



Self-efficacy beliefs mediate the association between pain intensity and pain interference in acute/subacute whiplash-associated disorders

Yolanda Pedrero-Martin^{1,2} · Deborah Falla³ · Javier Martinez-Calderon^{1,4} · Bernard X. W. Liew⁵ · Marco Scutari⁶ · Alejandro Luque-Suarez^{1,4} 

Received: 15 October 2020 / Revised: 24 December 2020 / Accepted: 11 January 2021
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH, DE part of Springer Nature 2021

Abstract

Purpose To evaluate whether a set of pre-accident demographic, accident-related, post-accident treatment and psychosocial factors assessed in people with acute/subacute whiplash-associated disorders (WAD) mediate the association between pain intensity and: (1) pain interference and (2) expectations of recovery, using Bayesian networks (BNs) analyses. This study also explored the potential mediating pathways (if any) between different psychosocial factors.

Methods This was a cross-sectional study conducted on a sample of 173 participants with acute/subacute WAD. Pain intensity, pain interference, pessimism, expectations of recovery, pain catastrophizing, and self-efficacy beliefs were assessed. BN analyses were conducted to analyse the mediating effects of psychological factors on the association between pain intensity and pain-related outcomes.

Results The results revealed that self-efficacy beliefs partially mediated the association between pain intensity and pain interference. Kinesiophobia partially mediated the association between self-efficacy and pain catastrophizing. Psychological factors did not mediate the association between pain intensity and expectations of recovery.

Conclusion These results indicate that individuals with acute/subacute WAD may present with lesser pain interference associated with a determined pain intensity value when they show greater self-efficacy beliefs. As the cross-sectional nature of this study limits firm conclusions on the causal impact, researchers are encouraged to investigate the role that patient's self-efficacy beliefs play in the transition to chronic WAD via longitudinal study designs.

Keywords Whiplash · Acute · Observational study · Psychological factors · Neck pain

Supplementary Information The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-021-06731-5>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Alejandro Luque-Suarez
aluques@uma.es

¹ Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Universidad de Malaga, Malaga, Spain

² Universidad Gimbernat, Cantabria, Spain

³ Centre of Precision Rehabilitation for Spinal Pain (CPR Spine), School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

⁴ Instituto de La Investigacion Biomedica de Malaga, Malaga, Spain

⁵ School of Sport, Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences, University of Essex, Essex, UK

⁶ Istituto Dalle Molle di Studi Sull'Intelligenza Artificiale (IDSIA), Manno, Switzerland

Introduction

Whiplash-associated disorders (WADs) remain a challenge to manage [1]; they affect up to one million people each year in the USA alone [2], and the socio-economic cost of this disorder is substantial [3]. Neck pain, pain interference, post-traumatic stress disorders, and sleep difficulties are common among individuals with WAD [4, 5]. Disturbances in motor and sensory function, as well as cognitive processing alterations, are also frequently observed [6, 7]. Although a rapid improvement may occur during the first three months following a whiplash injury, recovery rates typically then stabilize [8].

Numerous biopsychosocial factors including widespread pain, sensorimotor incongruence, social withdrawal and depressed mood may be involved in the persistence of pain and pain interference following a whiplash injury

[9]. Theoretical pain models have postulated that negative psychological factors such as pain catastrophizing, fear of pain/movement and pain-related anxiety foster the use of passive coping strategies in response to pain, e.g. avoidance behaviours or pain hypervigilance [9–11]. This may be associated with a worse prognosis following a whiplash injury [9–11]. In this sense, a recent systematic review has found that some negative psychological factors including poor expectations of recovery, post-traumatic stress symptoms and passive coping strategies may increase the risk of developing chronic neck pain and/or disability [12]. On the other hand, previous cross-sectional studies have revealed that self-efficacy beliefs can be protective in people with acute WAD [13, 14].

Previous research has evaluated the mediating effects of some psychological factors in the association between pain and pain-related outcomes (e.g. pain interference) in individuals with WAD before the onset of chronicity. For example, self-efficacy beliefs have been shown to mediate the association between pain intensity and pain interference in a cross-sectional study [14]. Pain catastrophizing and fear of movement have been reported to mediate the association between pain intensity and disability [13]. Additionally, longitudinal data have reported that fear of movement, but not pain catastrophizing, mediated the association between pain intensity and disability [15]. However, neither control over pain nor the ability to reduce pain mediated the association between functional self-efficacy or pain catastrophizing and pain interference in a longitudinal study [13]. To the best of our knowledge, the simultaneous mediating effects of multiple psychological factors between pain intensity and pain interference in acute or subacute WAD have not been evaluated. This information would allow us to compare the relative importance of different psychological factors as mediators in these associations.

