

Characteristics of patients who dropped out after multidisciplinary pain management in Japan: A prospective cohort study

Naoto Takahashi^{a,b,*}, Kozue Takatsuki^a, Satoshi Kasahara^{a,b} and Shoji Yabuki^{a,b}

^aDepartment of Pain Medicine, Fukushima Medical University School of Medicine, Fukushima City, Fukushima, Japan

^bPain Management Center, Hoshi General Hospital, Koriyama City, Fukushima, Japan

Received 3 October 2020

Accepted 29 October 2021

Abstract.

BACKGROUND: Because regular visits to distant hospitals may be a burden to patients, both in terms of time and cost, some patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain may discontinue multidisciplinary pain treatment, unable to maintain motivation to attend.

OBJECTIVE: To evaluate and compare the pre-program characteristics of patients who dropped out and patients who continued treatment, thereby clarifying the characteristics of patients at risk of dropping out.

METHODS: A multidisciplinary pain management treatment program was implemented for patients at the Pain Management Center, Hoshi General Hospital. From April 2015 to March 2018, 23 patients participated in the program. Twelve of the 23 patients lived outside the prefecture where the hospital is located. Of these 12 patients, five completed the program, while seven did not. We compared the dropout and continuation groups in terms of patient characteristics, pain severity, pain-related psychosocial factors, and quality of life.

RESULTS: We found significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in median age, Japanese Orthopaedic Association Back Pain Evaluation Questionnaire walking ability dysfunction score, and Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire score.

CONCLUSIONS: The characteristics of patients who dropped out were older age, walking ability dysfunction, and low quality of life associated with low back pain.

Keywords: Chronic musculoskeletal pain, multidisciplinary treatment, inpatient pain management program, drop out

1. Introduction

Pain management using a multidisciplinary approach for patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain is a useful method of treatment because of its efficacy, cost effectiveness, and the rarity of iatrogenic complications, as demonstrated in the United States since the 1950s [1,2]. The biopsychosocial model of well-

being [3,4] is an important concept in multidisciplinary pain management. This is a general model or approach in which biological, psychological, and social factors are presumed to play important roles in human functioning with respect to disease or illness. Multidisciplinary pain treatment requires special facilities [5,6] because of the requirement for cooperation with multidisciplinary medical staff; few facilities in Japan are able to provide a multidisciplinary approach for pain management – especially in the form of inpatient programs.

We implemented a multidisciplinary pain management program [5,6] at Hoshi General Hospital based

*Corresponding author: Naoto Takahashi, Department of Pain Medicine, Fukushima Medical University School of Medicine, 1 Hikarigaoka, Fukushima City, Fukushima 9601295, Japan. Tel.: +81 24 581 5547; Fax: +81 24 581 5547; E-mail: naoto-t@fmu.ac.jp

Table 1

Characteristics of the dropout group (patients from other prefectures treated through the inpatient program), presented according to order of treatment

Patient (Distance from the patient's home to our hospital)	Chief complaint	Structural disorder	Psychiatric diagnosis
55-year-old woman (250 km [155 miles])	Posterior cervical pain, bilateral upper extremity numbness	Ossification of posterior longitudinal ligament (after surgery)	Narcissistic personality disorder
47-year-old woman (265 km [165 miles])	Low back pain	None found	Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, histrionic personality disorder, somatoform disorders
51-year-old man (111 km [69 miles])	Low back pain	None found	Pervasive developmental disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, somatoform disorders
75-year-old woman (183 km [114 miles])	Posterior cervical pain, bilateral omalgia, low back pain	Spondylosis	None diagnosed
73-year-old woman (285 km [177 miles])	Low back pain, bilateral leg pain	Spondylosis	None diagnosed
42-year-old woman (1020 km [634 miles])	Low back pain, bilateral leg numbness, cool feeling, burning sensation	None found	Pervasive developmental disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, somatoform disorders
53-year-old woman (457 km [284 miles])	Low back pain	Spondylosis	Pervasive developmental disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, somatoform disorders

on the biopsychosocial model of well-being and guided by the recommendations of the International Association for the Study of Pain [3–10]. Some patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain who desired treatment within the multidisciplinary pain management program lived outside the prefecture. Japan comprises four large islands and many smaller islands; it is divided into 47 prefectures. The center hospital (i.e., a university hospital) is the core medical institution in each prefecture in the Japanese medical system; this hospital primarily provides medical treatments to patients with intractable disease who reside near the hospital. However, when patients and their primary doctors seek multidisciplinary pain treatment, doctors may refer patients to a pain center located outside the patient's prefecture of residence. Regular visits to a hospital located a long distance from the residential prefecture may be a burden to patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain. Although following up patients after the inpatient program is important for maintenance of patient motivation to control pain, visiting a hospital outside the prefecture of residence is difficult for patients because it requires additional time and expenses. For example, a typical patient in our dropout group (patient no. 5, 75-year-old woman with chronic low back pain) lived 285 km (177 miles) from our hospital (Table 1). Our inpatient multidisciplinary pain treatment program was attractive for her because of the ineffectiveness of all past treatments. She initially

