1	Rasch Validation of the Revised Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire (BARQ-R) in Adults
2	with Musculoskeletal Pain, Adults with Spinal Cord Injury, and Community-Dwelling Adults in the
3	US
4	Sydney Carpentier ¹ ; Wei Deng ¹ ; Jena Blackwood ¹ ; Ann Van de Winckel ^{2*}
5	
6	¹ Division of Rehabilitation Science, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Medical School,
7	University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of America
8	
9	² Division of Physical Therapy, Division of Rehabilitation Science, Department of Rehabilitation
10	Medicine, Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of
11	America
12	
13	*Corresponding Author
14	avandewi@umn.edu
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

26 ABSTRACT

- 27 Background: To establish Rasch validation of the Revised Body Awareness Rating
- 28 Questionnaire (BARQ-R) in adults with musculoskeletal pain, community-dwelling adults without
- 29 pain, and adults with spinal cord injury (SCI) who have neuropathic pain.
- 30 Materials and Method: The BARQ-R has 12 items with scores ranging from 0 (completely
- 31 disagree) to 3 (completely agree). Through Rasch analysis, we evaluated unidimensionality
- 32 through item and person fit, targeting of the population, person separation reliability (PSR), local
- item dependence (LID), and principal components analysis of residuals (PCAR).
- 34 **Results:** The BARQ-R in adults with musculoskeletal pain (n=152; average age = 52.26±16.13
- 35 years) showed good targeting (person mean location: -0.36±0.88 logits), minimal floor effect
- 36 (0.01%), and no ceiling effect (0.00%) and had good reliability (PSR=0.75). The BARQ-R in
- 37 community-dwelling adults (n=471; average age = 49.63±17.57 years) had a person mean
- 38 location of -0.62±1.09 logits, minimal floor (2.63%), and minimal ceiling effect (0.43%) after
- 39 rescoring 2 items and deleting 3 items and had good reliability (PSR=0.74). The BARQ-R in
- 40 adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain (n=44; average age = 55.45±13.47 years) showed
- 41 good targeting after rescoring 7 items (person mean location: -0.33±0.71 logits), no floor effect
- 42 (0.00%) or ceiling effect (0.00%) but had poor reliability (PSR=0.65).
- 43 **Conclusions:** The BARQ-R shows sufficient fit to be used in clinical settings for group decision-
- 44 making for both adults with musculoskeletal pain and community-dwelling adults. However, in
- 45 adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain, preliminary Rasch analysis of the BARQ-R showed
- 46 low reliability and therefore the BARQ-R is not recommended for clinical use in that population.
- 47 Validation in larger groups of adults with SCI as well as more diverse samples are needed.

- 49 Key Words: body awareness, validation studies, musculoskeletal pain, spinal cord injury,
- 50 neuropathic pain
- 51

52 Abbreviation List

- 53 BARQ: Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire
- 54 BARQ-R: Revised Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire
- 55 cMDC: conditional Minimally Detectable Change
- 56 NPMP: Norwegian Psychomotor Physiotherapy
- 57 LID: Local item dependence
- 58 PSR: Personal Separation Reliability
- 59 RULER: Rasch Reporting Guideline for Rehabilitation Research
- 60 RUMM2030: Rasch Unidimensional Measurement Model
- 61 SCI: Spinal Cord Injury
- 62 US: United States

63 INTRODUCTION

64 Body awareness is generally defined as the ability to understand and become aware of (i) how the body is situated in space (i.e., proprioception); sensory signals, such as visual, 65 66 auditory, tactile signals that are perceived in that space (i.e., exteroception); and internal bodily 67 states (i.e., interception).^{1–9} This definition encompasses awareness of body posture and body movements, which are elements that are addressed in physical therapy.¹⁰ Mind and body 68 69 approaches such as Tai Chi, Qigong, Yoga as well as other meditative practices such as 70 mindfulness, breathing exercises, and even physical activity impact body awareness,^{11,12} 71 necessitating the use of a scale that can measure a person's body awareness ability. 72 To measure body awareness, Dragesund et al. (2010) developed a patient-reported 73 outcome measure, the Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire (BARQ), intended for adults with 74 chronic musculoskeletal pain and psychosomatic disorders.¹³ In the context of this scale, body awareness was defined as a person's ability to sense muscle tension and body movements as 75 76 well as reflect on their emotions and attitudes toward their own body.¹¹ People who are aware of 77 their body posture and muscle tension will readjust their posture more quickly,¹³ thereby 78 avoiding muscle tension and resultant pain. Items of the BARQ were developed through 79 interviewing therapists specializing in Norwegian Psychomotor Physiotherapy (NPMP) - a mindbody physiotherapeutic approach for improving pain levels and function ^{13,14}— and through focus 80 81 groups of individuals with chronic pain who both received and were on a waiting list to receive 82 the NPMP therapy. This resulted in 66 items. Through Cronbach's α test and exploratory factor 83 analysis, the resulting scale consisted of 24 items with 4 subscales reflecting separate aspects 84 of body awareness: Function, Mood, Feelings, and Awareness. The BARQ is scored using a 7-85 point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally agree) to 7 (totally disagree).