The current study had three objectives which were examined using Bayesian networks (BNs). This cross-sectional study sought to evaluate whether a set of pre-accident demographic, accident-related, post-accident treatment and psychosocial factors in people with acute/subacute WAD mediate the association between pain intensity and: (1) pain interference and (2) expectations of recovery. We hypothesized that the aforementioned factors mediate the association between pain intensity and pain-related outcomes (pain interference and expectations of recovery). A further objective of this study (3) was to explore the potential mediating pathways (if any) between different psychosocial factors.

Methods

Study design

This cross-sectional study was conducted between August 2018 and September 2019 at a private Physiotherapy clinic in Malaga, Spain. This study followed the Declaration of Helsinki and is reported according to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) criteria [16]. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee and Research of Malaga, Spain (13,122,018). Participants provided informed written consent.

Participants and setting

Participants with acute/subacute WAD attending a physiotherapy clinic to receive treatment were invited to participate in this study. A physiotherapist with 10 years of expertise in the management of musculoskeletal pain disorders screened potential participants for eligibility. Inclusion criteria were adults > 18 years with acute or subacute WAD (pain duration less than 3 months from the onset of injury) attributed to a motor vehicle accident. We excluded individuals with an inability to complete patient-reported outcome measures. A convenience sample of 178 participants with acute or subacute WAD was recruited; however, five patients did not provide all necessary information, and thus, a final sample of 173 participants was considered for the analysis.

Variables

The following 16 variables were collected and grouped into five categories to build the BN:

Pre-accident variables

- Age: age (years) of the participant upon study enrolment.
- Sex: male or female.
- Educational level coded as (i) university ≥ 4 years; (ii) university up to 4 years; (iii) high school; (iv) school; (v) no formal education.
- Employment coded as: (i) unemployed; (ii) freelance; (iii) employee.

Accident-related variables

- Type of vehicle coded as: (i) car; (ii) motorbike; (iii) bike; (iv) bus; (v) others.
- Passenger's position in the vehicle coded as (i) driver; (ii) co-pilot; (iii) back seat.

Post-accident pain characteristic variables

- Current pain intensity: a visual analogue scale (VAS), where zero implies no pain and 10 the worst pain imaginable, was used to evaluate pain intensity. This tool is valid and reliable to assess pain intensity [17].
- Pain duration is based on weeks from the accident.

Post-accident psychosocial and treatment variables

- Current treatment coded as: (i) no treatment; (ii) medication + physiotherapy; (iii) injections; (iv) physiotherapy; (v) other treatments (massage, reflexology, acupuncture).
- Self-efficacy beliefs: the Spanish version of the Chronic Disease Self-Efficacy (CDSE) (internal consistency Cronbach's α 0.85 and a test-retest validity 0.80) was used [18]. This tool consists of four items whose score ranges from 0 "very insecure" to 10 "very safe". The total score can range from 0 to 40, with higher scores reflecting greater self-efficacy beliefs.
- Pessimism: the Spanish version of the Life Orientation Test-Revised (LOT-R) (internal consistency Cronbach's α = 0.90 [19]; test-retest reliability = 0.72 [20]) (pessimism subscale) was used [21]. This tool is composed of three items whose score ranges from 0 "strongly disagree" to 4 "strongly agree". The total score can range from 0 to 12, with higher scores reflecting greater pessimism.
- Kinesiophobia: the Spanish version of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia short form (TSK-11) (internal consistency Cronbach's α 0.79) was used [22, 23]. This tool is composed of 11 items whose score can range from 1 "strongly disagree" to 4 "completely agree". The total score can range from 11 to 44, with higher scores reflecting greater kinesiophobia.
- Sick leave: coded as: (i) no; (ii) retired; (iii) yes.

Outcome variables

- Pain catastrophizing: the Spanish version of the Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS) (internal consistency Cronbach's α 0.79; test-retest reliability 0.84) was used [24]. This tool is composed of 13 items, whose score can range from 0 "not at all" to 4 "all the time". The total score can range from 0 to 52, with higher scores reflecting greater pain catastrophizing.
- Recovery expectations: a single question "What chance of recovery do you think you will have once you finish the treatment?" was used which was scored on an 11-point Likert scale, where zero means no chance of recovery and 10 means total recovery. Greater scores reflect higher levels of positive expectations of recovery.

- Pain interference: the Spanish version of the Neck Disability Index (NDI) (internal consistency Cronbach's α 0.89; intra-class correlation coefficient 0.98) was used [25]. This tool is composed of 10 items, each ranging from 0 to 5 [25]. Greater scores reflect higher levels of pain interference (disability).