attended our inpatient program, and reported reduced pain severity, improved physical function, and better QOL immediately after attending our inpatient program. However, she discontinued attending our hospital without notice, 2 months after the discharge from the inpatient program. A previous study suggested that patients who discontinued attending a psychiatric clinic were dissatisfied with their experience at the clinic because the treatment offered was not consistent with their preferences, they feared severe side effects from the medications, were required to travel long distances to the clinic, and encountered other social and economic barriers [11]. Another study demonstrated that the dropout rate in a glaucoma clinic was high during early treatment, particularly among patients who were required to travel long distances to the clinic [12]. These previous findings suggested that patients who drop out of a treatment program might be required to travel long distances to the hospital.

Five of the 12 inpatient-program patients from other prefectures completed our program, but the remaining seven patients did not. It is important to clarify the pre-program characteristics of patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain who may drop out of treatment. We presumed that patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain who dropped out of treatment would engage in repeated doctor shopping and/or enter a vicious cycle involving chronic pain. Therefore, we hypothesized that

dropping out of treatment was associated with specific patient characteristics, including pain severity, pain-related psychosocial factors, and quality of life (QOL). The purpose of this study was to evaluate and compare the two groups of patients (i.e., dropout and continuation groups) before the program to clarify the characteristics of patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain who may drop out of treatment, and to prospectively analyze some outcomes in both groups.

2. Methods

2.1. Patients

We evaluated 23 patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain who underwent multidisciplinary pain treatment at Hoshi General Hospital. Twelve (four men and eight women) of these 23 patients lived outside the prefecture where the hospital is located. Data regarding these 12 patients who lived far from the hospital (i.e., more than 111 km [69 miles]) were analyzed before and immediately after the program. Five of the patients (continuation group) were also assessed at 3 and 6 months after the program. The other seven patients (dropout group) could not be followed up because they did not attend regular hospital visits and/or satisfy the inpatient program (Fig. 1). None of the 12 patients had a regular occupation.

2.2. Multidisciplinary pain management program

The Pain Management Center was established at Hoshi General Hospital in April 2015, with technical support from the Department of Pain Medicine at Fukushima Medical University School of Medicine. The program is staffed by a team of orthopedic surgeons, psychiatrists, nurses, physical therapists, clinical psychologists, pharmacists, and nutritionists. The orthopedic surgeons and physical therapists screen patients for mechanical and biological changes in the body; the psychiatrists and clinical psychologists evaluate psychosocial and social factors. Our program is indicated for patients who have difficulty working or attending school because of chronic musculoskeletal pain, as well as patients who are confined to their homes but wish to return to work or school. The multidisciplinary pain management treatment program includes a 3-week inpatient program and outpatient care for 6 months after the inpatient program. The program consists of three parts: exercise therapy, psychotherapy, and patient ed-




Fig. 1. Flowchart of patient dropout. Data regarding these 12 patients were analyzed before and immediately after the inpatient multidisciplinary pain management program. Five patients (continuation group) were also assessed at 3 and 6 months after the program. The remaining seven patients (dropout group) could not be assessed after the program.

ucation. Our previous reports [5,6] have described the multidisciplinary pain management program in detail. The objectives of the program are for patients to return to a functional daily life by acquiring new habits and methods of coping with their pain. One characteristic of the program is that family members or significant others can also participate in some of the lectures and psychotherapy sessions [5,6].

The inclusion criteria for our 3-week inpatient multidisciplinary pain management program were: difficulty working or attending school because of chronic musculoskeletal pain; confinement to life at home but desiring to return to work or school; acceptance of our program; and ability to pay the hospital expenses for our inpatient program. Exclusion criteria were (one or more): older age and inability to answer the questionnaires; dementia or intellectual disabilities; and expectation of difficulty participating in the program (determined by multidisciplinary conference) [6].

