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Personalised care in patients with chronic pain disorders: Educational implications from a population-based study

Abstract

Background: Personalised care offers psychological benefits to patients with chronic pain disorders. However, it is unclear which patient groups are prioritised, and which ones may require additional educational support in dealing with the psychological impact of chronic pain.

Aim: To assess the relationship between having a chronic pain disorder and the likelihood of being offered a personalised care plan, and also identify underlying psychological vulnerabilities.

Method: Bootstrapping was performed on data from 3717 respondents to the 2014 Health Survey for England. Participants were predominantly female (55.4%) and had a chronic pain disorder; (a) mental illness (anxiety, depression), (b) arthritis, rheumatism, fibrositis, (c) back problems, slipped disc, neck, and (d) other unspecified rheumatic problems (bones, joints, muscles).

Results: Personalised care plans were more likely to be offered to patients with mental health disorders, and experiencing specific psychological issues around feelings of usefulness (Effect = 0.026, 95% CI = 0.001 to 0.051), decisiveness (Effect = 0.030, 95% CI = 0.008 to 0.057), and optimism about the future (Effect = -0.028, 95% CI = -0.046 to -0.012). By
contrast, patients with arthritis, rheumatism, fibrositis, and other unspecified rheumatic
problems (bones, joints, muscles), were less likely to be offered personalised care.

**Conclusion:** Patients with a rheumatic condition, or other problems of bones, joints, and
muscles, might require additional educational support in dealing with the emotional and
psychological impact of living with a chronic pain disorder. This should include referral to
structured patient education programmes that help improve self-management skills for
chronic pain disorders.

1. **Background**

1.1 **Chronic pain disorders**

Chronic pain is a multi-faceted, interdisciplinary condition, often co-morbid with other long
term illnesses (Dahan et al., 2014). It has been estimated that 20% of adults suffer from pain
globally and 10% of adults are diagnosed with chronic pain every year (Goldberg & McGee,
2011). Personalised care plans are typically offered to patients with long-term conditions
(Coulter et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2013), including chronic pain disorders (Earle, 2006;
Hager & Brockopp, 2009; Jambunathan et al., 2016; Malanga & Paster, 2007; Matthie &
Jenerette, 2015; Parker et al., 2013; Von Korff et al., 2016).

1.2 **Personalised care**

A personal care plan is a special record that specifies treatment goals, and action plans for
achieving them (Coulter et al., 2013). The plan is discussed and agreed by both patient and
clinician (Coulter et al., 2015). Care plans have been implicated in favourable outcomes
amongst patients suffering from chronic pain (Kerns et al., 2011), particularly the elderly
(Malanga & Paster, 2007). They are structured around a particular illness (Coulter et al.,
Thus, a patient suffering from a physical condition is offered a care plan to deal with that specific condition.

1.3 Psychological benefits

Care plans may provide psychological benefits to patients, even if their underlying condition is biomedical (Hird et al., 2015; Russell et al., 2008). For example, they ‘empower’ patients by giving them more control over their care, and improving the patient-professional partnership (Coulter et al., 2013). This is important given that chronic pain disorders are linked to mental distress (Hirsch et al., 2016), including depression (Chirita et al., 2008; Hirsch et al., 2016; Jack et al., 1987). Indeed, pain disorders and depression are comorbid (Bair et al., 2003; Dahan et al., 2014). Conditions such as arthritis can generate pain-inducing functional impairments (e.g., avoiding sports/exercise) (Hunter & Riordan, 2014). Personal care plans embolden patients, by giving them more say over their treatment, and encouraging better partnerships health professionals (Coulter et al., 2013; Fu et al., 2016). Thus, care plans can be set up entirely (or in part) to enable a psychologically vulnerable patient more effectively manage feelings of anxiety and depression associated with having a chronic pain disorder (Kerns et al., 2011). However, due to resource constraints it may not be possible to offer a care plan to every patient with a chronic pain disorder, thereby necessitating additional support partly in the form of patient education courses (Coulter et al., 2013).