Approach to data analysis

All the BN analyses were conducted in R software using the BN learn package [26]. The codes can be found in the supplementary material (Supplementary Appendix A). BN quantifies the relationships among a set of variables $X = \{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$, where N is the number of variables, using a directed acyclic graph (DAG). Each variable is associated with a node, and directed arcs represent conditional dependencies between pairs of nodes. Building a BN model using a data-driven approach involves two stages: (1) structural learning—identifying which arcs are present in the DAG; and (2) parameter learning—estimating the parameters that regulate the strength and the direction of the corresponding relationships. In other words, the BN structure gives the (putative) causal direction and the parameters give the magnitude and the sign of the relationship (i.e. positive vs negative relationship, etc.).

We made use of blacklisting and model averaging to reduce the number of arcs that are incorrectly included in the BN. A blacklist is simply a set of relationships that we know are less likely to exist, as they go against known biological/physical mechanisms, and are ignored during structural learning. We blacklisted arcs that pointed from a higher category number to a lower category number. For example, a person's education level would not likely affect the position within the vehicle during the accident. All blacklisted arcs included are found in Supplementary Appendix B. Model averaging consists of resampling the data multiple times ($B=200$) using bootstrap and performing structure learning on each of the resulting samples; in the following, we will use the hill-climbing (HC) algorithm for this purpose. We computed an "average" consensus DAG by selecting those arcs that have a frequency of > 50% in the bootstrapped samples, to create a sparse and interpretable network [27].

BN can easily incorporate prior knowledge available from the literature and expert opinions into the models, by encoding prior knowledge in sets of whitelisted arcs. We built a second BN model using the same blacklists as the first model but added dependent relationships reported in the literature (Table 1) [14, 15, 28].

The second BN model was used to compare its predictive correlation with the first model (without a whitelist). If the empirical data supported the dependent relationships reported in the literature, then the predictive correlation

Table 1 Whitelist arcs used in second Bayesian network model (using knowledge from Kamper et al. [19], Crombez et al. [8] and Söderlund et al. [42])

From	To	Explanation
VAS	TSK	Greater pain intensity resulting in more kinesiophobia
TSK	NDI	Greater kinesiophobia resulting in more pain interference
VAS	SES	Greater pain intensity resulting in low self-efficacy beliefs
SES	NDI	Greater self-efficacy beliefs resulting in more pain interference
PCS	TSK	Greater pain catastrophizing resulting in more kinesiophobia

NDI Neck Disability Index, PCS Pain Catastrophizing Scale, SES Self-Efficacy Scale, TSK Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, VAS visual analogue scale

of the second model would be superior to that of the first model. To determine the validity of the model, validation was performed using nested tenfold cross-validation. Nested tenfold cross-validation iteratively splits the training set into 10 approximately equal folds, trains the model on 9 folds, evaluate the model's performance on the 10th fold, and averaging the performance metric across all 10 evaluations. The metric of model performance was defined by computing the correlation coefficient between the predicted and observed values of each continuous variable. The strength of correlation was categorized as negligible ($|r| \leq 0.30$), low ($|r| = 0.31-0.50$), moderate ($|r| = 0.51-0.70$), high ($|r| = 0.71-0.90$) and very high ($|r| = 0.91-1$) [29].

Conditional probability queries The derived averaged BN model can be considered an “expert system”, which means that we can elicit a sample of realizations of the modelled variables under specific conditions. For example, we can query the system to infer the values of the NDI when neck pain intensity reduces by a threshold value. For each conditional probability query, we sampled 10^4 realizations of the variables of interest to obtain precise probability estimates. We used a technique known as belief updating, which estimates the posterior probability of an event happening based on the available evidence on the values of certain variables. We adopted a specific method of belief updating known as logic sampling [30].

Results

The descriptive characteristics of the 16 variables used for BN analysis are presented in Table 2. Figures 1 and 2 show the averaged BN consensus model for models 1 and 2, learned from 200 networks constructed from the data, with arcs appearing at least in 50% of the networks kept. We included the predictive correlations for all variables in Table 3. Given that the predictive validity of the two models was similar, we performed conditional probability queries on model 1. An advantage of BN is that the model enables the reader to query the system on any arbitrary set of clinical

questions. To this end, we focused on several interesting clinical queries and present the ensuing results here.

Pathway(s) leading to pain interference

Based on model 1 (Fig. 1), two paths were associated with pain interference. One pathway was a direct path between pain intensity and pain interference, whilst another was an indirect path passing through self-efficacy beliefs. From the sampled posterior distribution, a one-point increase in pain intensity resulted in a 2.08-point increase in pain interference ($t = 67.57$, $p < 0.001$) (Fig. 3).

