Title: Characterizing Acute Low Back Pain in a Community-Based Cohort

Authors: Kenneth A. Taylor, DPT, PhD[1,2,*], Colleen Burke, DPT[1,3,*], Steven Z. George, PT, PhD, FAPTA[1,2,3], Stephanie Danyluk, MS[1], Carla A. Kingsbury, BA[4,5], Flavia Penteado Kapos, DDS, PhD[1,2], Kelley Seebeck, BA[1], Christopher E. Lewis[4,5], BA, Emily Ford, BA[4,5], Cecilia Plez[4,5], BA, Andrzej Kosinski, PhD[6], Rebecca Filippo, DPT[1,3], Michael Brown, PhD[7,8], Adam P. Goode, DPT, PhD[1,2,3]

[1]Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA; [2]Duke Clinical Research Institute, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA; [3] Department of Population Health Sciences, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA; [4]Duke Department of Medicine, Duke University, NC, USA [5]Duke Clinical and Translational Science Institute, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA; [6]Department of Bioinformatics and Biostatistics, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA, [7]Department of Neurosurgery, Duke University, Durham NC; [8]Duke Cancer Institute, Duke University, Durham NC;

Corresponding author: Adam P. Goode, Duke University School of Medicine, Box 104002 DUMC, Durham, NC 27708, USA; Phone: 919-681-6157; Fax: 919-684-1846; adam.goode@duke.edu

*****Contributed equally as the first author.

Running title: Acute low back pain characterization

Funding Sources: This work was supported by the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases (NIAMS) R01AR071440, R01AR075399, and K24AR079594. Support for the MURDOCK Study comes from Duke University's CTSA grant (UL1TR002553) awarded from the National Institutes of Health (NIH)'s National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS).

Abstract

Acute low back pain (LBP) is a common experience, however, the associated pain severity, pain frequency, and characteristics of individuals with acute LBP in community settings have yet to be well understood. The purpose of this manuscript is to categorize and compare acute LBP groups for differences in the following characteristics: 1) sociodemographic, 2) general and physical health, and 3) psychological. This cross-sectional study used baseline data from 131 community-based participants with acute LBP (<4 weeks duration before screening and ≥30 pain-free days before acute LBP onset). Two LBP categorization definitions were used based on LBP frequency combined with either: 1) pain interference frequency (impact-based) or 2) pain intensity (intensity-based). Descriptive associations were calculated as prevalence ratios for categorical variables and Hedges' *g* for continuous variables. Our analyses identified several large associations for impact-based and intensity-based categories for pain interference with activity and with enjoyment in life, global mental health, STarT Back Screening Tool risk category, general health, and Fear Avoidance Beliefs Questionnaire-Physical Activity subscale. Larger associations were found with social constructs (racially and ethnically minoritized, performance of social roles, and isolation) when using the intensity-based versus impact-based categorization. This study adds to the literature by providing standard ways to characterize community-based individuals experiencing acute LBP. The robust differences observed between these categorization approaches suggest they may be used to improve the early identification of factors potentially contributing to the development of chronic LBP.

Keywords: Low Back Pain, Acute Pain, Cohort Study

Introduction

Up to 25% of individuals suffer acute low back pain (LBP) annually.[50, 54] Despite being relatively common, acute LBP receives little attention due to perceived favorable long-term outcome.[40, 47] However, the incidence of chronic LBP may be higher than previously thought, with 32% in a large cohort of US adults seeking care for acute LBP.[53] Additionally, it is typical for studies estimating chronic LBP incidence to use cohorts restricted to patients seeking healthcare, yet a large proportion (42%) of individuals experiencing LBP do not seek care.[19] Because of this, results from care-seeking cohorts may not be generalizable to adults with acute LBP.

Cohorts recruited directly from the community (i.e., not limited to individuals seeking care) play an essential role in understanding the full spectrum of health and disease processes regardless of healthcare access or utilization. For example, a recent Australian community-based cohort study indicated that acute LBP's prognosis is far better than in clinical populations.[15] However, the same may not be accurate in the US, given the differences between these countries (e.g., demographic makeup, sociopolitical, and healthcare characteristics). Like studies of those seeking care for LBP, the limited US community-based studies available, also indicate that chronic LBP incidence is higher than previously thought (approximately 25%).[27, 54]

Various cutoffs for pain intensity (e.g., >4/10 on an 11-point scale) have been proposed to determine eligibility for LBP studies with the rationale that excluding individuals with lower pain intensity may provide greater scope for meaningful change in pain scores.[37] The downside is that studies applying such restrictions may miss important information regarding characteristics of the overall group of acute LBP sufferers, biasing study results and impacting the ability to estimate (and accurately predict) the incidence of chronic LBP transition.[36, 37]

More studies enrolling participants directly from the community are needed to understand acute LBP, and ultimately how these characteristics of acute LBP contribute to chronic LBP by means of transitioning from acute-to-chronic LBP. Recently developed measures to characterize chronic LBP focus on frequency-based questions to better understand high-impact chronic pain.[14] However, there has yet to be an attempt to extend this categorization approach to acute LBP. Furthermore, few studies of acute LBP have included the characterization of key sociodemographic, general health/clinical characteristics, health behaviors, social health, and psychological factors, which may improve the prediction of chronic LBP or the identification of factors that contribute to its development. To fill these gaps, we proposed two definitions to categorize the acute LBP experience in a US-based cohort study of participants recruited from the community. The purpose of this manuscript is to categorize acute LBP and characterize these two subgroups by: 1)

sociodemographic factors, 2) general health and physical characteristics, and 3) psychological aspects within and across the two proposed acute LBP definitions.