2.3. Evaluation of inpatients with chronic musculoskeletal pain

We evaluated patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain before the inpatient program, and collected

relevant data. Specifically, we collected: 1) age; 2) distance from the patient's home to our hospital; 3) pain severity assessed with the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) [13]; 4) pain-related psychosocial factors assessed with several scales, including (a) the Brief Scale for Psychiatric Problems in Orthopedic Patients (BS-POP) (assessed by medical staff and/or the patient) [14], (b) the Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS) to evaluate the degrees of rumination, magnification, and helplessness [15,16], (c) the Pain Disability Assessment Scale (PDAS) [17], (d) the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) to assess anxiety and depression [18,19] and (e) the Pain Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (PSEQ) [20,21]; and 5) QOL assessed with several scales, including (a) the EuroQol Five-Dimensions Questionnaire (EQ-5D) [22,23], b) the Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire (RDQ) [24], and the Japanese Orthopaedic Association Back Pain Evaluation Questionnaire (JOABPEQ) [25]. Japanese validation studies of BS-POP [14], PCS [16], PDAS [17], HADS [19], PSEQ [21], EQ-5D [23], RDQ [24], JOABPEQ [25] were previously performed; all Japanese questionnaires were verified prior to this study. Our investigators comprised nine medical staff members: seven specialists (an orthopedic surgeon, a psychiatrist, a nurse, a physical therapist, a clinical psychologist, a pharmacist, and a nutritionist) to collect the data and two technicians to analyze the data for each patient. The data for patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain used in this study were: 1) age, 2) distance from the patient's home to our hospital, and 3) questionnaires completed by the patients that evaluated pain severity, pain-related psychosocial factors (assessed with several scales), and QOL (assessed with several scales).

2.4. Statistical analysis

We evaluated the dropout and continuation groups, then compared data between these two groups. Initial assessment of data normalization was performed using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Statistical analyses for each item were performed using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test, because normalization could not be assumed for each item. A p -value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 25 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Statistical power analysis in this study was performed using G*Power 3.1 (Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany). In Japan, the number of patients with chronic pain is estimated to be 20–23 million. The power analysis uti-

lized an effect size of 0.5, alpha level of 0.05, power (1-beta error probability) of 0.95, and requirement of each group. In total, 184 patients were required to achieve an adequate sample size of 20–23 million patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain in Japan.

This study was focused on the patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain who lived outside the prefecture where our hospital is located and received treatment in the form of a 3-week inpatient program in our hospital. All of the patients (100%) completed the program. We could analyze these patients who completed the program. Therefore, the total sample size was small ($n = 12$) in this study.

2.5. Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study was approved by the ethics committees of the participating institutions at Fukushima Medical University (Reference number: 2429) and Hoshi General Hospital (Reference number: 27-3); it was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. All patients provided written informed consent for inclusion in the study.

3. Results

The distance from the patient's home to our hospital, clinical characteristics, chief complaints, structural disorders, and psychiatric diagnoses of the 12 patients from other prefectures who participated in the multidisciplinary pain management program are shown in Tables 1 and 2. All comparisons of assessed characteristics between the dropout and continuation groups are presented in Table 3. Some patients exhibited psychiatric disorders, but all were able to attend regular hospital visits. There was no statistically significant difference in the distance from the patient's home to our hospital between the dropout and continuation groups ($p = 1$) (Table 3). Significant differences in pre-program characteristics were found between the two groups in terms of median age (53.0 years in the dropout group, 35.0 years in the continuation group; $p = 0.04$), JOABPEQ walking ability dysfunction score (39.5 in the dropout group, 64.0 in the continuation group; $p = 0.02$), and RDQ score (8.0 in the dropout group, 3.0 in the continuation group; $p = 0.03$) (Table 3). We found no statistically significant differences between the two groups in scores on the BPI, BS-POP (assessed by medical staff and the patient), PCS (rumination, magnification, helplessness, and total score), PDAS, HADS (anxiety, depression), or EQ-5D (Table 3).

Table 2

Characteristics of the continuation group (patients from other prefectures treated through the inpatient program), presented according to order of treatment

Patient (Distance from the patient's home to our hospital)	Chief complaint	Structural disorder	Psychiatric diagnosis
20-year-old man (539 km [335 miles])	Low back pain	None found	Pervasive developmental disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, somatoform disorders
31-year-old woman (265 km [165 miles])	Posterior cervical pain, bilateral omalgia, low back pain	None found	None diagnosed
55-year-old man (159 km [99 miles])	Posterior cervical pain, bilateral omalgia, back pain, low back pain, bilateral leg pain	None found	Pervasive developmental disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, somatoform disorders
34-year-old man (161 km [100 miles])	Low back pain	None found	Pervasive developmental disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, somatoform disorders
42-year-old man (620 km [380 miles])	Low back pain	None found	Pervasive developmental disorder, autism spectrum disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, somatoform disorders

Table 3

Comparison of characteristics, pain, and associated factors between the dropout and continuation groups ($n = 12$)