We simulated a scenario where self-efficacy beliefs were not dependent on pain intensity, by fixing the value of the self-efficacy beliefs regression coefficient in the local distributions to zero, which is equivalent to removing the pain intensity–self-efficacy beliefs arc. When fixing the value of self-efficacy beliefs to zero (i.e. the only path from pain intensity to pain interference is the direct path), a one-point increase in pain intensity resulted in a 1.54-point increase in pain interference ($t = 56.32$, $p < 0.001$). This result suggests that self-efficacy beliefs mediated $\sim 26\%$ ($\frac{2.08-1.54}{2.08}$) of the total relationship between pain intensity and pain interference.

Pathway(s) leading to pain catastrophizing

Two paths were associated with pain catastrophizing (Fig. 1). One pathway was a direct path between self-efficacy beliefs and pain catastrophizing, whilst another was an indirect path passing through kinesiophobia. From the sampled posterior distribution, a one-point increase in self-efficacy beliefs resulted in a -0.69 -point decrease in pain catastrophizing ($t = -72.56$, $p < 0.001$) (Fig. 4).

When fixing the value of kinesiophobia to zero (i.e. the only path from self-efficacy beliefs to pain catastrophizing is the direct path), a one-point increase in self-efficacy beliefs resulted in a -0.48 -point decrease in pain catastrophizing ($t = -53.45$, $p < 0.001$). This result suggests that kinesiophobia mediated $\sim 13\%$ ($\frac{0.69-0.48}{0.69}$) of the total relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and pain catastrophizing.

Table 2 Characteristics of the included participants ($n=173$)

Variables	Mean and % or standard deviation (SD)
Sex	100 females (57.8%), 73 males (42.2%)
Age (years)	36.94 (SD 13.55)
Sick leave	No 93 (SD 53.8%) Retired 53 (SD 30.6%) Yes 27 (SD 15.6%)
Work contract	Employee 108 (62.4%) Freelance 11 (6.4%) Unemployed 54 (31.2%)
Weeks from accident	6.28 (SD 3.19)
Type of vehicle	Bicycle 5 (2.9%) Bus 4 (2.3%) Car 149 (86.1%) Motorbike 13 (7.5%) Others 2 (1.2%) [‡]
Education levels	High 30 (17.3%) Low 56 (32.4%) Med 58 (33.5%) Very high 6 (3.5%) Very low 23 (13.3%)
Passenger's position in the vehicle	Back 21 (12.1%) Co-pilot 51 (29.5%) Driver 101 (58.4%)
Current treatment	Medical treatment (drugs or injections) 3 (1.7%) No treatment 1 (0.6%) Others 80 (46.2%) [†] Physiotherapy 89 (51.4%)
Pain intensity (VAS) (0–10)	6.62 (SD 1.90)
Expectations of recovery (0–100)	78.74 (SD 23.31)
Pessimism (LOT-R) (0–12)	4.71 (SD 3.08)
Self-efficacy beliefs (CDSE) (0–40)	24.10 (SD 8.26)
Kinesiophobia (TSK-11) (11–44)	29.65 (SD 7.60)
Pain catastrophizing (PCS) (0–52)	15.35 (SD 9.72)
Pain interference (NDI) (0–50)	15.82 (SD 7.07)

CDSE chronic disease self-efficacy, *LOT-R* life orientation test-revised, *NDI* Neck Disability Index, *PCS* Pain Catastrophizing Scale, *SD* standard deviation, *TSK-11* short-version of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, *VAS* visual analogue scale

[†]Others = medical treatment + physiotherapy

[‡]1 skateboard; 1 pedestrian

Pathway(s) leading to expectations of recovery

None of the included psychological factors demonstrated mediating effects in the association between pain intensity and expectations of recovery (Figs. 1 and 2).

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study analysing the role that a large number of psychological factors play as mediators of the association between pain intensity and different pain-related outcomes (expectations of recovery, pain catastrophizing and pain interference) in the same sample of acute/subacute WAD, using a BN approach. We found

that none of the included psychological factors mediated the association between pain intensity and expectations of recovery. Furthermore, self-efficacy beliefs partially mediated the association between pain intensity and pain interference, whereas kinesiophobia partially mediated the association between self-efficacy beliefs and pain catastrophizing. The results of the present study suggest that individuals with acute/subacute WAD may present lesser pain interference associated with a determined pain intensity value when they show greater self-efficacy beliefs. These individuals may present with greater pain catastrophizing associated with a determined self-efficacy when they show greater kinesiophobia.