To assess whether the BARQ has satisfactory measurement properties, Dragesund *et al.* (2012) tested its validity and reliability in a sample of Norwegian adults with long-lasting musculoskeletal pain and/or psychosomatic disorders. Reliability was satisfactory for all

89 subscales: however, construct and discriminate validity was only substantial for three subscales 90 (i.e., Function, Feelings, and Awareness), but was not substantial for the Mood subscale. 91 As a next step, Dragesund et al. (2018) evaluated the structural validity of the BARQ 92 through Rasch analysis in 48 adults with musculoskeletal pain, which resulted in the Revised 93 BARQ (BARQ-R)¹⁵ with 12 items reflecting statements on body awareness, on a 4-point ordinal 94 scale ranging from 0 (completely disagree) to 3 (completely agree), with higher scores reflecting 95 lower degrees of body awareness.¹⁵ 96 It is critical to replicate these findings in both a larger sample and in other populations 97 outside of Norway. In addition to pain populations, it is important to determine what the typical 98 range of BARQ-R scores is in adults in a community who do not have pain. Also, it is important 99 to know if the BARQ-R scale can be used in other patient populations known to have body 100 awareness deficits,^{16,17} such as adults with spinal cord injury (SCI) and neuropathic pain. 101 Therefore, the objectives of this study were to (1) validate the results from Dragesund et 102 al. (2018) by evaluating the structural validity of the BARQ-R with Rasch analysis in a large 103 sample of adults with self-reported musculoskeletal pain in the United States (US), (2) evaluate 104 the scoring range of the BARQ-R in community-dwelling adults in the US who report no pain, 105 and (3) assess the BARQ-R as a pilot Rasch analysis in adults with SCI who had neuropathic 106 pain. 107 108 MATERIALS AND METHODS 109 **Participants** 110 Participants were recruited at the Minnesota State Fair, Highland Fest, from a contact list

110 Participants were recruited at the Minnesota State Fair, Highland Fest, from a contact list 111 of the Brain Body Mind Lab at the University of Minnesota, and through flyers and website 112 announcements. Participants must be 18-75 years of age to participate in the study. Those who 113 were pregnant, who did not speak English, and/or those who could not provide consent were 114 excluded from the study.

115 This study adhered to the principles of the most recent Declaration of Helsinki (2013) 116 and received approval from the Institutional Review Board of the University of Minnesota (IRB#s 117 00008476; 00011997; 00005656; 00005849). All participants provided informed consent. Adults 118 with SCI-related neuropathic pain completed the BARQ-R as part of a clinical trial. They signed 119 consent on the secure University of Minnesota REDCap platform. All other participants 120 completed the BARQ-R as part of an anonymous questionnaire and, thus, we did not collect any 121 personal or identifiable information (including signatures) from those participants. After they 122 read and provided consent, participants were guizzed on the comprehension of the content of 123 the consent form through the University of California, San Diego Brief Assessment of Capacity to Consent (UBACC)¹⁸. All information was stored automatically on the secure University of 124 125 Minnesota REDCap platform. 126

127 Main outcome measures

128 The BARQ-R is a patient-reported outcome measure consisting of 12 items, scored on a 129 4-point ordinal scale, ranging from 0 (completely disagree) to 3 (completely agree), with higher 130 scores reflecting lower degrees of body awareness.