	Continuation group ($n = 5$) (median (IQR))	Dropout group ($n = 7$) (median (IQR))	p -value	r
Age	35.0 (25.5–49.0)	53.0 (47.0–73.0)	0.04	−0.59
Distance from the patient's home to our hospital (km) [miles]	265 (160–579.5) (km) [166 (100–362.1) miles]	265 (183–457) (km) [166 (114.3–285.6) miles]	1.00	0.00
BPI	29.0 (11.5–32.5)	25.5 (14.8–29.8)	0.72	−0.11
BS-POP (medical staff)	15.0 (10.5–17.5)	12.0 (0–14.0)	0.33	−0.28
BS-POP (patients)	22.0 (19.0–24.0)	19.0 (16.0–24.0)	0.29	−1.06
PCS (rumination)	16.0 (16.0–19.5)	9.8 (12.0–19.0)	0.14	−0.45
PCS (magnification)	7.0 (5.0–8.5)	4.0 (2.0–10.5)	0.46	−0.22
PCS (helplessness)	11.0 (6.5–12.0)	10.5 (6.5–17.3)	0.64	−0.14
PCS (total)	34.0 (26.5–39.5)	26.0 (19.0–47.0)	0.84	−0.06
PDAS	22.0 (14.5–40.5)	32.0 (27.0–42.0)	0.33	−0.28
HADS (anxiety)	13.0 (8.0–13.0)	6.0 (5.0–15.0)	0.22	−0.36
HADS (depression)	8.0 (6.0–16.5)	9.0 (4.0–11.0)	0.51	−0.19
PSEQ	21.0 (11.0–24.0)	19.0 (14.0–30.0)	0.75	−0.09
EQ-5D	0.473 (0.419–0.759)	0.482 (0.473–0.596)	0.57	−0.17
RDQ	3.0 (1.5–4.0)	8.0 (5.0–10.0)	0.03	−0.70
JOABPEQ	64.0 (53.5–85.5)	39.5 (5.3–44.8)	0.02	−0.72

p -values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. r indicates effect size, comparing results before and immediately after the inpatient program. Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; BPI, Brief Pain Inventory; BS-POP, Brief Scale for Psychiatric Problems in Orthopaedic Patients; PCS, Pain Catastrophizing Scale; PDAS, Pain Disability Assessment Scale; HADS, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; PSEQ, Pain Self-Efficacy Questionnaire; EQ-5D, EuroQol Five-Dimensions Questionnaire; RDQ, Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire; JOABPEQ, the Japanese Orthopaedic Association Back Pain Evaluation Questionnaire; CBT, cognitive behavioral therapy.

4. Discussion

In this study, we assumed that a greater distance between the patient's home and our hospital was a risk factor for dropout from the program; however, we could not prove this was a risk factor. Our analysis showed that compared with the continuation group, patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain living in other prefectures who dropped out after the inpatient multidisciplinary pain management program were characterized

by older age, lower walking ability, and lower QOL associated with low back pain.

Previous studies have suggested that dropping out of chronic musculoskeletal pain management programs is associated with poor or negative treatment outcomes and low patient motivation to participate in the program [26–28]. Other previous work has revealed dropout incidence rates of approximately 20% and provided valuable insights regarding predictors of dropout [29–32]. These barriers to retention in therapy can be categorized into five domains: 1) sociodemo-

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261 graphic characteristics (patients who drop out tend to be
262 younger and less educated) [29,32]; 2) patient charac-
263 teristics (patients who drop out tend to be less motivated
264 for treatment, prefer alternative treatments, and have di-
265 agnoses of specific disorders, such as depression or sub-
266 stance use disorder) [29,32]; 3) disease characteristics;
267 4) treatment characteristics (patients who drop out tend
268 to have no pre-determined treatment time period and
269 be enrolled in outpatient treatment); and 5) healthcare
270 system/system domain characteristics (higher dropout
271 rates are observed when the treatment is administered
272 by trainees, instead of licensed therapists) [29].

273 Tetsunaga et al. reported that multidisciplinary treat-
274 ment at a liaison clinic for patients with intractable
275 chronic pain was able to improve patient anxiety; how-
276 ever, severe anxiety at the initial visit was a risk factor
277 for dropout from the clinic [33]. In the present study, we
278 found no statistically significant differences between
279 the dropout and continuation groups in terms of anxiety,
280 as measured by the HADS.

281 Sloots et al. suggested that the major reason for
282 dropout from the diagnostic or treatment phase of a re-
283 habilitation program was that patient expectations dif-
284 fered from the expectations of their health providers
285 regarding the aim of treatment, because of differing
286 views regarding the origin and treatment of low back
287 pain [34]. Consistent with this previous finding, pa-
288 tients with chronic musculoskeletal pain participating
289 in our inpatient program may have been constrained
290 by preconceived notions regarding their symptoms at
291 initial examination. Specifically, these patients typically
292 presumed that the cause of their pain must be a bi-
293 ological problem in their bodies. At the initial examina-
294 tion, these patients had difficulty accepting the notion
295 that there are many causes of pain, including biologi-
296 cal, psychological, and social factors. In our program,
297 patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain receive de-
298 tailed information regarding the biopsychosocial model
299 of well-being [35] at their first examination. This patient
300 education may be the first step in cognitive behavioral
301 therapy to treat their pain. We typically explain that
302 pain self-management is very important for reduction
303 of pain and improvement of QOL. Some patients are
304 able to accept this approach, but others are not; notably,
305 patients who are unable to accept or understand the ap-
306 proach may be at risk of dropout. However, we were
307 unable to examine this possibility in the present study.