Self-efficacy is the belief that one can conduct a determined activity/movement and produce the desired effect




Fig. 1 The directed acyclic graph (DAG) underlying the consensus Bayesian network learned from the variables across 173 participants (model 1). The thickness of the arcs is in proportion to their strength. Only arcs with strength > 0.5 are included in the consensus

network. *CDSE* chronic disease self-efficacy, *LOT-R* life orientation test-revised, *NDI* Neck Disability Index, *NRS-pain* Numerical Rating Scale for Pain, *PCS* Pain Catastrophizing Scale, *SD* standard deviation, *TSK* Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia





Fig. 2 The directed acyclic graph (DAG) underlying the consensus Bayesian network learned from the variables across 173 participants (model 2). Arcs in red are enforced to be present in the network by the whitelist. The thickness of the arcs is in proportion to their strength. Only arcs with strength > 0.5 are included in the consensus

network. *CDSE* chronic disease self-efficacy, *LOT-R* life orientation test-revised, *NDI* Neck Disability Index, *NRS-pain* Numerical Rating Scale for Pain, *PCS* Pain Catastrophizing Scale, *SD* standard deviation, *TSK* Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia


Table 3 The predictive correlations for all variables in both models

Variable	Model	Value	Strength
VAS	No_WL	0.59	Moderate
Recovery Expectation	No_WL	0.31	Low
Pessimism	No_WL	0.07	Negligible
SES	No_WL	0.68	Moderate
TSK	No_WL	0.57	Moderate
PCS	No_WL	0.60	Moderate
NDI	No_WL	0.66	Moderate
VAS	WL	0.58	Moderate
Recovery Expectation	WL	0.36	Low
Pessimism	WL	0.08	Negligible
SES	WL	0.67	Moderate
TSK	WL	0.58	Moderate
PCS	WL	0.59	Moderate
NDI	WL	0.66	Moderate

CDSE chronic disease self-efficacy, NDI Neck Disability Index, PCS Pain Catastrophizing Scale, TSK-11 short-version of the Tampa Scale for Kinesiophobia, VAS visual analogue scale

**Fig. 3** Increases in pain interference (NDI) for every 1-point increase in pain intensity (VAS) with no variables mediating this relationship. *NDI* neck disability index, *VAS* visual analogue scale

despite the potential difficulties [31]. This factor is important in the prognosis of different chronic pain conditions [32] and, specifically, in chronic musculoskeletal pain [33]. Previous research also suggests that self-efficacy is a potential mediator of the association between pain intensity and disability in individuals with headache, osteoarthritis and chronic low back pain [34–36]. A cross-sectional investigation of individuals with non-chronic WAD reported that self-efficacy beliefs mediated the association between pain intensity and pain interference [14] which is in agreement with our results. All these findings indicate that people who can

**Fig. 4** Increases in pain catastrophizing (PCS) for every 1-point increase in self-efficacy (SES) with no variables mediating this relationship. *PCS* pain catastrophizing scale, *SES* self-efficacy scale

elicit greater self-efficacy beliefs in response to an increase in pain intensity may report lower levels of pain interference.

The current study found that self-efficacy beliefs only mediated ~26% of the relationship between pain intensity and pain interference. This suggests that either the influence of pain intensity on pain interference is the dominant factor [37] or that variables (e.g. mental health comorbidity [38] and psychological inflexibility [39]) not included in the present study could mediate this relationship. In a previous systematic review of mediation studies in spinal pain disorders, it was reported that self-efficacy, psychological distress and fear mediate the pain intensity–interference relationship [40]. Interestingly, psychological distress in the primary studies of the review was measured using the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale or the Patient Health Questionnaire (depression subscale) [40]. This suggests that depressive and anxiety symptoms, not included in the present study, could mediate in part the relationship between pain intensity and interference, which would be an important area for future investigations.

Considering the association between self-efficacy and pain catastrophizing, a surprising finding of the present study was that kinesiophobia preceded pain catastrophizing. This stands in contrast to the fear-avoidance model [41], but the present results have empirical support from the literature. Greater fear may heighten the cognitive mechanisms that result in selective attention to threatening stimuli such as catastrophic thoughts [42] and hypervigilance [43] which, from an evolutionary perspective, confer the organism greater survival benefits [44, 45]. Additionally, self-efficacy beliefs showed a direct path towards pain catastrophizing which may indicate the importance of assessing self-efficacy beliefs when physical (e.g. pain interference) and cognitive

(e.g. pain catastrophizing) factors are considered among individuals with non-chronic WAD.

Finally, none of the psychological factors showed a mediating effect in the association between pain intensity and expectations of recovery. Although prior research has demonstrated that poor expectations of recovery are prognostic for the development of chronic WAD [12], the evidence incorporating expectations of recovery as an outcome measure for WAD is scarce. A cross-sectional study found that depressive symptoms, as well as a set of factors such as pain-related variables, economic and sociodemographic factors, were related to poor expectations of recovery [46]. However, the level of depressive symptoms was not assessed in our sample. Future longitudinal studies should evaluate the role that psychological factors play as mediators of the association between pain intensity and expectations of recovery following a whiplash injury as this would enable more robust conclusions.