Methods:

For this study, we used baseline data from an ongoing cohort study of adults investigating the biopsychosocial factors related to transitioning from new onset acute LBP to chronic LBP. Study participants were recruited from communities in and around Durham, NC and Kannapolis, NC between February 2022 and November 2022. We utilized a community-based approach to recruit potential participants at both sites; this included advertisements on social media, newspaper articles, volunteer registries, emails distributed through university networks, flyers posted in or around the communities, and word of mouth. Recruitment in Kannapolis was primarily based on the MURDOCK Study. [6] The MURDOCK Study is a 12,526-participant community-based longitudinal cohort recruited from 2007-2013 (~2,000 participants per year) centralized in Cabarrus County. In Durham County, we recruited participants using social media, flyers at local events, and the Duke Health Volunteer Registry. This registry can be queried for inclusion and exclusion criteria related to age, comorbidities (cancer/autoimmune conditions), and recent surgery/trauma. It contains over 7,200 volunteers accessible by email, and among those 55% are healthy, 56% identify as White, 35% identify as Black, and 5% identify as Hispanic. This study was reviewed and approved by the institutional review board at the Duke University School of Medicine.

Individuals interested in participating contacted research coordinators, who explained the study and initiated a telephone script for screening. To be eligible for study participation, individuals were required to be adults ($\geq$18 years old) with acute LBP: LBP that started <4 weeks before screening and $\geq$30 days without LBP before the date of acute onset. We excluded individuals with a current or previous history of systemic inflammatory or autoimmune conditions (i.e., rheumatoid arthritis, spondyloarthropathies, irritable bowel syndrome, multiple sclerosis, Guillain-Barré Syndrome, human immunodeficiency virus, lupus), cancer (other than skin cancer), lumbar spine surgery, low back trauma (e.g., motor vehicle accident, falls), and congenital or acquired spinal defect (e.g., scoliosis). We also excluded individuals who were pregnant. Eligible individuals received and signed an informed consent form electronically via Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap)[30, 31, 45] or in person. All participants were provided a copy of their signed consent form and scheduled for a baseline in-person visit no later than 6 weeks from the date of LBP onset. Before in-person data collection, participants completed study questionnaires to assess pain intensity, interference, and duration; depression, anxiety, and social measures via an online questionnaire using REDCap or, if the participant preferred, by phone. Study

staff reviewed procedures with participants at the start of the in-person data collection visit. Participants were compensated for each in-person data collection visit and completion of electronic questionnaires.

Defining Acute Low Back Pain Categories

We operationalized acute LBP categories using two different definitions that relied on LBP frequency combined with either: 1) pain interference frequency (impact-based) or 2) pain intensity (intensity-based). The impact-based acute LBP categorization was based on the definition used to determine high impact chronic pain[56], adapting questions for an acute LBP population. Participants responded to the following questions about their LBP: 1) "Since the onset of your pain, how often have you had pain? Would you say Never, Some Days, Most Days, or Every Day?" and 2) "Since the onset of your low back pain, how often has pain limited your life or work activities? Would you say Never, Some Days, Most Days, or Every Day?" We categorized participants who answered "Most Days" or "Every Day" to both questions as having high impact acute LBP. **Figure 1-A** illustrates how we used the same questions to categorize further participants who did not fall into the high impact acute LBP group into either a moderate or low impact category.

A. Impact-Based Definition

		Since the onset of your pain, how often have you had pain?	
		Most Days or Every Day	**Some Days**
Since the onset of your low back pain, how often has your pain limited your life or work activities?	**Most Days or Every Day**	High Impact	Moderate Impact
	Some Days or Never	Moderate Impact	Low Impact

B. Intensity-Based Definition

		Since the onset of your pain, how often have you had pain?	
		Most Days or Every Day	**Some Days**
Low Back Pain Intensity	**≥40 / 100**	Strong Intensity	Moderate Intensity
	<40 / 100	Moderate Intensity	Weak Intensity

Figure 1. Acute Low Back Pain Categorization Definitions

Instead of incorporating pain interference frequency, our intensity-based definition combined LBP frequency with LBP intensity using the 0-100 Numerical Rating Scale. Participants were categorized as having strong intensity acute LBP if they reported pain frequency as "Most Days" or "Every Day" and reported pain intensity ≥40 / 100. Incorporating the

cut-point in this definition provides value for comparisons with other cohorts. **Figure 1-B** illustrates how we used a similar approach to categorize participants who did not fall into the strong intensity acute LBP group into either a moderate or weak intensity category.

Acute Low Back Pain and Sensory Characteristics

Beyond the questions used to categorize acute LBP, we collected information regarding other pains and LBP treatments used since the onset of current LBP (adapted from the NIH recommended minimum dataset for chronic LBP),[16] personal history of prior LBP episodes, and family history of LBP and chronic pain. We also collected the STarT Back Screening Tool (SBT)[34] . This 9-item questionnaire asks about LBP spreading down the leg(s), pain in other areas, pain interference with enjoyment of life (from the PEG),[42] pain interference with general activities (from the PEG),[42] perception of physical activity safety, pain catastrophizing, and LBP-related functional limitations to categorize individuals with LBP into low, medium, and high risk categories based on their predicted risk of acute-to-chronic LBP transition.

We measured pain pressure threshold (PPT) at the upper trapezius (PPT-UT) and posterior superior iliac spine (PPT-PSIS) bilaterally using a standard rubber-tip algometer. All PPT tests were performed with participants seated with their hands in their lap. Study staff explained the procedure to the participants and instructed them to say “pain” as soon as the pressure applied first produced a painful sensation. Pressure was applied at a rate of 1-kgf/cm2/second until the participant’s PPT was reached up to 10.1 kgf. If the PPT was not reached before this ceiling, the measurement was recorded at a truncated value of 10.1 kgf. Three measurements for PPT-UT and PPT-PSIS were recorded on each side (alternating between left and right); we present the mean value (in kgf) of the PPT-UT and PPT-PSIS measurements.