308 Oosterhaven et al. explored predictors of dropout
309 from an interdisciplinary chronic pain management
310 program among patients with chronic musculoskeletal
311 pain [36]. In their study, the dropout rate was 19% (35

of 188 patients). These researchers evaluated several
outcomes, including PCS, PSEQ, and HADS scores,
by means of multiple logistic regression analyses; they
concluded that patients with chronic pain who catas-
trophized were more likely to drop out of the program.
However, in the present study, we found no statisti-
cally significant differences between the dropout and
continuation groups in terms of PCS, PSEQ, or HADS
scores.

Hosogoshi et al. conducted a pilot study to develop
a basic individualized cognitive behavioral therapy ap-
proach for chronic pain and assessed its feasibility for
use in Japan [37]; they evaluated the results immedi-
ately after treatment and at the 3-month follow-up. The
dropout rate in their study was 14%: two of 14 patients
dropped out during the intervention period. Notably,
this previous study did not involve an inpatient program.

In most previous studies, dropout has been assessed
during the course of multidisciplinary or interdis-
ciplinary pain management programs, without consid-
erations of dropout that occurs after programs have
concluded [26–36]. Very few facilities carry out pa-
tient follow-up for more than 6 months after multi-
disciplinary or interdisciplinary pain management pro-
grams, and it is rare for studies to report dropout rates
at 6 months after such programs [38–42]. In the present
study, no patients dropped out during the inpatient pro-
gram; moreover, patients who were treated in the inpa-
tient program did not demonstrate low motivation dur-
ing the program. Because these patients were followed
up for 6 months after the program, we were able to
compare the characteristics of the dropout group with
the characteristics of the continuation group. There-
fore, this study is valuable because it presents an eval-
uation of the characteristics of patients with chronic
musculoskeletal pain in Japan who dropped out within
6 months after an inpatient multidisciplinary pain man-
agement program. In our study, the dropout rate was
high: seven of 12 patients (58%) dropped out during the
study period (Table 4). Table 4 presents a comparison
of dropout rates between our study and previous studies
conducted at other institutions worldwide [38–42].

Multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary pain management
programs are generally presumed to have relatively high
dropout rates; patient dropout from these programs is
related to poor treatment outcomes and high financial
costs. We had no instances of dropout among patients
with chronic musculoskeletal pain during the inpatient
portion of our multidisciplinary pain management pro-
gram. All instances of dropout in our study occurred
during outpatient treatment after discharge from the

312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363

Table 4
Comparison of dropout rates between the present study and previous studies

First Author (year)	Reference Number	Institution	Program (Duration)	Dropout rate, immediately after program (%)	Dropout rate, 3 months after program (%)	Dropout rate, 6 months after program (%)
Angst et al. [38]		Reha Clinic Zurzach (Bad Zurzach, Switzerland)	Interdisciplinary pain treatment included: Adapted drug therapy, Standard rehabilitation, and CBT (total > 100 h)	4.1% (7 dropouts of 171 patients: Refused to participate, $n = 1$; Premature discharge, $n = 5$; Data lost, $n = 1$)	Not administered	34.8% (57 dropouts of 164 patients: Refused to participate, $n = 56$; Other reason, $n = 1$)
van Wilgen et al. [39]		Pain Centre of the University Medical Centre Groningen (Groningen, the Netherlands)	Multidisciplinary pain treatment included: CBT (3–6 weeks)	12.5% (4 dropouts of 32 patients: No requirement for follow-up due to pain improvement, $n = 1$; Conflict during clinical phase and psychiatric problems, $n = 3$)	Not administered	7.1% (2 dropouts of 28 patients: No requirement for follow-up due to pain improvement, $n = 2$)
Hampel et al. [40]		Center of Clinical Psychology and Rehabilitation, University of Bremen (Bremen, Germany)	Multidisciplinary pain treatment included: Rehabilitation and CBT (3–4 weeks)	7% (22 dropouts of 311 patients: Personal reasons, $n = 22$)	Not administered	16.6% (48 dropouts of 289 patients: Discontinued participation, $n = 48$)
Tlach et al. [41]		Department of Internal and Integrative Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Duisburg-Essen (Essen, Germany)	Multidisciplinary pain treatment included: physiotherapy, classical naturopathy, and psychotherapy (2 weeks)	12.3% (38 dropouts of 310 patients: Discontinued study and/or withdrew consent for study participation, $n = 38$)	Not administered	30.1% (82 dropouts of 272 patients: Discontinued study and/or withdrew consent for study participation, $n = 82$)
Takahashi et al. (this study)		Hoshi General Hospital (Koriyama, Japan)	Multidisciplinary pain treatment included: Physical therapy, Exercise therapy, Psychotherapy, CBT, and Pharmacotherapy (3 weeks)	0%	58% (7 dropouts of 12 patients: Disc continued study and/or withdrew consent for study participation, $n = 7$)	0%