Clinical considerations

Given that self-efficacy belief partially mediated the association between pain intensity and pain interference and pain catastrophizing, it would be interesting to speculate the clinical implications of such findings. In this sense, low levels of self-efficacy beliefs are considered a barrier to musculoskeletal care [47]. Individuals with musculoskeletal pain with higher levels of self-efficacy often show greater self-confidence and willingness to take risks in comparison with those with lower self-efficacy [47], which may improve recovery. Therefore, clinicians can enhance a patient's self-efficacy belief by facilitating mastery of experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion and the education of body response [48]. A recent systematic review found that exercise and psychological interventions may be useful therapeutic approaches to increase pain self-efficacy in people with chronic musculoskeletal pain [49]. Moreover, previous randomized controlled trials have found that exercise and cognitive behavioural interventions may improve self-efficacy beliefs in acute and chronic WAD [50, 51].

Methodological considerations

This study has several strengths. First, our study applied a BN approach by incorporating prior knowledge available from the literature and expert opinion into the models. We found that our model 1 (empirical data) attained similar correlation values to model 2 (created based on previous knowledge) which adds confidence to our conclusions. Second, we recruited a considerable number of participants and evaluated a large number of psychological factors as mediators of the association between pain intensity and pain interference/expectations of recovery.

Limitations of the study need to be acknowledged. First, similar to previous mediation research [10, 52, 53], this was a cross-sectional study that limits firm conclusions on the causal nature of the relationships explored in the present study. Second, the previous psychological—psychiatric status, and medication status of the participants were not evaluated. These variables could act as moderator–mediator factors. Third, the variables included presently were based on prior knowledge about their mediating and prognostic value and excluded physical variables (e.g. neck muscle endurance [54]). Realistically, the number of variables included in a BN model must depend not only on prior knowledge but should also consider the logistical feasibility of measuring these measures in a clinical or research environment. However, we view the relationships learned in this study within a “hypothesis-generation” framework, where plausible mediators identified could be targets of intervention in future randomized controlled studies. Future longitudinal and experimental studies are needed.

Conclusions

Self-efficacy beliefs partially mediated the association between pain intensity and pain interference, whereas kinesiophobia mediated the association between self-efficacy and pain catastrophizing in people with acute/subacute WAD. This indicates that individuals with greater self-efficacy beliefs present with lesser pain interference for a given pain intensity. These individuals may present with greater pain catastrophizing associated with a determined self-efficacy when they show greater kinesiophobia. No psychological factors mediated the association between pain intensity and expectations of recovery.

Acknowledgements Dr. Javier Martinez-Calderon is supported by the Universidad de Malaga through a postdoctoral grant. All authors state that they have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Funding Dr. Javier Martinez-Calderon is supported by the University of Malaga through a postdoctoral grant.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest None declared. All data are stored and protected by the University of Malaga.

References

1. Elliott JM, Walton DM (2017) How do we meet the challenge of whiplash? *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 47:444–446. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2017.0106>