131

132 Statistical analysis: Rasch Measurement Theory

133 The structural validity of the BARQ-R was assessed with the Rasch Measurement 134 Theory using the Rasch Unidimensional Measurement Model (RUMM2030) software and was 135 reported following the Rasch Reporting Guideline for Rehabilitation Research (RULER).^{19,20} The 136 Rasch model is a probabilistic model, which states that a person with a higher ability on a 137 certain construct would have a higher probability of obtaining a better score on the scale 138 measuring that construct.²¹

139 To assess the structural validity of the BARQ-R, we evaluated: (1) the presence of 140 reversed thresholds; (2) item and person fit, with good item fit reflected by fit residuals between -2.50 and +2.50;²¹ (3) targeting of the population, with good targeting reflected by the average person location being within 0.5 logits of average item location and less than 15% floor and ceiling effect,²² and (4) personal separation reliability (PSR), which reflects how well we can distinguish groups of persons with different levels of ability,²³ with ≥ .70 sufficient for group decisions and ≥ .90 sufficient for individual decisions.^{19,20} The interpretation of this value is sometimes compared to Cronbach's alpha but the error variance structure of PSR and Cronbach's alpha are reversed.^{23,24}

We also evaluated: (5) Local item dependence (LID) measured through residual 148 149 correlations, with those at least r = 0.20 above the average correlation indicating pairs of items 150 that are more correlated with each other, and thus sharing more content than with other items in 151 the scale; and (6) unidimensionality tested through Principal Component Analysis of Residuals 152 $(PCAR)^{22}$ showing unidimensionality if the eigenvalue is < 2.00, and the percent variance on the 153 first residual factor is <10%. Furthermore, a paired sample *t*-test of two subsets of items 154 (correlation with the first principal component loadings of r > 0.3 or < 0.3) showing < 5% of 155 significance confirms unidimensionality. The analysis results in a hierarchical order of items 156 ranging from easiest to hardest item. For analyses revealing good structural validity, we provide 157 a score-to-measure table relating the ordinal total score to the Rasch-based logit score and 158 transformed logit score to 0-100% for easier use in the clinic or research. Of note, these score-159 to-measure tables can only be used for full datasets.

160

161 **RESULTS**

162 **Demographic data**

163 There were 667 participants in total: 152 adults with musculoskeletal pain (average

age=52.26±16.13 years), 44 adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain (average

- age=55.45±13.47 years), and 471 community-dwelling adults with no pain (average
- age=49.63±17.57 years). More details on the demographic data are displayed in **Table 1**.

167

168 Rasch Measurement Theory

- 169 All iteration steps are shown in **Table 2**.
- 170

171 Adults with musculoskeletal pain

172 No items showed disordered thresholds. There were no misfitting items and only 2 173 (1.32%) misfitting persons. The BARQ-R showed good targeting for adults with musculoskeletal 174 pain (person mean location: -0.36±0.88 logits, Fig. 1A), minimal floor effect (0.01%), and no 175 ceiling effect (0.00%). Reliability was good (PSR=0.75). LID was found in 6 item pairs (Table 3). 176 PCAR had an eigenvalue of 2.47 (percent variance 20.55%) but the paired t-test resulted in only 177 13.82% of persons having a significantly different logit location on the two subtests, created by 178 the positive and negative principal component loadings. This result is indicative of the scale 179 being multidimensional. "My body is affected by how I feel" was the easiest item and "I don't like 180 to be touched' was the hardest item for this group (Fig. 2A). The score-to-measure table is 181 provided in Table 4.

182

183 Community-dwelling adults

184 Initially, for community-dwelling adults, Rasch analysis of the BARQ-R showed that 1 185 item (item 11) presented misfit (Res=2.77, p=.000004) and 2 items (items 2,12) had disordered 186 thresholds. Upon rescoring item 2 (0012) and item 12 (0011), there were no more disordered 187 thresholds, but item 11 was still misfitting. After deleting item 11 (Res=3.03, p=.000004), item 3 188 (Res=3.33, p=.000092) and item 4 (Res=2.89, p=.00016) displayed misfit. After deleting the 2 189 items (items 3,4), the scale had no more items with disordered thresholds or misfitting items. 190 There were only 4 (0.85%) misfitting persons. The person mean location was -0.62±1.09 logits 191 (Fig. 1B) which is close to good targeting. There were minimal floor (2.63%), and ceiling effects 192 (0.425%). The scale showed sufficient reliability for group decision-making in this population

(PSR=0.74). No consequential LID was found. PCAR had an eigenvalue of 1.88 (percent
variance 20.85%) but the paired *t*-test resulted in only 3.61% of persons having a significantly
different logit location on the two subtests. This result is indicative of the scale being
unidimensional. Similar to the group with musculoskeletal pain, "*My body is affected by how I feel*" was the easiest item for adults in the community, and "*I don't like to be touched*" was the
hardest item for this group (**Fig. 2B**). The score-to-measure table is provided in **Table 5**.