Abbreviation: CBT, cognitive behavioral therapy.

inpatient program. The patients who dropped out in our study had very high expectations to reduce their pain intensity and increase their activity; they consistently completed our inpatient program. We presumed that our inpatient program had no poor treatment outcomes because our previous analysis of 23 patients showed significant improvements in pain, associated factors, and physical functions, based on assessments performed before and immediately after the program [6]. However, these patients did not maintain reductions in pain, associated factors, and physical functions at home after discharge from the inpatient program; they could not continue to engage in exercise (e.g., walking, strengthening, and stretching) without assistance from our clinicians, and they could not maintain motivation to withstand the pain. The present findings indicate that patient dropout from treatment after the inpatient program was associated with older age, lower walking ability, and lower QOL associated with low back pain. Each of these variables may be associated with worsening of pain, associated factors, and physical functions after discharge from the inpatient program. Because of the additional time and expenses involved, it might have been difficult for our patients to maintain motivation for regular visits to a distant hospital. We have considered methods to improve the overall effectiveness of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary pain management programs, especially during follow-up after discharge from an inpatient program. It is important to establish systems of cooperation with institutions located close to patients' homes; these institutions can then manage follow-up for patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain after the completion of inpatient programs conducted at more distant institutions. Additionally, we have considered the need to clarify how to approach patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain who have older age, lower walking ability, and lower QOL associated with low back pain, prior to enrollment in our inpatient program. To the best of our knowledge, few studies have been published regarding long-term follow-up after multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary pain management programs. It is important to construct a system that enables long-term follow-up at all institutions, or (at least) at all cooperating pain centers. This system could facilitate the collection of information regarding treatment effects and improve treatment for patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain.

In addition to our program's advantages, it has a few weak or controversial aspects. First, although our program is open to everyone, we must carefully consider each patient's rehabilitation. Second, because it may

be difficult to sufficiently change how patients think and behave within a short period of time, patients may require follow-up after discharge. Finally, a large number of medical personnel are involved in our inpatient program, and their incomes may be inadequate, given the insurance system for chronic pain in Japan. These points should be addressed before the findings for our inpatient program can be generalized to other areas. In addition, the present study had several important limitations. First, our study population was small, and larger populations should be analyzed in future studies. Second, the follow-up period was relatively short, and more studies with longer follow-up periods are needed to evaluate long-term outcomes.

In conclusion, this study showed that the characteristics of patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain living outside the prefecture who dropped out of treatment after an inpatient multidisciplinary pain management program were older age, lower walking ability, and lower QOL associated with low back pain. Previous studies regarding chronic musculoskeletal pain management programs have suggested that dropping out is associated with poor or negative treatment outcomes and low patient motivation to participate in the program. Our current study provides new insights regarding factors associated with dropping out of chronic musculoskeletal pain management programs.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to all participants in this study and the clinical staff who supported this research: Koh Matsudaira, Akira Onda, Kenji Nihei, Minoru Iwasaki, Kazuaki Suzuki, Miho Ohuchi, Yuki Haruyama, Tikara Saitoh, Takahiro Yatsuda, Yoko Arase, Aki Kiryu, Yurika Saito, Yuki Moriyama, Megumi Sato, Yukie Moto, Mami Tanimoto, Akari Funao, Tomoko Fukuchi, and Mika Kanazawa. The authors also thank Jennifer Barrett, Ph.D., Ryan Chastain-Gross, Ph.D., and Audrey Holmes, Ph.D., from Edanz (<https://jp.edanz.com/ac/>) for editing a draft of this manuscript.