2. Bin CH, Yang KH, Wang ZG (2009) Biomechanics of whiplash injury. *Chin J Traumatol—English Ed* 12:305–314. <https://doi.org/10.3760/cma.j.issn.1008-1275.2009.05.011>
3. Pink J, Petrou S, Williamson E et al (2016) Economic and health-related quality of life outcomes of whiplash associated disorders. *Spine* 41:1378–1386. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.00000000000001512>
4. Yadla S, Ratliff JK, Harrop JS (2007) Whiplash: diagnosis, treatment, and associated injuries. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med* 1:65–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12178-007-9008-x>
5. Hogg-Johnson S, van der Velde G, Carroll LJ et al (2008) The burden and determinants of neck pain in the general population. *Eur Spine J* 17:39–51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-008-0624-y>
6. Ritchie C, Hendrikz J, Kenardy J, Sterling M (2013) Derivation of a clinical prediction rule to identify both chronic moderate/severe disability and full recovery following whiplash injury. *Pain* 154:2198–2206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2013.07.001>
7. Ritchie C, Sterling M (2016) Recovery pathways and prognosis after whiplash injury. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 46:851–861. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2016.6918>
8. Kamper SJ, Rebbek TJ, Maher CG et al (2008) Course and prognostic factors of whiplash: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pain* 138:617–629. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2008.02.019>
9. Walton DEJ (2017) An integrated model of chronic whiplash-associated disorder. *J Orthop Sport Phys Ther* 47:462–471
10. Nieto R, Miró J, Huguet A (2009) The fear-avoidance model in whiplash injuries. *Eur J Pain* 13:518–523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2008.06.005>
11. Vangronsveld K, Peters M, Goossens M et al (2007) Applying the fear-avoidance model to the chronic whiplash syndrome. *Pain* 131:258–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2007.04.015>
12. Campbell L, Smith A, McGregor L, Sterling M (2018) Psychological factors and the development of chronic whiplash associated disorder(s). *Clin J Pain* 34:755–768
13. Söderlund A, Sandborgh M, Johansson A-C (2017) Is self-efficacy and catastrophizing in pain-related disability mediated by control over pain and ability to decrease pain in whiplash-associated disorders? *Physiother Theory Pract* 33:376–385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593985.2017.1307890>
14. Söderlund A, Åsenlöf P (2010) The mediating role of self-efficacy expectations and fear of movement and (re)injury beliefs in two samples of acute pain. *Disabil Rehabil* 32:2118–2126. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638288.2010.483036>
15. Kamper SJ, Maher CG, Menezes Costa LDC et al (2012) Does fear of movement mediate the relationship between pain intensity and disability in patients following whiplash injury? A prospective longitudinal study. *Pain* 153:113–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2011.09.023>
16. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PCVJSI (2014) The strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Int J Surg* 12:1495–1499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.013>
17. Karcioğlu O, Topacoglu H, Dikme O, Dikme O (2018) A systematic review of the pain scales in adults: which to use? *Am J Emerg Med* 36:707–714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2018.01.008>
18. Lorig KR, Ritter PL, González VM (2003) Hispanic chronic disease self-management: a randomized community-based outcome trial. *Nurs Res* 52:361–369. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-200311000-00003>
19. Ramírez-Maestre C, Esteve R, López-Martínez AE et al (2019) Goal adjustment and well-being: the role of optimism in patients with chronic pain. *Ann Behav Med* 53:597–607. <https://doi.org/10.1093/abm/kay070>
20. Hirsch JK, Britton PC, Conner KR (2010) Psychometric evaluation of the life orientation test-revised in treated opiate dependent individuals. *Int J Ment Health Addict* 8:423–431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-009-9224-2>
21. Ferrando PJ, Chico E, Tous M (2002) Propiedades psicométricas del test de optimismo Life Orientation Test. *Psicothema* 14:673–680
22. Sterling M, Jull G, Kenardy J (2006) Physical and psychological factors maintain long-term predictive capacity post-whiplash injury. *Pain* 122:102–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2006.01.014>
23. Gómez L, López E, Ruiz GT (2011) Psychometric properties of the spanish version of the tampa scale for kinesiphobia (TSK). *J Pain* 12(4):425–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2010.08.004>
24. García Campayo J, Rodero B, Alda M et al (2008) Validación de la versión española de la escala de la catastrofización ante el dolor (Pain Catastrophizing Scale) en la fibromialgia. *Med Clin (Barc)* 131:487–492. <https://doi.org/10.1157/13127277>
25. Andrade Ortega JA, Delgado Martínez AD, Ruiz RA (2010) Validation of the Spanish version of the neck disability index. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 35:E114–E118. <https://doi.org/10.1157/13115352>
26. Scutari M (2010) Learning bayesian networks with the bn learn R package. *J Stat Softw* 35:22
27. Scutari M, Nagarajan R (2013) Identifying significant edges in graphical models of molecular networks. *Artif Intell Med* 57:207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artmed.2012.12.006>
28. Crombez G, Eccleston C, Van DS et al (2012) Fear-Avoidance model of chronic pain. *Clin J Pain* 28:475–483. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AJP.0b013e3182385392>
29. Hinkle D, Wiersma WJS (2003) Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Houghton Mifflin, Boston
30. Nagarajan R, Scutari MLS (2013) Bayesian networks in R with applications in systems biology. Verlag, New York
31. Nicholas MK (2007) The pain self-efficacy questionnaire: taking pain into account. *Eur J Pain* 11:153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2005.12.008>
32. Jackson T, Wang Y, Wang Y, Fan H (2014) Self-efficacy and chronic pain outcomes: a meta-analytic review. *J Pain* 15:800–814. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2014.05.002>
33. Martinez-Calderon J, Zamora-Campos C, Navarro-Ledesma S, Luque-Suarez A (2018) The role of self-efficacy on the prognosis of chronic musculoskeletal pain: a systematic review. *J Pain* 19:10–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.JPAIN.2017.08.008>
34. Peck KR, Smitherman TA (2015) Mediator variables in headache research: methodological critique and exemplar using self-efficacy as a mediator of the relationship between headache severity and disability. *Headache* 55:1102–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/head.12633>
35. Schulz S, Brenk-Franz K, Kratz A et al (2015) Self-efficacy in multimorbid elderly patients with osteoarthritis in primary care— influence on pain-related disability. *Clin Rheumatol* 34:1761–1767. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10067-014-2766-0>
36. Costa LDCM, Maher CG, McAuley JH et al (2011) Self-efficacy is more important than fear of movement in mediating the relationship between pain and disability in chronic low back pain. *Eur J Pain* 15:213–219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2010.06.014>
37. Wallis BJ, Lord SM, Bogduk N (1997) Resolution of psychological distress of whiplash patients following treatment by radiofrequency neurotomy: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Pain* 73:15–22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3959\(97\)00060-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3959(97)00060-2)
38. Paré C, Thibault P, Côté P et al (2019) The relation between level of catastrophizing and mental health comorbidity in individuals with whiplash injuries. *Clin J Pain* 35:880–886. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AJP.0000000000000749>
39. Wicksell RK, Olsson GL, Hayes SC (2010) Psychological flexibility as a mediator of improvement in acceptance and commitment therapy for patients with chronic pain following whiplash.

