In additional analyses of the ActiFE study, multisite pain was even stronger associated with anxiety and this relationship persisted after controlling for the above-mentioned confounders (not shown). Therefore, if older adults report multisite pain, physicians or nurses should be especially aware of a relevant depressive disorder (and/or anxiety).

The study has limitations. Depression was diagnosed using the HADS and comorbidity was self-reported, both without external confirmation. Other confounders that have been proposed such as neuroticism or mastery could not be included because they were not available [8, 9]. However, both parameters have been shown to rather mediate the relationship and our primary objective was to identify the most useful dimension for clinical practice. Still, relevant parameters might be missing in the current analysis.

To conclude, we believe that our results might increase the awareness of the clinician to think of depression when a patient complains of multiple painful body areas. This could be one step to improve the recognition of depression by geriatricians, an issue that has been criticised [1] five years ago.

Key points

- Multisite pain is most significantly associated with depression in older adults.
- When controlling for comorbidity and social network, only pain severity remains significantly associated with depression in the whole cohort and in females. In males, pain frequency becomes more important.
- For diagnostic purposes, physicians and nurses should be aware of a depressive disorder if older adults report pain across multiple body sites.
- The understanding of the association of pain and late life depression could be improved by disentangling the different pain dimensions and by stratifying for gender.
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