Conflict of interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

References

- [1] Bonica JJ. Management of chronic pain in general practice. J

- Lancet. 1959; 39(6): 389-396.
- [2] Bonica JJ. Management of intractable pain in general practice. *GP*. 1996; 33(1): 107-123.
- [3] Loeser JD. Conception of pain. In: Stanton-Hicks M and Boas R, editors. *Chronic low back pain*. New York: Raven Press; 1982; pp. 145-148.
- [4] Flor H, Turk DC. *Chronic Pain: An Integrated Biobehavioral Approach*. Seattle: IASP Press, 2011.
- [5] Takahashi N, Kasahara S, Yabuki S. Development and implementation of an inpatient multidisciplinary pain management program for patients with intractable chronic musculoskeletal pain in Japan: preliminary report. *J Pain Res*. 2018; 1: 201-211.
- [6] Takahashi N, Takatsuki K, Kasahara S, Yabuki S. Multidisciplinary pain management program for patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain in Japan: a cohort study. *J Pain Res*. 2019; 12: 2563-2576.
- [7] Loeser JD, Turk DC. *Multidisciplinary Pain Management*. In: Loeser JD, et al., editors. *Bonica's Management of Pain*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins, 2001.
- [8] Turk DC, Okifuji A. *Multidisciplinary Pain Management*. In: Loeser JD, et al., editors. *Bonica's Management of Pain*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins, 2001.
- [9] Kamper SJ, Apeldoorn AT, Chiarotto A, Smeets RJ, Ostelo RW, Guzman J, et al. Multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation for chronic low back pain: Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2015; 350: h444. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h444.
- [10] Otis JD, Reid MC, Kerns RD. The management of chronic pain in the primary care setting. In: James LC, Folen RA, editors. *Primary Care Clinical Health Psychology: a model for the next frontier*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association Press, 2005.
- [11] Gill HP, Singh Sharma KC. Study of dropouts from a psychiatric clinic of a general hospital. *Indian J Psychiatry*. 1970; 32(2): 152-158.
- [12] Ashaye AO, Adeoye AO. Characteristics of patients who dropout from a glaucoma clinic. *J Glaucoma*. 2008; 17(3): 227-232.
- [13] Ceeland CS, Ryan KM. Pain assessment: global use of Brief Pain Inventory. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*. 1994; 23(2): 129-138.
- [14] Yoshida K, Sekiguchi M, Otani I, Mashiko H, Shiota H, Wakita T, et al. A validation study of the Brief Scale for Psychiatric problems in Orthopaedic Patients (BS-POP) for patients with chronic low back pain (verification of reliability, validity, and reproducibility). *J Orthop Sci*. 2011; 16(1): 7-13. doi: 10.1007/s00776-010-0012-4.
- [15] Osman A, Barrios FX, Gutierrez PM, Kopper BA, Merrifield T, Grittmann L. The Pain Catastrophizing Scale: further psychometric evaluation with adult samples. *J Behav Med*. 2000; 23(4): 351-365.
- [16] Matsuoka H, Sakano Y. Assessment of cognitive aspect of pain: development, reliability, and validation of Japanese Version of Pain catastrophizing scale. *Japanese J Psychos Med*. 2007; 47: 95-102.
- [17] Yamashiro K, Arimura T, Iwaki R, Jensen MP, Kubo C, Hosoi M. A multidimensional measure of pain interference: reliability and validity of the pain disability assessment scale. *Clin J Pain*. 2011; 27(4): 338-343.
- [18] Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 1983; 67(6): 361-370.
- [19] Matsudaira T, Igarashi H, Kikuchi H, Kano R, Mitoma H, Ohuhi K, et al. Factor structure of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale in Japanese psychiatric outpatient and student populations. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2009; 7: 42.
- [20] Nicholas MK. The pain self-efficacy questionnaire: taking pain into account. *Eur J Pain*. 2007; 11(2): 153-163.
- [21] Adachi T, Nakae A, Maruo T, Shibata M, Maeda L, Saitoh Y, et al. Validation of the Japanese version of the pain self-efficacy questionnaire in Japanese patients with chronic pain. *Pain Med*. 2014; 15(8): 1405-1417.
- [22] EuroQOL Group. EuroQol – a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health Policy*. 1990; 16(3): 199-208.
- [23] Shiroywa T, Fukuda T, Ikeda S, Igarashi A, Noto S, Saito S, et al. Japanese population norms for preference-based measures: EQ-5D-3L, EQ-5D-5L, and SF-6D. *Qual Life Res*. 2016; 25: 707-719.
- [24] Suzukamo Y, Fukuhara S, Kikuchi S, Konno S, Roland M, Iwamoto Y, et al. Validation of the Japanese version of the Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire. *J Orthop Sci*. 2003; 8(4): 543-548.
- [25] Kasai Y, Fukui M, Takahashi K, Ohtori S, Takeuchi D, Hashizume H, et al. Verification of the sensitivity of functional scores for treatment results – substantial clinical benefit thresholds for the Japanese Orthopaedic Association Back Pain Evaluation Questionnaire (JOABPEQ). *J Orthop Sci*. 2017; 22(4): 663-669.
- [26] Andrews NE, Strong J, Meredith PJ. Activity pacing, avoidance, endurance, and associations with patient functioning in chronic pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2012; 93: 2109-2121.
- [27] De Rooij A, Roorda LD, Otten RHH, van der Leeden M, Dekker J, Steultjens MPM. Predictors of multidisciplinary treatment outcome in fibromyalgia: a systematic review. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2012; 35: 1-13.
- [28] Van der Hulst M, Vollenbroek-Hutten MMR, IJzerman MJ. A systematic review of sociodemographic, physical, and psychological predictors of multidisciplinary rehabilitation-or, back school treatment outcome in patients with chronic low back pain. *Spine*. 2005; 30: 813-825.
- [29] Swift JK, Greenberg RP. Premature discontinuation in adult psychotherapy: a meta-analysis. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2012; 80: 547-559.
- [30] Swift JK, Greenberg RP, Tompkins KA, Parkin SR. Treatment refusal and premature termination in psychotherapy, pharmacotherapy, and their combination: a meta-analysis of head-to-head comparisons. *Psychotherapy*. 2017; 54: 47-57.
- [31] Fernandez E, Salem D, Swift JK, Ramtahal N. Meta-analysis of dropout from cognitive behavioral therapy: magnitude, timing, and moderators. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2015; 83: 1108-1122.
- [32] Taylor S, Abramowitz JS, McKay D. Non-adherence and non-response in the treatment of anxiety disorders. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2012; 26: 583-589.
- [33] Tetsunaga T, Tetsunaga T, Nishie H, Ozaki T. Establishment of a liaison clinic for patients with intractable chronic pain. *J Orthop Sci*. 2015; 20: 907-913.
- [34] Sloots M, Dekker JH, Pont M, Bartels EA, Geertzen JH, Dekker M. Reasons of drop-out from rehabilitation in patients of Turkish and Moroccan origin with chronic low back pain in The Netherlands: a qualitative study. *J Rehabil Med*. 2010; 42(6): 566-573.
- [35] Turk DC, Monarch ES. Biopsychosocial perspective on chronic pain. In: Turk DC, Gatchel RJ, editors. *Psychological Approaches to Pain Management: A Practitioner's Handbook*. New York: Guilford Press, 2002.
- [36] Oosterhaven J, Wittink H, Dekker J, Kruitwagen C, Devillé W,