- Eur J Pain 14:1059.e1-1059.e11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2010.05.001>
40. Lee H, Hübscher M, Moseley GL et al (2015) How does pain lead to disability? A systematic review and meta-analysis of mediation studies in people with back and neck pain. *Pain* 156:988–997. <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000146>
 41. Vlaeyen JWS, Linton SJ (2000) Fear-avoidance and its consequences in muscle skeleton pain: a state of the art. *Pain* 85:317–332
 42. Sullivan MJL, Thorn B, Rodgers W, Ward LC (2004) Path model of psychological antecedents to pain experience: experimental and clinical findings. *Clin J Pain* 20:164–173. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00002508-200405000-00006>
 43. He C-H, Yu F, Jiang Z-C et al (2014) Fearful thinking predicts hypervigilance towards pain-related stimuli in patients with chronic pain. *PsyCh J* 3:189–200. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.57>
 44. Ohman A, Mineka S (2001) Fears, phobias, and preparedness: toward an evolved module of fear and fear learning. *Psychol Rev* 108:483–522. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.108.3.483>
 45. Mathews A (1990) Why worry? The cognitive function of anxiety. *Behav Res Ther* 28:455–468. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(90\)90132-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(90)90132-3)
 46. Ozegovic D, Carroll LJ, Cassidy JD (2010) Factors associated with recovery expectations following vehicle collision: a population-based study. *J Rehabil Med* 42:66–73. <https://doi.org/10.2340/16501977-0466>
 47. Picha KJ, Howell DM (2017) A model to increase rehabilitation adherence to home exercise programmes in patients with varying levels of self-efficacy. *Musculoskelet Care*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/msc.1194>
 48. Bandura A (1977) Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychol Rev* 84:191
 49. Martinez-Calderon J, Flores-Cortes M, Morales-Asencio M et al (2020) Which interventions enhance pain self-efficacy in people with chronic musculoskeletal pain? A systematic review and meta analysis of randomized controlled trials including over 12,000 participants. *J Orthop Sport Phys Ther* 50:418–430
 50. Ludvigsson ML, Peterson G, O’Leary S et al (2015) The effect of neck-specific exercise with, or without a behavioral approach, on pain, disability, and self-efficacy in chronic whiplash-associated disorders: a randomized clinical trial. *Clin J Pain* 31:294–303. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AJP.0000000000000123>
 51. Bring A, Åsenlöf P, Söderlund A (2016) What is the comparative effectiveness of current standard treatment, against an individually tailored behavioural programme delivered either on the Internet or face-to-face for people with acute whiplash associated disorder? A randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil* 30:441–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215515581503>
 52. Marshall PWM, Schabrun S, Knox MF (2017) Physical activity and the mediating effect of fear, depression, anxiety, and catastrophizing on pain related disability in people with chronic low back pain. *PLoS ONE* 12:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0180788>
 53. Shigetoh H, Tanaka Y, Koga M et al (2019) The mediating effect of central sensitization on the relation between pain intensity and psychological factors: a cross-sectional study with mediation analysis. *Pain Res Manag* 2019:3916135. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/3916135>
 54. Liew BXW, Scutari M, Peolsson A et al (2019) Investigating the causal mechanisms of symptom recovery in chronic whiplash-associated disorders using bayesian networks. *Clin J Pain* 35:647–655. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AJP.0000000000000728>

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH (“Springer Nature”).

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users (“Users”), for small-scale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use (“Terms”). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;
2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;
3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval, sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;
4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages
5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or
6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

onlineservice@springernature.com