# Correlation between Lower Back Pain with Psychological Distress in Tertiary Care Centre

Dr. Dipen Ariwala<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Sandeep Sonone<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Sunil Bhosle<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Abhishek Rai<sup>4</sup>, Dr. Harini Seshadri<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Senior Resident, Department of Orthopedics, K.E.M.H, Mumbai, India Corresponding author Email: *dipenaariwala[at]yahoo.com* 

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Orthopedics, K.E.M.H., Mumbai, India Email: drsandeep72[at]yahoo.com

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Orthopedics, K.E.M.H., Mumbai, India Email: drsunilbhosle09[at]gmail.com

<sup>4</sup>Senior Resident, Department of Orthopedics, L.T.M.C, Mumbai, India Email: abhishek110891[at]gmail.com

<sup>5</sup>Senior Resident, Department of Radiodiagnosis, L.T.M.C, Mumbai, India Email: *harini.s.2773[at]gmail.com* 

Abstract: This cross-sectional study investigates the correlation between lower back pain and psychological distress. Despite common assumptions, our findings reveal no significant statistical correlation between these two factors, aligning with previous studies such as Alturkistani et al. <u>Study design</u>: Cross sectional study. <u>Purpose</u>: Consider 2 patients of the same age, same pathology seen on MRI but different tolerance to lower back pain. Both these patients have different effect on similar management and it would be interesting to know was whether there is a psychological component related with pain. Low back pain (LBP) is so common around the world that almost everyone will have at least one episode during their lifetime. It is defined as pain and discomfort between the costal margin and inferior gluteal folds with or without leg pain. Movement aggravates mechanical pain, which is eased by rest. <u>Significance</u>: This study contributes to the ongoing debate about the relationship between physical and psychological health, specifically in the context of lower back pain, a common health issue worldwide.

Keywords: psychology, lower back pain, disability, chronicity, depression, anxiety, stress

## 1. Introduction

Low back pain (LBP) is so prevalent globally that most people will experience at least one episode of it over their lifetime.<sup>[1]</sup> The 1-year incidence of first-ever LBP has been estimated to be between 6.3 and 15.4%, and the 1-year incidence of any episode of LBP range from 1.5 to 36%.<sup>[2]</sup> Most individuals experience neck and/or low back pain at least once in their life, and with increasing age, a greater number of patients with such symptoms are seen by family physicians and in outpatient clinics. The first incidence of LBP occurs most frequently in the third decade of life and prevalence increases until 65 years, whereupon the rate decreases.<sup>[2]</sup> It is the leading cause of occupational disability worldwide. It is defined as pain and discomfort between the costal margin and inferior gluteal folds with or without leg pain. Mechanical pain is aggravated with movement and relieved by rest. Pain is described as dull, aching and similar to toothache and does not radiate down the leg. LBP may be episodic, characterized by remissions and relapses with periodic flares. <sup>[2]</sup> Pain may be acute (less than 6 weeks' duration), subacute (6–12 weeks) and chronic (more than 12 weeks). <sup>[3]</sup> Prevalence of lower back pain is maximum in the 55-64 age group and more common in women than men. Also, it is the second most common complaint for which patients visit a primary care doctor's office. [2-4] Psychological research has revealed that a great deal of pain is related to emotional stress.[4] Psychosocial factors play a crucial role in the aetiology of musculoskeletal

pain. These factors include low educational status, stress, depression, anxiety, dissatisfaction with a job or work situation, and poor social support.<sup>[4]</sup> Recently, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) was associated with incident chronic LBP.<sup>[5]</sup>

Causes of lower back pain:

|                            | Muscular strains or from ligamentous                   |  |
|----------------------------|--|--|
|                            | injury   |  |
|                            | <ul> <li>Degenerative disc disease</li> </ul>          |  |
| Mashariant                 | <ul> <li>Facet joint disease (facet joint</li> </ul>   |  |
| (ROM)                      | dysfunction)   |  |
| (80%)                      | Spondylolysis  |  |
|                            | <ul> <li>Osteoporotic compression fractures</li> </ul> |  |
|                            | • Instability  |  |
|                            | <ul> <li>Sacroiliac joint pathology</li> </ul>         |  |
|                            | Herniated disc   |  |
| Neurogenic                 | Spinal stenosis  |  |
| (15%) • Foraminal stenosis |  |  |
|                            | • Disc annular tear and neuritis                       |  |
| Non-mechanical             | • Infections   |  |
| back pain (1-              | Neoplasms  |  |
| 2%)                        | <ul> <li>Inflammatory conditions</li> </ul>            |  |