1.4 Educational challenges

In the UK structured patient education/self-management programmes are routinely provided to patients with long-term conditions, with courses for chronic pain occurring frequently (Department of Health, 2016). These educational programmes play an important role in enabling patients take more control of their health, and keeping them informed and involved.
in discussions about how to manage their condition (Coulter et al., 2013). Thus, patient education programmes form an integral part of personalised care (Lau-Walker et al., 2016). It has been acknowledged in the literature that some patients may require additional educational support, to help them develop strategies for managing the emotional and psychological challenges of living with a long-term condition (Coulter et al., 2013). Since not every patient may be offered personalised care, due to resource constraints (Moffat & Mercer, 2015), it is important to identify patient groups that are prioritised for personalised care, and those which aren’t. The latter group (i.e., patients less likely to be offered personalised care) may need additional educational support in dealing with emotional and psychological impact of living with a long-term condition. This could include referral to a structured education programme that improve self-management skills for chronic pain disorders (Coulter et al., 2013).

1.5 The present study

To the best of our knowledge, no study has examined the relationship between having a chronic pain disorder and likelihood of being offered personalised care, and also considered the educational implications. An educational approach to this topic may yield useful insights for structured patient education programmes targeting patients with chronic pain disorders (Department of Health, 2016), specifically by identifying patient groups that may benefit from additional educational support due to comparatively deficient access to personalised care planning (relative to other patient groups). Chronic pain disorders can present psychological challenges for patients (Chirita et al., 2008; Davis et al., 2014; Hirsch et al., 2016; Kerns et al., 2011). Although personalised care planning is set up partly to address these emotional issues (Coulter et al., 2015; Coulter et al., 2013), not every patient is offered personalised care (Moffat & Mercer, 2015). Thus, this study aimed to (a) assess the relationship between having a chronic pain disorder, and the likelihood of being offered a
personalised care plan, and also identify underlying psychological vulnerabilities, and (b) consider the implications for structured patient education programmes.

2. Methodology

2.1. Design and procedures

This study used data from the 2014 Health Survey for England (HSE) (Health Survey for England, 2014). The HSE is conducted annually to assess various health-related parameters amongst UK residents. The UK Data Service manages access to HSE data. Data on personalised care planning, mental wellbeing, chronic illness (e.g., rheumatic disorders, back pain), and subjective perception of pain, were particularly relevant to the present study.

2.2. Participants

A total of 3717 adults were eligible to participate. Respondents were included if they were aged 16 and over, and suffered from a long-term condition, including chronic pain disorders such as arthritis/rheumatism/fibrositis, back problems/slipped disc/spinal problems, and mental illness. The average age was 55.67 years (SD = 17.66). The sample were all UK residents and predominantly female (55.4%), with an average age of 53.05 (SD = 22.08) years.

2.3. Personalised care plan

The main outcome variable was whether patients had discussed and agreed a personal care plan with a health professional. The HSE survey specifically addressed personalised care in a separate section, in which participants were asked whether they had discussed setting up a care plan with their doctor/nurse (Health Survey for England, 2014). Responses options were; ‘Yes’ (1), ‘Not sure’ (0), ‘No’ (0). There was an additional statement specifically on whether
a care plan had been agreed. Response options were; ‘Yes, have agreed a personal care plan in the last 12 months’ (1), ‘Yes, agreed a personal care plan more than 12 months ago’ (1), ‘No, do not have a personal plan’ (0). Responses to the two questions were summed to generate a personal care plan index, with scores ranging from 0 to 2. High scorers had discussed a personal care plan with a health professional, or gone further and agreed a plan.

2.4. Mental wellbeing

During the HSE the WEMWBS (Warwick and Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale) was administered by asking participants to self-complete a questionnaire (Bridges, 2015). The WEMWBS is a self-administered instrument that assesses fourteen domains of mental wellbeing (i.e., positive psychological states) (Tennant et al., 2007). Responses are indicated on a 5-point likert-style scale, ranging from 'None of the time' (1), 'Rarely' (2), 'Some of the time' (3), 'Often' (4), 'All of the time's (5). The scale had good internal consistency (α = 0.93).