Sociodemographic Characteristics

We collected self-reported sociodemographic characteristics, including age, sex at birth, gender identity, racial identity, Hispanic ethnicity (yes/no), highest educational attainment, insurance type, marital status, and employment status. Participants could indicate one or more racial identities out of the following categories: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or White. Participants also had the option to select “other” and provide a write-in racial category option or select “unknown” or “choose not to respond.” To assess racialized pain inequities in our impact-based and severity-based categorization approaches, we

grouped participants into two groups based on racialized sociopolitical positions: 1) “racially minoritized”, which included participants who identified as Asian, Black or African American, and those who had selected more than one race category (there were no participants who identified as American Indian or Alaskan Native, or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander), and 2) “racially advantaged”, which included participants who identified as White only.[7] Participants reported sex at birth (female/male) and gender identity (cisgender, transgender, non-binary, genderqueer, agender, or gender fluid) using standardized items.[3]

General Health and Clinical Characteristics. We used the General Health Item from the Patient Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Scale v1.2 – Global Health[32] to capture self-reported health status: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor. In addition to general health, we asked participants about prior infections with the novel coronavirus disease of 2019 (COVID-19). Participants who indicated previous COVID-19 infections were also asked about the cumulative number of separate COVID-19 infections experienced and whether they considered their back pain related to a prior COVID-19 infection. Participant height and weight were collected in person on a standard electronic scale and used to calculate body mass index (BMI).

Health Behaviors. We classified participants into three mutually exclusive physical activity groups (0 min/week = inactive, 1-149 min/week = insufficiently active, and ≥150 min/week = sufficiently active) based on their responses to two questions: 1) “On average, how many days per week do you engage in moderate to strenuous exercise (like walking fast, running, jogging, dancing, swimming, biking, or other activities that cause a light or heavy sweat)?” and 2) “On average, how many minutes do you engage in exercise at this level?”[12, 26] We captured sleep disturbance using the PROMIS Short Form v1.0 – Sleep Disturbance 4a.[58]

To categorize smoking status, we asked participants, “Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your ENTIRE LIFE?” We classified individuals answering “no” to the first question as never smokers. Participants responding “yes” to the first question were asked a follow-up question: “Do you NOW smoke cigarettes every day, some days, or not at all?” Those responding “not at all” we classified as former smokers, while those responding otherwise were considered current smokers.[26] We ascertained substance use with two questions: 1) “Have you ever been drunk or used drugs more than you meant to?”; and 2) “Have you felt you wanted or needed to cut down on your drinking or drug use?” Response options for both questions were Never, Rarely, Sometimes, or Often.[16]

Social Health. We captured two components of social health: social isolation and the ability to perform social roles. We ascertained social isolation using the Social Network Index (SNI)[5] , as the Institute of Medicine (IOM) recommended.[26, 46] The SNI asks questions about the frequency of contact with friends and family, religious participation, group membership, and marital status to classify individuals into four mutually exclusive groups: most isolated, very isolated, somewhat isolated, and not isolated.[26, 32] We used an item assessing the performance of social activities and roles collected from the PROMIS Scale v1.2 – Global Health to measure social function.[32]

Psychological Characteristics. To capture depressive symptoms, we collected the PROMIS Short Form v1.0 – Depression 4a.[48, 49] We collected stress symptoms using the IOM-recommended validated single-item question: "Stress means a situation in which a person feels tense, restless, nervous, or anxious, or is unable to sleep at night because their mind is troubled all the time. Do you feel this kind of stress these days?"[26] Participants are given the following response options: Not at All, A Little Bit, Somewhat, Quite a Bit, and Very Much.[18, 26] We used the Optimal Screening for Prediction of Referral and Outcome Yellow Flags (OSPRO-YF) 10-item questionnaire to estimate scores of other important psychological measures. The OSPRO-YF is a validated tool that provides predicted scores on the following measures: Fear-Avoidance Beliefs Questionnaire (both physical activity and work subscales; FABQ-PA and FABQ-W), Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale (PASS-20), Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS), Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9), Pain Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (PSEQ), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI), and Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia (TSK-11).[9, 23, 43]

Statistical Analysis

We separately summarized individual-level characteristics stratified by acute LBP categories for each categorization approach (i.e., impact-based and intensity-based). Using low impact acute LBP and weak intensity acute LBP categories as the reference groups, we present the relative magnitude of differences using prevalence ratios (PR) for categorical variables and Hedges' *g* for continuous variables with their respective 95% confidence intervals (CI). Interpretation of Hedges' *g* is like Cohen's *d* – with values around 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8 or more interpreted as small, moderate, and large differences between acute LBP groups.[33] We conducted all analyses in SAS 9.4 (Cary, NC) and used RStudio for data visualization.[38, 51, 57]

Results

We screened 384 potential participants, 184 of whom met the study criteria. The most common reason for exclusion 158/200 (79%) was a duration of low back pain >4 weeks or having LBP within 30 days before the current LBP episode, followed by history of cancer 16/200 (8%), active inflammatory condition 11/200 (5.5%), history of lumbar surgery 7/200 (3.5%) and other reasons 8/200 (4%). Of those who screened eligible, 143/184 (77.7%) enrolled in the study, and 131/143 (91.6%) of those enrolled provided baseline data. No significant differences in the distribution of age, racial identity, or sex at birth were found between those eligible and did not enroll and those that did enroll in the study or those that did and did not provide baseline data.