## 2. Materials and Methods

#### Study description

Study design: Single centre ,cross-sectional study

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

**Sample size:** Sample size calculation. In a study by Ganesan et al (Asian Spine J. 2017 Aug; 11(4): 610–617), the prevalence was calculated to be 42.4%. Using this data, sample size was calculated as follows, Using formula for sample size calculation for prevalence studies, Sample size = 4pq/d2 Where, p = prevalence from previous study, q=1-p, d = precision error. Assuming p = 0.424 (42.4%), q=1-p = 1-0.424 = 0.576, d = 0.1 (10%) Sample size = 4 x 0.424 x 0.576 / 0.1 x 0.1 = 97.68 = 100 (rounded off) Thus, for the study we will need to enrol at least 100 patients.

#### Study period: 1 year

#### Inclusion criteria:

- 1) Patient coming to Outpatient Department of tertiary care centre hospital in the study period.
- 2) Patient aged 18 years to 65 years old, irrespective gender
- Patients having chronic low back pain(pain persisting for more 12 weeks and present between last rib and gluteal fold)

The data entry will be done with the help of Microsoft Excel 2010. Data will be analysed using SPS version 21. Data was entered into Microsoft Excel (Windows 7; Version 2007) and analyses were done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows software (version 22.0; SPSS Inc, Chicago). Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation (SD) for continuous variables, frequencies and percentages were calculated for categorical Variables were determined. Association between Variables

was analyzed by using Chi-Square test for categorical Variables. Unpaired t Test and ANOVA (Analysis of

Variance) were used to compare mean of quantitative variables between variables having 2 and more than 2 categories respectively. Bar charts and Pie charts were used for visual representation of the analyzed data. Level of

4) Patients with no radicular pain

Patient fulfilling the

inclusion criterion

3. Result and Discussion

#### **Exclusion criteria:**

Patient with

- 1) Acute lower back pain
- 2) Traumatic aetiology

- 3) Neurological deficit
- 4) Bowel bladder involvement
- 5) Past history of psychiatric illness and psychiatric treatment for psychological ailment

#### **Study Procedure**

- 1) Patient fulfilling the inclusion criterion of the study will be enrolled.
- Demographic data of the patient including Name, Age, Sex and duration of lower back pain of patient coming to Outpatient department of tertiary care Centre will be collected.
- 3) Patient will be asked to fill the questionnaire after taking proper informed consent.

| Table 1: Questionnaire                                  |                        |  |  |
|---|------------------------|--|--|
| Lower back Pain Psychological distress                  |                        |  |  |
| Oswestry Lower back pain<br>questionnaire               | Perceived stress scale |  |  |
| Roland Morris questionnaire                             | K10 (Kessler score)    |  |  |
| Back pain functional score Depression Anxiety stress sc |                        |  |  |

4) Statistical correlation between low back pain and psychological distress will be studied. This correlation will be done by Spearman's rank coefficient test



Figure 1: Study Procedure

Table 2: Distribution of Study Subjects according to the

Gender (N = 100)

| Gender | No. | Percent |  |
|--------|-----|---------|--|
| Male   | 56  | 56.0    |  |
| Female | 44  | 44.0    |  |



Graph 2: Distribution of Gender

Age of the patients included in the study ranged from 18 years to 65 years.

#### **Demographic Distribution**

significance was set at 0.05.

100 patients who fulfilled our inclusion criteria and not failing the exclusion criteria, were included in the study. Distribution was done based on gender, age, occupation, education, socioeconomic status, family income, duration of lower back pain and VAS score.

DOI: 10.21275/SR23720172201

**Table 3:** Distribution of Study Subjects according to the

| Age (N=100) |               |         |  |  |
|-------------|---------------|---------|--|--|
| Age (Years) | No.           | Percent |  |  |
| $\leq$ 30   | 21            | 21.0    |  |  |
| 31-40       | 33            | 33.0    |  |  |
| 41-50       | 18            | 18.0    |  |  |
| 51-60       | 13            | 13.0    |  |  |
| >60         | 15            | 15.0    |  |  |
| Mean (SD)   | 42.11 (13.63) |         |  |  |
| Range       | 15-65         |         |  |  |