It has been recommended that the when internal consistency of a scale is extremely high – that is, the items are extremely homogenous (α > 0.90) – the use of single item measures should be considered (Diamantopoulos et al., 2012; Fuchs & Diamantopoulos, 2009). High inter-item homogeneity denotes semantic redundancy, which can negatively affect content validity (Diamantopoulos et al., 2012). We felt generating a single mental wellbeing score, from multiple items, will not adequately represent the different and more subtle facets of positive psychological functioning. For example, research suggests one specific domain of mental wellbeing – optimism – plays a particularly important role in patient outcomes (Dubois et al., 2012). In order to adequately account for the (subtle) distinctions between different domains, it was decided to treat the fourteen WEMWBS items as individual single-item measures.
2.5. Chronic pain disorders

The identification of chronic pain disorders in the HSE was based primarily on self-reported diagnosis (Health Survey for England, 2014). Participants were asked if they had any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last 12 months or more?, responding ‘Yes’ (1), ‘No’ (0). For those who responded 'Yes' the researcher asked 'What (else) is the matter with you?', then recorded up to six conditions. Participants who provided a vague answer were asked to provide more clarity. Finally, the researcher asked '(Can I check) do you have any other physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last 12 months or more? Several groups of chronic pain disorders were identified from the first (of up to six possible) illnesses recorded; (a) mental illness (anxiety, depression), (b) arthritis, rheumatism, fibrositis, (c) back problems, slipped disc, neck, (d) other unspecified rheumatic problems (bones, joints, muscles). To identify mental illness participants were shown a list of 17 different mental health conditions (e.g., phobia, panic attacks, depression, psychosis or schizophrenia, dementia) and asked which they had ever been told by a doctor, psychiatrist, or other health professional, that they had any of the conditions on the list (Bridges, 2015). Although mental illness is not a physical condition, it is implicated in chronic pain (Bair et al., 2003; Dahan et al., 2014). Each illness was converted into a dummy variable; each respondent was categorised as a 'case' (1) or non-case (0).

2.6. Subjective pain

HSE incorporated the EQ-5D-3L questionnaire, which assesses health-related quality of life (Feng et al., 2015; Herdman et al., 2011). This 5-item instrument measures various aspects of general health including mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, and
anxiety/depression. This paper focuses specifically on the pain/discomfort subscale, which offers respondents three options to choose from; ‘I have no pain or discomfort’, ‘I have moderate pain or discomfort’, and ‘I have extreme pain or discomfort’. Due to the inherent subjectivity in how respondents may define ‘moderate’ or ‘extreme’ pain we decided to collapse the three options into a simple dichotomous variable, for easier interpretation; 'No pain or discomfort' (0), 'Pain or discomfort' (1).

3. Results

3.1 Descriptive statistics

Data is summarised in Table 1. Percentages reported exclude missing data. Just over 10% of respondents suffered from a mental illness (anxiety/depression). A similar percentage had arthritis, rheumatism or fibrositis, while just under 6% suffered from back, slipped disc, spine or neck problems. Slightly over 8% reported ‘other’ rheumatic problems (bones, joints, muscles). More than 50% experienced ‘moderate’ or ‘extreme’ pain or discomfort. Average mental wellbeing was comparable to (albeit slightly lower than) population norms reported elsewhere (Tennant et al., 2007). About 50% of participants had discussed a personal care plan with a health professional, while only about one in ten had actually agreed a care plan. The average personal care plan index score was less than one, confirming a general paucity of care plans.

Figure 1 Mediating effect of feeling optimistic about the future on the association between mental illness and setting up a PCP ($^a p \leq 0.05$, $^b p \leq 0.01$, $^c p \leq 0.001$).
Figure 2 Mediating effect of ability to make up one’s mind about things on the association between mental illness and setting up a PCP ($^a p \leq 0.05$, $^b p \leq 0.01$, $^c p \leq 0.001$)

3.2 Bootstrapping

We used an SPSS bootstrapping dialogue (Hayes, 2009, 2013) to assess the association between illness status and mental wellbeing (path a), the relationships mental wellbeing and personalised care (path b), the direct association between illness and personalised care (path c), and the indirect effect of illness status on personalised care, mediated by domains of mental wellbeing (path $a*b$). Age, gender, and subjective pain/discomfort were treated as covariates. Due to software constraints limiting the total number of mediator variables per model to ten (Hayes, 2013), the analysis was performed twice, initially using the first ten domains of mental wellbeing, and then repeated using the last four domains. Statistical significance was based on confidence intervals and the (conservative) Sobel normal theory test (Mackinnon et al., 1995). Initial bootstrapping revealed both direct and indirect associations. The results are summarised in Table 2.