We present sociodemographic characteristics for the overall sample in **Table 1**. Sex at birth for much of our sample (58.8%) was female, and 100% of our sample had cisgender identity. Mean (SD) age was 56.9 (13.8), ranging from 19 to 81 years old. Regarding race, 22.9% of participants identified as Black or African American, and 67.9% identified as White. There were 6.1% of participants (of any race) who reported Hispanic ethnicity. The most common employment status was working full-time (42.7%), with 42.0% of all participants reporting having some college, and 51.2% having a bachelor's degree or higher. A large proportion (72.5%) reported never smoking, whereas 7.6% were current smokers (smoking some or every day).

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Cohort

	Total (N=131)
Age Category (years), n (%)	
18-24	3 (2.3%)
25-34	6 (4.6%)
35-44	14 (10.7%)
45-54	30 (22.9%)
55-64	36 (27.5%)
65-74	29 (22.1%)
75+	13 (9.9%)
Female Sex At Birth, n (%)	77 (58.8%)
Hispanic Ethnicity (yes), n (%)	8 (6.1%)
Racial Identity, n (%)	
Asian	3 (2.3%)
Black or African American	30 (22.9%)
White	89 (67.9%)
Multiple Races	6 (4.6%)
Unknown	3 (2.3%)
Employment Status, n (%)	

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Cohort

	Total (N=131)
Working now, full-time	56 (42.7%)
Working now, part-time	18 (13.7%)
Looking for work, unemployed	1 (0.8%)
Sick leave or maternity leave	1 (0.8%)
Disabled for reasons other than back pain	4 (3.1%)
Student	3 (2.3%)
Retired	40 (30.5%)
Keeping house	3 (2.3%)
Other	3 (2.3%)
Choose Not to Answer	2 (1.5%)
Highest Educational Attainment, n (%)	
High School Graduate, GED, or less	9 (6.9%)
Limited College Education, Trade / Technical School Training, or Associates Degree	55 (42.0%)
Bachelor's Degree or Some Graduate School but No Degree	36 (27.5%)
Graduate Degree	31 (23.7%)
Marital Status, n (%)	
Single Never Married	21 (16.0%)
Divorced	19 (14.5%)
Separated	4 (3.1%)
Widowed	4 (3.1%)
Married / Living with Partner	83 (63.4%)

When considering the intersection between both categorization approaches, 28.2% (95% CI: 20.5% to 36.0%) of participants were in both the low impact and the weak intensity categories, while 11.5% (95% CI: 6.0% to 16.9%) were in both the moderate impact and moderate intensity categories and 5.3% (95% CI: 1.5% to 9.2%) were in both the high impact and strong intensity categories. The remainder of the participants had different combinations of acute LBP categories across the two approaches, typically with a higher-tier intensity-based category than their impact-based category.

Impact-Based Definition

The proportion of individuals in each impact-based acute LBP category decreased in a stepwise fashion from low impact to high impact acute LBP, with 52.7% (95% CI: 44.1% to 61.2%), 38.9% (95% CI: 30.6% to 47.3%), and 8.4% (95% CI: 3.6% to 13.1%) of our sample falling into low, moderate, and high impact acute LBP categories, respectively. We present results for differences in continuous variables in **Figure 2** and **Figure 3** comparing the moderate impact acute LBP group and the high impact acute LBP group, respectively, to the low impact acute LBP group; PRs comparing the same groups to the low impact acute LBP group are in **Figure 4**. Compared to the low impact acute LBP group, the

moderate impact group had higher NRS for current LBP, PEG Interference Enjoyment Scale, and PEG Interference Activity Scale. They were more likely to be a current smoker and less likely to have Hispanic ethnicity than the low impact acute LBP group. When comparing the high impact group to the low impact acute LBP group, the high impact acute LBP group had higher NRS for current LBP, higher estimated fear avoidance beliefs related to work (FABQ-W Subscale), higher estimated fear avoidance beliefs related to physical activity (FABQ-PA Subscale), PEG Interference Activity Scale, and PEG Interference Enjoyment Scale and were more likely to have leg pain related to their LBP. The low impact acute LBP group had better PROMIS Global Physical Health scores than the moderate and high impact groups. Still, this difference was larger when compared to the moderate impact group. The moderate impact acute LBP and the high impact acute LBP groups were more likely to have medium risk and less likely to have low risk on the SBT. We could not calculate a PR to compare the likelihood of having high risk on the SBT because no participants in the reference group (low impact acute LBP) had high risk on the SBT. Compared to those in the low impact acute LBP group, those with moderate impact acute LBP and high impact acute LBP were also more likely to report being racially minoritized. Individuals in both the moderate and high impact acute LBP groups were more likely to report needing or wanting to cut back on alcohol or drug use than those with low impact acute LBP.



Figure 2. Hedges' *g* for continuous variables comparing moderate impact to low impact acute LBP categories



Figure 3. Hedges' *g* for continuous variables comparing high impact to low impact acute LBP categories



Figure 4. Prevalence ratios for categorical variables by impact-based acute LBP categories

Intensity-Based Definition

Compared to the impact-based acute LBP categorization, the proportion of our sample in each of our intensity-based acute LBP categories was more evenly distributed, with 33.6% (95% CI: 25.5% to 41.7%), 37.4% (95% CI: 29.1% to 45.7%), and 29.0% (95% CI: 21.2% to 36.8%) of our sample being in the strong, moderate, and weak intensity acute LBP categories.