 Table 4: Distribution of Study Subjects according to the Occupation (N=100)

| Occupation (14-  | -100) |         |
|------------------|-------|---------|
| Occupation       | No.   | Percent |
| Professional     | 6     | 6.0     |
| Skilled Worker   | 36    | 36.0    |
| Clerical         | 2     | 2.0     |
| Employee         | 9     | 9.0     |
| Shopkeeper       | 13    | 13.0    |
| Housewife        | 19    | 19.0    |
| Student          | 11    | 11.0    |
| Unskilled Worker | 4     | 4.0     |



Graph 4: Distribution of Occupation

| Table 5: Di | stribution of Stu | dy Subjects | according to the | Education (N=100) |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|
|             |                   |             |                  |                   |

| Education            | No. | Percent |
|----------------------|-----|---------|
| Illiterate           | 0   | 0.0     |
| Primary              | 4   | 4.0     |
| Middle               | 15  | 15.0    |
| High School          | 24  | 24.0    |
| Intermediate/Diploma | 20  | 20.0    |
| Graduate             | 17  | 17.0    |
| Post Graduate        | 17  | 17.0    |
| Professional         | 3   | 3.0     |

Volume 12 Issue 7, July 2023 <u>www.ijsr.net</u> Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY





## Table 6: Distribution of Study Subjects according to the

| SES (N=100)  |     |         |  |  |
|--------------|-----|---------|--|--|
| SES          | No. | Percent |  |  |
| Upper Middle | 43  | 43.0    |  |  |
| Lower Middle | 56  | 56.0    |  |  |
| Lower        | 1   | 1.0     |  |  |



Graph 6: Distribution of SES

Table 7: Distribution of Study Subjects according to the Family Income (N=100)

| Family Income (Lakh) | No.    | Percent |
|----------------------|--------|---------|
| $\leq 2$             | 33     | 33.0    |
| 2-5                  | 40     | 40.0    |
| >5                   | 27     | 27.0    |
| Mean (SD)            | 3.81 ( | (2.07)  |
| Range                | 1-     | 10      |





Table 8: Distribution of Study Subjects according to the Duration of Low Back Pain (Months) (N=100)

| Duration of Low L | Durution of Bow Buck Full (Montalis) (11 100) |         |  |  |
|-------------------|---|---------|--|--|
| Duration (Months) | No.   | Percent |  |  |
| ≤ 12              | 63  | 63.0    |  |  |
| 13-24             | 22  | 22.0    |  |  |
| >24               | 15  | 15.0    |  |  |
| Mean (SD)         | 15.53 (13.09)                                 |         |  |  |
| Range             | 3-60  |         |  |  |



Graph 8: Distribution of Duration

| Table 9: | Distribution | of Study   | Subjects | according | to the |
|----------|--------------|------------|----------|-----------|--------|
|          | VAS          | S Score () | N=100)   |           |        |

| 110.00    |     |         |  |  |  |
|-----------|-----|---------|--|--|--|
| VAS Score | No. | Percent |  |  |  |
| 5         | 8   | 8.0     |  |  |  |
| 6         | 28  | 28.0    |  |  |  |
| 7         | 38  | 38.0    |  |  |  |
| 8         | 22  | 22.0    |  |  |  |
| 9         | 4   | 4.0     |  |  |  |



Graph 9: Distribution of VAS Score

Volume 12 Issue 7, July 2023

www.ijsr.net Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

 Table 10: Association between Oswestry Disability Score and Perceived Stress (N=100)

| Disability Score                                  | Perceived Stress |           |  |
|---|------------------|-----------|--|
|   | Low              | Moderate  |  |
| Mild  | 2 (100.0)        |           |  |
| Minimal   | 17 (51.5)        | 16 (48.5) |  |
| Moderate  | 17 (43.6)        | 22 (56.4) |  |
| Severe  | 10 (38.5)        | 16 (61.5) |  |
| Chi-Square Test, P Value = 0.329, Not Significant |                  |           |  |



Graph 10: Oswestry Disability Score and Perceived Stress

| Table 11: Association between Oswestry Disability Score | re |
|---|----|
| and Kessler Score (N=100)                               |    |

| Oswestry  | Kessler Score |           |          |
|---|---------------|-----------|----------|
| Disability Score                                  | Mild          | Moderate  | Well     |
| Mild  | 1 (50.0)      |           | 1 (50.0) |
| Minimal   | 11 (33.3)     | 13 (39.4) | 9 (27.3) |
| Moderate  | 13 (33.3)     | 18 (46.2) | 8 (20.5) |
| Severe  | 9 (34.6)      | 13 (50.0) | 4 (15.4) |
| Chi-Square Test, P Value = 0.791, Not Significant |               |           |          |