3.3 Mental illness/anxiety/depression

Patients with mental illness (based on self-reported diagnosis, whereby a doctor, psychiatrist, or other health professional had told participants, that they had a mental illness – see Section 2.5) were more likely to have a care plan. This association was mediated by several domains of mental wellbeing – ‘optimism about the future’, ‘feeling useful’, and ‘being able to make up ones’ mind. These mediator effects respectively accounted for 18.4%, 17.1% and 20.7% of the total association between X (mental illness) and Y (personal care plan scores). The data
suggests respondents with a personal care plan were more likely to have poor mental health (e.g., depression), but also tended to feel less useful, less able to make up their minds (Figure 2), and/or felt more optimistic about the future (Figure 1). The total effect models were significant, accounting for up to 1% of the variance in personal care plan score.

3.4 Arthritis/rheumatism/fibrositis

Patients who had a rheumatic condition, based on self-reported diagnosis (see Section 2.5), were less likely to have a care plan. Mental wellbeing failed to mediate this relationship. Total effect models were significant, explaining up to 1.3% of the variance in care plan scores.

3.5 Back problems/slipped disc/spine/neck

There was no direct association between self-reported diagnosis of back problems/slipped disc/spine/neck problems (see Section 2.5) and having a care plan, and no mediating effects for mental wellbeing. Total effect models were not significant.

3.6 Other problems of bones/joints/muscles

Care plans were less likely to be offered to patients with self-reported diagnosis of other bone/joint/muscle problems (see Section 2.5). There were no significant mediator effects for mental wellbeing. The total effect models were significant, accounting for about 1% of the variance in personal care plan scores.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics
Table 2 Mediating effects of positive psychological states on relations between chronic pain disorders and PCP status

4. Discussion

4.1 Educational implications for mental health patients

The higher propensity for mental health patients to receive personalised care is important given the added psychological challenges of living with a chronic condition (Bair et al., 2003; Chirita et al., 2008; Hirsch et al., 2016). It appears the extent to which patients felt ‘optimistic’, ‘useful’ and ‘decisive’, were key issues in their care. Presumably, patients may express or project these sentiments during doctor-patient consultations, creating a mental health narrative that feeds into care plan decision making. This is plausible given that personalised care is meant to help address a patient’s psychological needs (Coulter et al., 2013). One qualitative study found that a majority of patients interviewed expressed a degree of psychological vulnerability in their relationship with their doctor (Frederiksen et al., 2010). Expressing or projecting psychological insecurity seemed to underscore a need for attachment, whereby vulnerable patients sort more regular contact with their doctor.

From the perspective of structured patient education programmes (Department of Health, 2016), these findings highlight the need for educators to target specific psychological vulnerabilities (i.e., feelings of usefulness, decisiveness, and lack of optimism) when teaching mental health patients the skills and strategies needed to deal with the emotional challenges of chronic psychopathology. From a doctor’s perspective, obvious mental fragility in a patient
underscores the importance of personalised care (Frederiksen et al., 2010), and perhaps may
even justify additional support by referral to structured education courses (Coulter et al.,
2013). Such a referral may be particularly helpful if education programmes specifically target
some of the psychological vulnerabilities identified here (e.g., referring mental health patients
to educational courses that assume an ‘active’ role for patients, making them feel ‘useful’).

Health educators should carefully explore the clinical significance of psychological
themes like ‘feeling useful’, and ‘being able to make up one’s mind’ with patients, and
provide appropriate support and skill development where necessary. For example, the latter
theme may underscore patients uncertainty regarding decision making about their care,
and highlight a necessity for decision making skills to be addressed in education courses for
mental health patients (Coulter et al., 2013). Feeling ‘useful’ may partly reflect patients' need
to play a more active role in their care, thus highlighting the importance of educating patients
on how to be more involved in care planning (Coulter et al., 2013). ‘Optimism’ may partly
underscore patients’ uncertainty about the long-term management of their condition (Haddad,
2010), suggesting patient education programmes should, where appropriate, emphasise an
optimistic outlook for patients struggling with mental health problems.

4.2 Educational implications for patients with arthritis, rheumatism, fibrositis, or
unspecified rheumatic problems (bones, joints, muscles)

The fact that patients with arthritis, rheumatism, fibrositis, or undetermined rheumatic
conditions, were less likely to be offered personalised care is curious since chronic pain and
mental distress are comorbid (Bair et al., 2003). Rheumatic problems can present significant
mental challenges (Kidd et al., 2007; Kreis et al., 2015). For example, analysis of the
experiences of amputees has identified up to six psychological issues that highlight the
importance of mental wellbeing in people with bone-related problems (Desmond &
MacLachlan, 2002). Thus, unsurprisingly treatments for patients with chronic pain disorders place considerable emphasis on improving behavioural, cognitive, and emotional functioning (Kerns et al., 2011).