For comparisons across intensity-based categories, we present the differences for continuous variables in **Figure 5** and **Figure 6,** comparing the moderate intensity acute LBP group and the strong intensity acute LBP group, respectively, to the weak intensity acute LBP group; PRs comparing the same groups to the weak intensity acute LBP group are in **Figure 7**. Compared to the weak intensity acute LBP group, the moderate intensity acute LBP group had higher PEG Interference Enjoyment Scale and PEG Interference Activity Scale and were more likely to be current smokers, or to report insufficient physical activity, social isolation, worse health, and worse ability to fulfill their usual social roles and activities. The strong intensity group had higher fear avoidance beliefs related to physical activity (FABQ-PA Subscale, PEG Interference Activity Scale, and PEG Interference Enjoyment Scale, and lower PROMIS Global Physical Health scores relative to the weak intensity acute LBP group and were more likely to have associated leg pain, a family history of LBP, worse general health, and worse ability to complete their usual social roles and activities. The group with strong intensity acute LBP and the group with moderate intensity acute LBP were more likely to have a medium risk of poor long-term outcome on the SBT than the weak intensity acute LBP group. In contrast, the strong intensity acute LBP group was less likely to have a low risk on the SBT than the weak intensity acute LBP group. Compared to the weak intensity acute LBP group, the other two intensity-based groups were more likely to report being racially minoritized. The moderate and strong intensity acute LBP groups also reported being drunk or using drugs more than they meant to be and wanting or needing to cut back on alcohol or drug use.



Figure 5. Hedges' *g* for continuous variables comparing moderate intensity to weak intensity acute LBP categories



Figure 6. Hedges' *g* for continuous variables comparing strong intensity to weak intensity acute LBP categories



Figure 7. Prevalence ratios for categorical variables by intensity-based acute LBP categories

Discussion

We characterized acute LBP with participants from a community setting according to both an impact-based definition and an intensity-based definition, which provides a better understanding of domains that may contribute to or better predict the development of chronic LBP. The current consistent characteristic for defining acute LBP is based upon duration, with most studies indicating <6 weeks to represent the acute phase of LBP.[41, 55,29] Others have used LBP intensity as an exclusion criterion, with individuals reporting intensities of <4/10 being considered ineligible. These cut-

offs are commonly used to exclude participants due to the potential inability to show important improvements in pain. This type of exclusion can lead to potential selection biases and an inability to characterize acute LBP accurately due to ceiling effects.[13, 37] Identifying new ways to define acute LBP may help to identify specific sub-groups where treatments may be best tailored for response or to identify groups at high risk for the transition to chronic LBP. To our knowledge, such a characterization of acute LBP has never been done. We recognize that our acute LBP impact-based definition was derived from a similar operational definition approach designed to measure the impact of activity-limiting chronic pain; however, our goal was to assess differences in sociodemographic, general and physical health, as well as psychological characteristics in acute LBP. We identified that the distribution of low, moderate, and high impact acute LBP was slightly higher (but similar overall) to the general population of chronic LBP. Additionally, our intensity-based definition approach combined commonly used clinical trial eligibility criteria (≥4/10 pain intensity) and pain frequency to categorize acute LBP based on key characteristics. Interestingly, there was little overlap in the participant characteristics between these two categorization approaches, suggesting these categorizations identified unique constructs associated with acute LBP. Categorizing acute LBP using one or both of these proposed approaches may provide opportunities to assess their value in predicting the transition to chronic LBP and their value in risk stratification to inform interventions that improve care access and/or utilization for those who may be at the highest risk of chronic LBP but may not have accessed care.

Differences were found between these two acute LBP categorization approaches, primarily observed regarding their relationships to social constructs (i.e., sociodemographics, social roles, and social isolation). To our knowledge, reporting social constructs in the characterization of acute LBP is rare. Social factors are highly complex and can be challenging to measure, which may contribute to the limited understanding of how social factors contribute to an individual's experience with acute LBP. Two components of social health[8] (social isolation and the ability to perform social roles/activities) were more likely to worsen among participants in the stronger intensity-based categories. This points to differences in how various social constructs relate to individuals' experiences with acute LBP and may help explain some differences between the two acute LBP categorization approaches. Racialized and ethnicized inequities exist related to chronic LBP (e.g., inequities in pain severity, frequency, and pain-related disability).[2, 10, 11, 44] They are driven by intersecting systems and practices of racial and ethnic minoritization, discrimination, and socioeconomic/sociopolitical disadvantage that can negatively impact the biopsychosocial health and well-being of racially and ethnically minoritized groups over individual lifetimes and across generations.[1, 22, 28] Importantly, these same systems and practices of racial and ethnic inequity create and maintain socioeconomic/sociopolitical advantage that can protect the biopsychosocial health

and well-being of White groups over individual lifetimes and across generations.[7] In both categorizations, being racially minoritized was associated with being in the higher categories for acute LBP (i.e. moderate- or high-impact and/or moderate- or strong-intensity). Conversely, self-report of Hispanic ethnicity was associated with lower categorization for the intensity-based definition (i.e. moderate intensity compared to strong intensity) and could therefore be a protective factor. The same can be seen in the impact-based definition, no one identifying as Hispanic ethnicity was categorized in the highest group (i.e., high-impact). These findings underscore the importance of considering the impact that race has on both acute and chronic LBP outcomes.

These differences found here in the categorization approaches present opportunities for standardization of acute LBP approaches based on specific populations and consistency for defining acute LBP for future pooling of results. For example, when investigating social factors such as social isolation, ethnicity, and possibly social networks or culture, it may be more appropriate to utilize the intensity-based definition since this categorization demonstrated differences between the various intensity category's effect sizes. While each category highlights unique contributions of various social factors, trade-offs exist between the representation of certain social constructs within our categorization. This demonstrates the need for special consideration of the representation of specific social factors when studying acute LBP. Understanding how social constructs relate to acute LBP and our acute LBP categorization approaches (intensity-based and impact-based) helps describe the broader group of adults experiencing acute LBP. It may help fill the gaps related to better predicting the transition to chronic LBP in future research.[39, 53, 54]