199

200 Adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain

201 Initially, for adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain, one item (item 12) showed misfit 202 (Res=2.56, p=.00012) and 5 items (items 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12) had disordered thresholds. Upon 203 rescoring items 6 (0011), 8 (0012), 9 (0012), 11 (0012), and 12 (0011), there were no misfitting 204 items, however, there were 2 items (items 2, 3) with disordered thresholds. After rescoring item 205 2 (0012) and item 3 (0011), the scale had no more disordered thresholds and no misfitting 206 items. There were no misfitting persons. The scale showed good targeting for adults with SCI 207 and neuropathic pain (person mean location: -0.33±0.71 logits, Fig. 1C), no floor effect (0.00%), 208 or ceiling effect (0.00%). However, the scale did not show sufficient reliability for this group 209 (PSR=0.65). LID was found in 10 item pairs (Table 3). PCAR had an eigenvalue of 2.48 210 (20.66%), however, the paired t-test revealed only 4.55% of persons having a significantly 211 different location on the two subtests, which points to the unidimensionality of the scale for this 212 group. "I try not to show how I'm feeling" was the easiest item and "I don't like to be touched" 213 was the hardest item (Fig. 2C).

214

215 **DISCUSSION**

For adults with self-reported musculoskeletal pain, we validated Dragesund *et al.*(2018)'s findings in a larger sample. The BARQ-R showed good item fit, good targeting, and

218 reliability, which indicates that this scale is considered unidimensional and can be used for219 group decision-making, given that the PSR is above .70.

220 For community-dwelling adults with no reported pain, the targeting is close to the 0.5 221 logit limit, indicating that the items were only slightly too easy for this group. This result is not 222 surprising given that this group does not have any known body awareness deficits and thus 223 could provide a baseline level of what the range of body awareness ability is in a general 224 healthy US community. The BARQ-R showed good item fit and reliability with PSR above .70. 225 Therefore, this scale can be recommended for use in community-dwelling adults. 226 The preliminary Rasch analysis in adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain 227 demonstrated that the BARQ-R had good item fit and good targeting. However, the reliability 228 was too low, given that the PSR was below .70. Our results should also be validated in a larger 229 sample before any recommendations can be made for use of this scale in adults with SCI. 230 Regarding unidimensionality, the paired *t*-tests indicated that the scale was 231 unidimensional for community-dwelling adults and adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain. 232 However, there may be multiple underlying aspects of body awareness in the BARQ-R for 233 adults with self-reported musculoskeletal pain. 234 As noted by the PCAR, the following items showed positive loadings on the first 235 component: "I avoid paying too much attention to my body," "I am not aware of the way I 236 breathe," and "I don't pay attention to the way I move." The following items showed negative 237 loadings on the first component: "I am often tense," "My body is affected by how I feel," "I 238 struggle to relax," and "My body is tense without me knowing why." Conceptually, these two 239 groupings may indicate two underlying aspects of body awareness. For example, all items with 240 positive loadings seem to have negatively worded items and indicate a lack of awareness. This 241 may be consistent with the "awareness" category in the original BARQ (Dragesund et al. 2010).

242 Whereas all items with negative loadings on the first component may be measuring an aspect of

being tense.

Across all groups, the hierarchy of items showed similar 'easy' items. Both adults with musculoskeletal pain and community-dwelling adults had the item "*my body is affected by how I feel*" as the easiest. Adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain had this item as the second easiest. Dragesund *et al.* (2018) also reported this item as the second easiest one. All groups had the same hardest item "*I don't like to be touched*", which aligns with Dragesund *et al.* (2018)'s findings as well.

Given the importance of body awareness training in clinical settings, it is critical to further examine the conditional minimally detectable change (cMDC) for the BARQ-R. In contrast to the MDC, which is a single index, the cMDC is a matrix of values for each pair-wise combination of change scores.²⁵

254

255 *Limitations*

Future studies should validate our preliminary findings in adults with SCI-related
neuropathic pain. One limitation across all samples may be a lack of diversity in our samples.
Our data was collected in adults in Minnesota, USA, where there is an 82.85% White population
and 6.41% Black or African American.²⁶ Therefore, future studies should attempt at recruiting a
more racially and geographically diverse sample.