It is possible patients suffering from arthritis, bone, joint, or muscle problems, or other rheumatic conditions, don’t volunteer much information about their mental wellbeing during doctor-patient consultations, perhaps due to the stigma associated with mental illness (Mercer et al., 2012). If so, this highlights a need for additional support and guidance through structured education programmes, to help patients develop specific strategies for managing psychological distress due to chronic pain (Coulter et al., 2013). The role of educational courses in this context may be especially crucial given that many doctors may simply lack the time to consider a patient’s mental wellbeing during routine consultations (Moffat & Mercer, 2015).

4.3 Educational implications for doctor-patient consultations

Clinicians are responsible for ensuring patients with chronic pain disorders receive the necessary education to enable them manage their condition (Coulter et al., 2013). This may include making referrals to structured education courses (Department of Health, 2016). Consequently, it is important for health professionals to monitor a patient’s educational needs, particularly in relation to managing psychological issues associated with their condition (Frederiksen et al., 2010). This is particularly important for patients with mental health problems, given their added psychological vulnerabilities.

Health professionals who are unsure whether to offer a care plan to patients with arthritis and other rheumatic problems should, where possible, recommend structured education programmes, to assist patients self-manage their condition, and develop strategies for dealing with associated emotional challenges (Coulter et al., 2013). It's also important that
patients experiencing psychological problems associated with chronic pain emphasise this mental vulnerability during doctor-patient discussions and, where necessary, request additional educational support (Frederiksen et al., 2010). More research is needed to verify the present findings, and better understand why specific psychological themes (e.g., decisiveness) were salient in care planning for mental health patients, but not those experiencing unspecified bone/joint/muscle problems and major rheumatic conditions such as arthritis.

4.4 Limitations

This study has several limitations. The observed indirect effects do not on their own provide clear evidence that patients’ mental wellbeing was consciously considered in the decision to offer them a personal care plan. The data merely shows that psychological functioning explained some of the variance in relations between illness and having a care plan. As chronic pain disorders and mental health are comorbid (Bair et al., 2003), the latter may by default be implicated in any associations between pain syndromes and care plans, whether or not psychological functioning is specifically mentioned during doctor-patient decision making to set up a plan. Use of single item measures is debatable (Diamantopoulos et al., 2012). The analysis of single items in the present context has provided insights on how specific aspects of positive psychological functioning affect the illness → care plan association. The analysis of ten psychological mediators in one model, followed by analysis of the remaining four in a second model, may partly confound the results. Psychological states significant in one model might not necessarily have been significant if tested within the other model, given the different set of variables (i.e., other sources of shared variance). Finally, the cross-sectional design precludes conclusive inferences about causality.
4.5 Conclusions