Graph 11: Oswestry Disability Score and Kessler Score

| Table 12: Association between Oswestry Disability Score |
|---|
| and Depression Anxiety Stress Score (N=100)             |

| Disability                                    | Depression Score |           |           |          |
|---|------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Score   | Normal           | Mild      | Moderate  | Severe   |
| Mild  | 1 (50.0)         | 1 (50.0)  |           |          |
| Minimal                                       | 1 (3.0)          | 7 (21.2)  | 19 (57.6) | 6 (18.2) |
| Moderate                                      | 1 (2.6)          | 15 (38.5) | 17 (43.6) | 6 (15.4) |
| Severe  | 1 (3.8)          | 11 (42.3) | 7 (26.9)  | 7 (26.9) |
| Chi-Square Test, P Value = 0.026, Significant |                  |           |           |          |





 

 Table 13: Association between Back Pain Scores and Perceived Stress Score (N=100)

| Perceived Stress                         | Roland Morris |  |
|--|---------------|--|
|  | Mean (SD)     |  |
| Low                                      | 14.41 (4.07)  |  |
| Moderate                                 | 15.70 (4.43)  |  |
| P Value                                  | 0.136         |  |
| Unpaired t Test, P Value Not Significant |               |  |



Graph 13: Roland Morris Score and Perceived Stress Score

 Table 14: Association between Roland Morris and Kessler

 Score (N=100)

| Secie (11-100) |               |  |
|----------------|---------------|--|
| Kessler Score  | Roland Morris |  |
|                | Mean (SD)     |  |
| Mild           | 15.62 (4.25)  |  |
| Moderate       | 15.30 (4.11)  |  |
| Well           | 13.95 (4.70)  |  |
| P Value        | 0.346         |  |

ANOVA, P Value Not Significant

Volume 12 Issue 7, July 2023 <u>www.ijsr.net</u> Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN: 2319-7064 SJIF (2022): 7.942



Graph 14: Roland Morris Score and Kessler Score

| Table | 15: | Association   | between     | Roland   | Morris s | core | and |
|-------|-----|---------------|-------------|----------|----------|------|-----|
|       | De  | epression any | kiety stres | ss Score | (N=100)  | )    |     |

| Depression, anxiety            | Roland Morris |  |
|--------------------------------|---------------|--|
| stress Score                   | Mean (SD)     |  |
| Normal                         | 13.25 (5.25)  |  |
| Mild                           | 15.35 (4.26)  |  |
| Moderate                       | 14.56 (4.11)  |  |
| Severe                         | 16.32 (4.60)  |  |
| P Value                        | 0.388         |  |
| ANOVA, P Value Not Significant |               |  |



Graph 15: Roland Morris Score and Depression anxiety stress Score

 Table 16: Association between Back Pain functional Scores and Perceived Stress Score (N=100)

| Perceived Stress                         | Functional Score |
|--|------------------|
|  | Mean (SD)        |
| Low                                      | 41.43 (9.54)     |
| Moderate                                 | 37.56 (10.39)    |
| P Value                                  | 0.056            |
| Unpaired t Test, P Value Not Significant |                  |



Graph 16: Functional Score and Perceived Stress Score

 
 Table 17: Association between Back Pain functional Scores and Kessler Score (N=100)

| Kessler Score                  | Back pain functional Score |  |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
|                                | Mean (SD)                  |  |
| Mild                           | 39.76 (10.82)              |  |
| Moderate                       | 38.45 (9.89)               |  |
| Well                           | 40.45 (9.89)               |  |
| P Value                        | 0.723                      |  |
| ANOVA, P Value Not Significant |                            |  |



Graph 17: Back pain functional Score and Kessler Score

 Table 18: Association between Back Pain functional Scores and Depression anxiety stress Score (N=100)

| $= -\mathbf{F}$  |                            |  |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Depression Score | Back pain functional Score |  |
|                  | Mean (SD)                  |  |
| Normal           | 43.50 (9.81)               |  |
| Mild             | 38.88 (10.15)              |  |
| Moderate         | 41.47 (9.96)               |  |
| Severe           | 34.47 (9.47)               |  |
| P Value          | 0.070                      |  |