Although differences were noted between the two proposed categorizations, several important similarities were observed in the strength of effect sizes between categorization approaches. Current acute LBP intensity was consistently higher among participants in worse categories when using the intensity- or impact-based approach. Higher acute LBP intensity has previously been identified as a predictor of transitioning to chronic LBP [17], lending face validity to the possibility that the categorization approaches we used in this study may be useful in predicting chronic LBP (independently or in combination with other covariates). SBT scores that indicate a medium risk showed similar strong relationships with worse categories across categorization approaches. Previous research among individuals seeking care for LBP has indicated that the SBT provides clinically relevant stratification of individuals with a higher risk of persistent chronic symptoms [34, 35] , and a recent large embedded pragmatic clinical trial enrolling individuals seeking care for acute LBP found that the SBT accurately identified those who transitioned to chronic LBP.[53] Similar to these studies among care-seeking individuals, our findings indicate a similar psychological burden on participants with acute LBP within the

community (regardless of care-seeking status) that may allow for chronic LBP risk stratification. Higher scores on FABQ were also consistent between categorization approaches. Higher FABQ scores are common among participants with acute LBP and predict work-related disability, care outcomes, and long-term disability. [4, 20, 21, 24, 25] Our findings support that higher FABQ scores may also have utility in predicting the transition to chronic LBP or long-term disability among community-based LBP sufferers.

This study has several strengths, including comprehensive psychosocial measurements and a community-based cohort sample. However, there are limitations to this study. First, the primary purpose of this study was to collect preliminary data to assess the feasibility and acceptability of collecting a comprehensive set of measures from acute LBP participants within the community and follow these participants longitudinally. Our sample size was limited, impacting the precision of our Hedges' *g* and PR estimates. This was especially true when comparing the high impact acute LBP category to the low impact category because of the relatively low number of participants in the high impact category. In addition, while we identified that ethnicity might play a role in the differences between categorizations, however our sample size of Hispanic ethnicity was small, limiting the comparisons between groups. Second, we relied on self-reported physical activity for these analyses, which may misclassify physical activity measurement relative to accelerometry. We fielded the use of accelerometers to objectively measure physical activity, but this was limited to a subset of participants and occurred later in the project. Third, although we excluded participants who did not have 30 consecutive days without LBP before the onset of their current LBP episode to restrict our cohort to potential recurrent acute LBP, however, some participants reported other LBP episodes within the past year. Some participants may meet the consensus definition for recurrent LBP, depending on the context surrounding these previous LBP episodes (which occurred and resolved ≥30 days before the current LBP episode).[52] A final limitation is the cross-sectional design, which does not allow us to fully investigate which of these categorization approaches is most helpful for the prediction of the transition to chronic LBP. Despite these limitations, our study comprehensively characterizes acute LBP within the community, an understudied area of LBP.

Conclusion

This study used two approaches to categorize and describe community-based adults experiencing acute LBP. As expected, both categorization approaches, based on LBP intensity and LBP interference, had similar measures with consistent within-approach differences, including current pain intensity, pain interference with activity or enjoyment, low

and medium risk categories on the SBT, and higher scores on the FABQ. However, there were higher cross-category differences in social isolation, social roles, and stress in the intensity-based definition compared to the impact-based definition. Results from this study may be used to better categorize acute LBP according to a given research question and provide the opportunity for standard definitions to be applied in future studies.

References

1. Bailey ZD, Krieger N, Agenor M, Graves J, Linos N, Bassett MT. Structural racism and health inequities in the USA: evidence and interventions. *Lancet.* 389:1453-1463, 2017
2. Bartley EJ, Hossain NI, Gravlee CC, Sibille KT, Terry EL, Vaughn IA, Cardoso JS, Booker SQ, Glover TL, Goodin BR, Sotolongo A, Thompson KA, Bulls HW, Staud R, Edberg JC, Bradley LA, Fillingim RB. Race/Ethnicity Moderates the Association Between Psychosocial Resilience and Movement-Evoked Pain in Knee Osteoarthritis. *ACR Open Rheumatol.* 1:16-25, 2019
3. Bauer GR, Braimoh J, Scheim AI, Dharma C. Transgender-inclusive measures of sex/gender for population surveys: Mixed-methods evaluation and recommendations. *PLoS One.* 12:e0178043, 2017
4. Beneciuk JM, Robinson ME, George SZ. Low back pain subgroups using fear-avoidance model measures: results of a cluster analysis. *Clin J Pain.* 28:658-666, 2012
5. Berkman LF, Syme SL. Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: a nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. *Am J Epidemiol.* 109:186-204, 1979
6. Bhattacharya S, Dunham AA, Cornish MA, Christian VA, Ginsburg GS, Tenenbaum JD, Nahm ML, Miranda ML, Califf RM, Dolor RJ, Newby LK. The Measurement to Understand Reclassification of Disease of Cabarrus/Kannapolis (MURDOCK) Study Community Registry and Biorepository. *Am J Transl Res.* 4:458-470, 2012
7. Black C, Cerdena JP, Spearman-McCarthy EV. I am not your minority. *Lancet Reg Health Am.* 19:100464, 2023
8. Bode RK, Hahn EA, DeVellis R, Cella D, Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Social Domain Working G. Measuring participation: the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System experience. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 91:S60-65, 2010
9. Butera KA, George SZ, Lentz TA. Psychometric Evaluation of the Optimal Screening for Prediction of Referral and Outcome Yellow Flag (OSPRO-YF) Tool: Factor Structure, Reliability, and Validity. *J Pain.* 21:557-569, 2020
10. Carey TS, Freburger JK, Holmes GM, Jackman A, Knauer S, Wallace A, Darter J. Race, care seeking, and utilization for chronic back and neck pain: population perspectives. *J Pain.* 11:343-350, 2010
11. Carey TS, Garrett JM. The relation of race to outcomes and the use of health care services for acute low back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 28:390-394, 2003
12. Coleman KJ, Ngor E, Reynolds K, Quinn VP, Koebnick C, Young DR, Sternfeld B, Sallis RE. Initial validation of an exercise "vital sign" in electronic medical records. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 44:2071-2076, 2012
13. Crombie IK, Davies HT. Selection bias in pain research. *Pain.* 74:1-3, 1998
14. Dahlhamer J, Lucas J, Zelaya C, Nahin R, Mackey S, DeBar L, Kerns R, Von Korff M, Porter L, Helmick C. Prevalence of Chronic Pain and High-Impact Chronic Pain Among Adults - United States, 2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 67:1001-1006, 2018
15. de Campos TF, da Silva TM, Maher CG, Pocovi NC, Hancock MJ. Prognosis of a new episode of low-back pain in a community inception cohort. *Eur J Pain.* 27:602-610, 2023
16. Deyo RA, Dworkin SF, Amtmann D, Andersson G, Borenstein D, Carragee E, Carrino J, Chou R, Cook K, DeLitto A, Goertz C, Khalsa P, Loeser J, Mackey S, Panagis J, Rainville J, Tosteson T, Turk D, Von Korff M, Weiner DK. Report of the NIH Task Force on research standards for chronic low back pain. *J Pain.* 15:569-585, 2014
17. Downie AS, Hancock MJ, Rzewuska M, Williams CM, Lin CC, Maher CG. Trajectories of acute low back pain: a latent class growth analysis. *Pain.* 157:225-234, 2016
18. Elo AL, Leppanen A, Jahkola A. Validity of a single-item measure of stress symptoms. *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 29:444-451, 2003
19. Ferreira ML, Machado G, Latimer J, Maher C, Ferreira PH, Smeets RJ. Factors defining care-seeking in low back pain--a meta-analysis of population based surveys. *Eur J Pain.* 14:747 e741-747, 2010