This study suggests personalised care is more likely to be offered to mental health patients, compared to patients with a rheumatic condition, or other problems of bones, joints, and muscles. This perhaps highlights the need for additional educational support targeted at patients in the latter groups, to equip them with practical skills necessary for managing the psychological challenges associated with chronic pain (Coulter et al., 2013). This added support can involve referrals to structured education programme for chronic pain, which are amongst the most frequently occurring patient education courses in Britain (Department of Health, 2016). These findings extend current understanding of care plans in caring for patients living with chronic pain (Hager & Brockopp, 2009; Jambunathan et al., 2016; Malanga & Paster, 2007; Parker et al., 2013; Von Korff et al., 2016). Even though chronic pain disorders have psychological comorbidities (Bair et al., 2003), mental wellbeing wasn’t a significant factor in care planning, except for patients with mental illness. Given the growing emphasis on personalised care (Coulter et al., 2013), this study highlights a potential problem whereby certain patient groups with chronic pain disorders are less likely to experience the psychological benefits of personalised care, and hence may require additional educational support through structured education programmes.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean/SD or N/%/Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>3717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>53.1/22.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male/Female)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1656/44.6/44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2061/55.4/55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental illness (anxiety/depression)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>382/10.3/10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3335/89.7/89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis, rheumatism, fibrositis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>399/10.7/10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3318/89.3/89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back problems, slipped disc, spine, neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>219/5.9/5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3498/94.1/94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (unspecified) rheumatic problems (bones, joints, muscles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>306/8.2/8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3411/91.8/91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Wellbeing (WEMBS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall score (sum of responses to all 14 items)</td>
<td>48.29/9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP conversation with a health professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, agreed PCP &lt; or &gt; 12 months ago</td>
<td>464/12.5/13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No PCP agreed</td>
<td>2909/78.3/86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP agreed with health professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1760/47.4/51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or not sure</td>
<td>1636/44.0/48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall score (conversed + agreed)</td>
<td>0.65/0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures show the mean (+ standard deviation) or count (+ percentage). PCP = Personal care plan (status). Valid percentages exclude missing data.
Table II – Mediating effects of positive psychological states on relations between chronic pain disorders and PCP status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronic pain disorder (CPD)</th>
<th>Mental illness (anxiety, depression)</th>
<th>Arthritis, rheumatism, fibrositis</th>
<th>Back problems, slipped disc, spine, neck</th>
<th>Other rheumatic problems (bones/joints/muscles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regression pathways (bootstrapping)</strong></td>
<td>Effect (CI)</td>
<td>Effect (CI)</td>
<td>Effect (CI)</td>
<td>Effect (CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First mediation model (10 positive psychological states as mediators)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total association between CPD &amp; PCP</td>
<td>0.15(^a) (0.06, 0.24)</td>
<td>-0.17(^a) (-0.26, -0.09)</td>
<td>-0.05 (-0.15, 0.05)</td>
<td>-0.14(^a) (-0.23, -0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct association between CPD &amp; PCP</td>
<td>0.14(^a) (0.05, 0.23)</td>
<td>-0.16(^a) (-0.25, -0.08)</td>
<td>-0.04 (-0.14, 0.07)</td>
<td>-0.14(^a) (-0.23, -0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect association between CPD &amp; PCP, mediated by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling optimistic about future</td>
<td>-0.03(^a,s) (-0.05, -0.01)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)</td>
<td>0.01(^s) (0.00, 0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling useful</td>
<td>0.03(^s) (0.00, 0.05)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.01(^s) (-0.02, -0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling relaxed</td>
<td>0.00 (-0.02, 0.03)</td>
<td>0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling interested in other people</td>
<td>-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.02)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had energy to spare</td>
<td>0.01 (-0.00, 0.02)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.02, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with problems well</td>
<td>0.00 (-0.03, 0.04)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking clearly</td>
<td>0.02 (-0.01, 0.05)</td>
<td>-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.02, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling good about myself</td>
<td>-0.01 (-0.05, 0.03)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling close to other people</td>
<td>-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00, 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling confident</td>
<td>0.03 (-0.02, 0.07)</td>
<td>-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second mediation model (5 additional positive psychological states as mediators)**

| Total association between CPD & PCP | 0.15\(^c\) (0.06, 0.23) | -0.16\(^c\) (-0.24, -0.08) | -0.05 (-0.15, 0.05) | -0.14\(^a\) (-0.23, -0.05) |
| Direct association between CPD & PCP | 0.14\(^b\) (0.05, 0.23) | -0.15\(^c\) (-0.23, -0.07) | -0.04 (-0.14, 0.06) | -0.13\(^a\) (-0.22, -0.04) |
Indirect association between CPD & PCP, mediated by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CPD → M → PCP</th>
<th>CPD → M → PCP</th>
<th>M → PCP</th>
<th>M → PCP</th>
<th>M → PCP</th>
<th>M → PCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to make up my mind</td>
<td>0.03&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(0.01, 0.06)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(-0.01, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(-0.02, 0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling loved</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>(-0.04, 0.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(-0.00, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(-0.00, 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in new things</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(-0.04, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(-0.00, 0.01)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(-0.00, 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling cheerful</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>(-0.02, 0.04)</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>(-0.01, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>(-0.01, 0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>p<0.05 or CI range excludes ‘0’. <sup>b</sup>Significant based on the conservative (‘normal theory’) Sobel test. Mediator path ‘a’ (i.e., association between illness and optimism) was not significant, despite a marginally significant indirect effect of X on Y. PCP = Personal care plan (status); CPD = Chronic Pain Disorder. For simplicity the table does not include the effects of variable X (CPD) on variables M (psychological states), and effects of variables M on variable Y (PCP status).
Optimistic about future

(a-path) -0.48c

Mental illness (e.g., depression)

(b-path) 0.05c

(c-path) 0.14b

Personal care plan
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