Graph 18: Back pain functional Score and Depression anxiety stress Score

| <b>Table 19:</b> Combined p-va |
|--------------------------------|
|--------------------------------|

|                            | Perceived    | K10   | Depression anxiety |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|
|                            | stress scale | score | stress scale       |
| Oswestry                   | 0.329        | 0.791 | 0.026              |
| Roland Morris              | 0.136        | 0.346 | 0.388              |
| Back pain functional score | 0.056        | 0.723 | 0.070              |

## 4. Discussion

Although many studies have been conducted in the past to find the correlation between lower back pain and psychological distress, most of the studies were conducted in the western world and large-scale data is scant in our country. We conducted a single centre, cross sectional study to correlate between psychological distress and lower back pain.Differences in occupation, such as job demands, workplace tension, and individuals' control in a certain occupation, may alter the degree of stress, resulting in variable rates of work-related injuries and so affecting the prevalence of LBP.

In our study, patients who fulfilled inclusion criterion were ask to fill questionnaire-psychological aspect viz Kessler scale, Perceived stress scale and Depression, anxiety, stress scale and lower back pain scales viz Oswestry low back pain disability questionnaire, Roland Morris low back pain and disability questionnaire, low back pain functionality score.

#### **Demographic distribution:**

A total of 100 patients (44 females and 56 males) were enrolled in the age group of 18 years to 65 years with a mean age of 42.11+/-13.63 years. Age of the patients ranged from 18 years to 65 years. The mean age of the study subjects was 42 years with majority of the participants were between 31 to 40 years.

#### Socioeconomic status:

56% of the study subjects were lower middle class with mean income of 3.81+/-2.07 lakhs/year. They accounted for majority of the patients.

Mean duration of LBP in study subjects: The mean duration of lower back pain in study subjects was  $15.53 \pm 13.09$  months.

It was found that there is statistical association between DASS scale and Oswestry low back pain scale stating significant association between degree of stress and chronic LBP but no significant association between Oswestry low back pain scale and Kessler score, Oswestry low back pain scale and Kessler score tested by chi square test with p value of 0.791 and 0.329 respectively.

No statistical significance was found between Low back pain functionality score and Kessler score, Low back pain functionality score and perceived stress scale, Low back pain functionality score and depress, anxiety, stress scale, tested with ANOVA unpaired T test and ANOVA respectively.

Few previous studies conducted by Alturkistani et al revealed no significant association between LBP and stress levels of the patients while study conducted by Sungwoo Choi et al,Eric L. Hurwitz et al showed significant association.

Our study found no significant statistical correlation between lower back pain and psychological stress levels, consistent with previous studies. This suggests the need for further research and a multidisciplinary approach to managing lower back pain.

## References

- [1] Pergolizzi JV, LeQuang JA. Rehabilitation for low back pain: A narrative review for managing pain and improving function in acute and chronic conditions. Pain and therapy. 2020 Jun;9(1):83-96.
- [2] Suri P, Boyko EJ, Smith NL, Jarvik JG, Jarvik GP, Williams FM, Williams R, Haselkorn J, Goldberg J. Post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms are associated with incident chronic back pain: a longitudinal twin study of older male veterans. Spine. 2019 Sep 1;44(17):1220.
- [3] Rozenberg S. Chronic low back pain: definition and treatment. La Revue du praticien. 2008 Feb 1;58(3):265-72.
- [4] Hoy D, Brooks P, Blyth F, Buchbinder R. The epidemiology of low back pain. Best practice & research Clinical rheumatology. 2010 Dec 1;24(6):769-81.
- [5] Croft PR, Macfarlane GJ, Papageorgiou AC, Thomas E, Silman AJ. Outcome of low back pain in general practice: a prospective study. BMJ (Clin Res Ed). 1998;316(7141):1356–9.]

# Volume 12 Issue 7, July 2023 www.ijsr.net

# Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

| Table 1: Questionnaire                 |                                 |  |  |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Lower back Pain                        | Psychological distress          |  |  |
| Oswestry Lower back pain questionnaire | Perceived stress scale          |  |  |
| Roland Morris questionnaire            | K10 (Kessler score)             |  |  |
| Back pain functional score             | Depression Anxiety stress scale |  |  |

Patient fulfilling the inclusion criterion

| Demographic data of<br>the national collected |  |
|---|--|
| tile patient conected.                        |  |
|   |  |

fill the questionnaire.

Statistical correlation by Spearman's rank coefficient test

Figure 1: Study Procedure

DOI: 10.21275/SR23720172201