20. Fritz JM, George SZ. Identifying psychosocial variables in patients with acute work-related low back pain: the importance of fear-avoidance beliefs. *Phys Ther.* 82:973-983, 2002

21. Fritz JM, George SZ, Delitto A. The role of fear-avoidance beliefs in acute low back pain: relationships with current and future disability and work status. *Pain.* 94:7-15, 2001

22. Fuentes A, Ackermann RR, Athreya S, Bolnick D, Lasisi T, Lee SH, McLean SA, Nelson R. AAPA Statement on Race and Racism. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 169:400-402, 2019

23. George SZ, Beneciuk JM, Lentz TA, Wu SS, Dai Y, Bialosky JE, Zeppieri G, Jr. Optimal Screening for Prediction of Referral and Outcome (OSPRO) for Musculoskeletal Pain Conditions: Results From the Validation Cohort. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 48:460-475, 2018

24. George SZ, Bialosky JE, Fritz JM. Physical therapist management of a patient with acute low back pain and elevated fear-avoidance beliefs. *Phys Ther.* 84:538-549, 2004

25. George SZ, Fritz JM, McNeil DW. Fear-avoidance beliefs as measured by the fear-avoidance beliefs questionnaire: change in fear-avoidance beliefs questionnaire is predictive of change in self-report of disability and pain intensity for patients with acute low back pain. *Clin J Pain.* 22:197-203, 2006

26. Giuse NB, Koonce TY, Kusnoor SV, Prather AA, Gottlieb LM, Huang LC, Phillips SE, Shyr Y, Adler NE, Stead WW. Institute of Medicine Measures of Social and Behavioral Determinants of Health: A Feasibility Study. *Am J Prev Med.* 52:199-206, 2017

27. Goode AP, Cleveland RJ, George SZ, Schwartz TA, Kraus VB, Renner JB, Gracely RH, DeFrate LE, Hu D, Jordan JM, Golightly YM. Predictors of Lumbar Spine Degeneration and Low Back Pain in the Community: The Johnston County Osteoarthritis Project. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* 2021

28. Gravlee CC. How race becomes biology: embodiment of social inequality. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 139:47-57, 2009

29. Griffith LE, Hogg-Johnson S, Cole DC, Krause N, Hayden J, Burdorf A, Leclerc A, Coggon D, Bongers P, Walter SD, Shannon HS, Meta-Analysis of Pain in the Lower B, Work Exposures Collaborative G. Low-back pain definitions in occupational studies were categorized for a meta-analysis using Delphi consensus methods. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 60:625-633, 2007

30. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, McLeod L, Delacqua G, Delacqua F, Kirby J, Duda SN, Consortium RE. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform.* 95:103208, 2019

31. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform.* 42:377-381, 2009

32. Hays RD, Bjorner JB, Revicki DA, Spritzer KL, Cella D. Development of physical and mental health summary scores from the patient-reported outcomes measurement information system (PROMIS) global items. *Qual Life Res.* 18:873-880, 2009

33. Hedges LV. Distribution Theory for Glass's Estimator of Effect Size and Related Estimators. *Journal of Educational Statistics.* 6:107-128, 1981

34. Hill JC, Dunn KM, Lewis M, Mullis R, Main CJ, Foster NE, Hay EM. A primary care back pain screening tool: identifying patient subgroups for initial treatment. *Arthritis Rheum.* 59:632-641, 2008

35. Hill JC, Whitehurst DG, Lewis M, Bryan S, Dunn KM, Foster NE, Konstantinou K, Main CJ, Mason E, Somerville S, Sowden G, Vohora K, Hay EM. Comparison of stratified primary care management for low back pain with current best practice (STarT Back): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 378:1560-1571, 2011

36. Infante-Rivard C, Cusson A. Reflection on modern methods: selection bias-a review of recent developments. *Int J Epidemiol.* 47:1714-1722, 2018