- 587 Pain catastrophizing predicts dropout of patients from an inter- 605
588 disciplinary chronic pain management programme: a prospec- 606
589 tive cohort study. *J Rehabil Med.* 2019; 51(10): 761-769. 607
590 [37] Hosogoshi H, Iwasa K, Fukumori T, Takagishi Y, Takebayashi 608
591 Y, Adachi T, et al. Pilot study of a basic individualized cog- 609
592 nitive behavioral therapy program for chronic pain in Japan. 610
593 *Biopsychosoc Med.* 2020; 14: 6. 611
594 [38] Angst F, Verra ML, Lehmann S, Brioschi R, Aeschlimann 612
595 A. Clinical effectiveness of an interdisciplinary pain man- 613
596 agement programme compared with standard inpatient re- 614
597 habilitation in chronic pain: a naturalistic, prospective con- 615
598 trolled cohort study. *J Rehabil Med.* 2009; 41(7): 569-575. doi: 616
599 102340/16501977-0381. 617
600 [39] van Wilgen CP, Dijkstra PU, Versteegen GJ, Fleuren MJ, Stew- 618
601 art R, van Wijhe M. Chronic pain and severe disuse syndrome: 619
602 long-term outcome of an inpatient multidisciplinary cognitive 620
603 behavioural programme. *J Rehabil Med.* 2009; 41(3): 122-128. 621
604 doi: 10.2340/16501977-0292.
- [40] Hampel P, Graef T, Krohn-Grimberghe B, Tlach L. Effects 605
of gender and cognitive-behavioral management of depressive 606
symptoms on rehabilitation outcome among inpatient orthope- 607
dic patients with chronic low back pain: a 1 year longitudinal 608
study. *Eur Spine J.* 2009; 18: 1867-1880. doi: 10.1007/s00586- 609
009-1080-z. 610
[41] Tlach L, Hampel P. Long-term effects of a cognitive- 611
behavioral training program for the management of depressive 612
symptoms among patients in orthopedic inpatient rehabilita- 613
tion of chronic low back pain: a 2-year follow-up. *Eur Spine J.* 614
2011; 20: 2143-2151. doi: 10.1007/s00586-011-1810-x. 615
[42] Saha FJ, Bruning A, Barcelona C, Bussing A, Langhort J, 616
Dobos G, et al. Integrative medicine for chronic pain: a 617
cohort study using a process-outcome design in the con- 618
text of a department for internal and integrative medicine. 619
Medicine (Baltimore). 2016; 95(27): e4152. doi: 10.1097/MD. 620
0000000000004152. 621

Uncorrected proof version