37. Kamerman PR, Vollert J. Greater baseline pain inclusion criteria in clinical trials increase regression to the mean effect: a modelling study. *Pain.* 163:e748-e758, 2022

38. Kassambara A. ggpubr: 'ggplot2' Based Publication Ready Plots, 2022

39. Klyne DM, Barbe MF, van den Hoorn W, Hodges PW. ISSLS PRIZE IN CLINICAL SCIENCE 2018: longitudinal analysis of inflammatory, psychological, and sleep-related factors following an acute low back pain episode-the good, the bad, and the ugly. *Eur Spine J.* 27:763-777, 2018

40. Koes BW, van Tulder MW, Thomas S. Diagnosis and treatment of low back pain. *BMJ.* 332:1430-1434, 2006

41. Kovacs FM, Seco J, Royuela A, Corcoll Reixach J, Abraira V, Spanish Back Pain Research N. Predicting the evolution of low back pain patients in routine clinical practice: results from a registry within the Spanish National Health Service. *Spine J.* 12:1008-1020, 2012

42. Krebs EE, Lorenz KA, Bair MJ, Damush TM, Wu J, Sutherland JM, Asch SM, Kroenke K. Development and initial validation of the PEG, a three-item scale assessing pain intensity and interference. *J Gen Intern Med.* 24:733-738, 2009

43. Lentz TA, Beneciuk JM, Bialosky JE, Zeppieri G, Jr., Dai Y, Wu SS, George SZ. Development of a Yellow Flag Assessment Tool for Orthopaedic Physical Therapists: Results From the Optimal Screening for Prediction of Referral and Outcome (OSPRO) Cohort. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 46:327-343, 2016

44. Milani CJ, Rundell SD, Jarvik JG, Friedly J, Heagerty PJ, Avins A, Nerenz D, Gold LS, Turner JA, Annaswamy T, Nedeljkovic SS, Suri P. Associations of Race and Ethnicity With Patient-Reported Outcomes and Health Care Utilization Among Older Adults Initiating a New Episode of Care for Back Pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 43:1007-1017, 2018

45. Obeid JS, McGraw CA, Minor BL, Conde JG, Pawluk R, Lin M, Wang J, Banks SR, Hemphill SA, Taylor R, Harris PA. Procurement of shared data instruments for Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap). *J Biomed Inform.* 46:259-265, 2013

46. Pantell M, Rehkopf D, Jutte D, Syme SL, Balmes J, Adler N. Social Isolation: A Predictor of Mortality Comparable to Traditional Clinical Risk Factors. *American Journal of Public Health.* 103:2056-2062, 2013

47. Pengel LH, Herbert RD, Maher CG, Refshauge KM. Acute low back pain: systematic review of its prognosis. *BMJ.* 327:323, 2003

48. Pilkonis PA, Choi SW, Reise SP, Stover AM, Riley WT, Cella D, Group PC. Item banks for measuring emotional distress from the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS(R)): depression, anxiety, and anger. *Assessment.* 18:263-283, 2011

49. Pilkonis PA, Yu L, Dodds NE, Johnston KL, Maihoefer CC, Lawrence SM. Validation of the depression item bank from the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) in a three-month observational study. *J Psychiatr Res.* 56:112-119, 2014

50. Riskowski JL. Associations of socioeconomic position and pain prevalence in the United States: findings from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Pain Med.* 15:1508-1521, 2014

51. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R: RStudio, PBC., 2022

52. Stanton TR, Latimer J, Maher CG, Hancock MJ. A modified Delphi approach to standardize low back pain recurrence terminology. *Eur Spine J.* 20:744-752, 2011

53. Stevans JM, Delitto A, Khoja SS, Patterson CG, Smith CN, Schneider MJ, Freburger JK, Greco CM, Freel JA, Sowa GA, Wasan AD, Brennan GP, Hunter SJ, Minick KI, Wegener ST, Ephraim PL, Friedman M, Beneciuk JM, George SZ, Saper RB. Risk Factors Associated With Transition From Acute to Chronic Low Back Pain in US Patients Seeking Primary Care. *JAMA Netw Open.* 4:e2037371, 2021

54. Taylor JB, Goode AP, George SZ, Cook CE. Incidence and risk factors for first-time incident low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Spine J.* 14:2299-2319, 2014

55. van Tulder MW, Koes BW, Bouter LM. Conservative treatment of acute and chronic nonspecific low back pain. A systematic review of randomized controlled trials of the most common interventions. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 22:2128-2156, 1997

56. Von Korff M, Scher AI, Helmick C, Carter-Pokras O, Dodick DW, Goulet J, Hamill-Ruth R, LeResche L, Porter L, Tait R, Terman G, Veasley C, Mackey S. United States National Pain Strategy for Population Research: Concepts, Definitions, and Pilot Data. *J Pain.* 17:1068-1080, 2016

57. Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis: Springer-Verlag New York, 2016

58. Yu L, Buysse DJ, Germain A, Moul DE, Stover A, Dodds NE, Johnston KL, Pilkonis PA. Development of short forms from the PROMIS sleep disturbance and Sleep-Related Impairment item banks. *Behav Sleep Med.* 10:6-24, 2011

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Acute Low Back Pain Categorization Definitions

Figure 2. Hedges' *g* for continuous variables comparing moderate impact to low impact acute LBP categories

Figure 3. Hedges' *g* for continuous variables comparing high impact to low impact acute LBP categories.

Figure 4. Prevalence ratios for categorical variables by impact-based acute LBP categories.

Figure 5. Hedges' *g* for continuous variables comparing moderate intensity to weak intensity acute LBP categories.

Figure 6. Hedges' *g* for continuous variables comparing strong intensity to weak intensity acute LBP categories

Figure 7. Prevalence ratios for categorical variables by intensity-based acute LBP categories