261

262 CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the BARQ-R showed good item and person fit and proved to be sufficient for group decision-making in a clinical setting for both adults with musculoskeletal pain and community-dwelling adults. However, due to the low reliability and the fact that we only have preliminary results of the BARQ-R in adults with SCI-related neuropathic pain, we cannot yet recommend the BARQ-R for clinical use in adults with SCI until a further Rash analysis is carried out in a larger sample and the reliability is higher.

000			<i>,</i>	12 1 42		e		
260	Futuro rocoarch	chould alco	tocus on	validating	thaca	tindinge	in a more	Inclusiva
203				vanualing	11030	muniga		

- 270 population as well as in other populations that may have body awareness deficits.
- 271

272 Acknowledgments

- 273 We thank all participants; the Driven to Discover (D2D) Research Team; and the volunteers who
- helped at the D2D Facility at the Minnesota State Fair and at Highland Fest for providing us with
- the opportunity to carry out this study. We would like to express our profound thanks to Marc
- 276 Noël for the critical review of the manuscript.
- 277

278 Author Contributions

279 AVDW designed the project. AVDW, WD, and other volunteers enrolled participants and

collected the data. AVDW analyzed and interpreted the data sets. SC wrote the manuscript.

AVDW, WD, and JB provided crucial revisions and edits to the manuscript. Every author takes

responsibility for the final draft.

283

284 Funding

- 285 Research reported in this publication was supported by the AIRP2-IND-30: Academic
- 286 Investment Research Program (AIRP) University of Minnesota School of Medicine and by the
- 287 National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of
- Health Award Number UL1TR002494. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and
- 289 does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

290 **REFERENCES**

- 1. Garfinkel SN, Manassei MF, Hamilton-Fletcher G, In den Bosch Y, Critchley HD, Engels M.
- 292 Interoceptive dimensions across cardiac and respiratory axes. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.
- 293 B Biol. Sci. [Internet]. 2016;371. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0014
- Park H-D, Blanke O. Coupling Inner and Outer Body for Self-Consciousness. Trends Cogn.
 Sci. 2019;23:377–88.
- Daprati E, Sirigu A, Nico D. Body and movement: consciousness in the parietal lobes.
 Neuropsychologia. 2010;48:756–62.
- Dijkerman HC, de Haan EH. Somatosensory processes subserving perception and action.
 Behav. Brain Sci. 2007;30:189–201; discussion 201–39.
- 300 5. Khalsa SS, Adolphs R, Cameron OG, Critchley HD, Davenport PW, Feinstein JS, et al.
- Interoception and Mental Health: A Roadmap. Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging.
 2018;3:501–13.
- 303 6. Mehling WE, Wrubel J, Daubenmier JJ, Price CJ, Kerr CE, Silow T, et al. Body Awareness:
- a phenomenological inquiry into the common ground of mind-body therapies. Philos. Ethics
 Humanit. Med. 2011;6:6.
- 306 7. Young KS, van der Velden AM, Craske MG, Pallesen KJ, Fjorback L, Roepstorff A, et al.
- 307 The impact of mindfulness-based interventions on brain activity: A systematic review of
- 308 functional magnetic resonance imaging studies. Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev. 2018;84:424–33.
- 309 8. Gibson J. Mindfulness, Interoception, and the Body: A Contemporary Perspective. Front.
 310 Psychol. 2019;10:2012.
- 311 9. Hassanpour MS, Simmons WK, Feinstein JS, Luo Q, Lapidus RC, Bodurka J, et al. The
- 312 Insular Cortex Dynamically Maps Changes in Cardiorespiratory Interoception.
- 313 Neuropsychopharmacology. 2018;43:426–34.
- 314 10. Gyllensten AL, Skär L, Miller M, Gard G. Embodied identity—A deeper understanding of
- body awareness. Physiother. Theory Pract. 2010;26:439–46.

- 316 11. Tihanyi BT, Sági A, Csala B, Tolnai N, Köteles F. Body Awareness, Mindfulness and Affect:
- 317 Does the Kind of Physical Activity Make a Difference? [Internet]. European Journal of Mental
- 318 Health. 2016;11:97–111. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.5708/ejmh.11.2016.1-2.6
- 319 12. Sze JA, Gyurak A, Yuan JW, Levenson RW. Coherence between emotional experience and
- 320 physiology: does body awareness training have an impact? Emotion. 2010;10:803–14.
- 321 13. Dragesund T, Ljunggren AE, Kvåle A, Strand LI. Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire –
- 322 Development of a self-administered questionnaire for patients with long-lasting
- 323 musculoskeletal and psychosomatic disorders [Internet]. Advances in Physiotherapy.
- 324 2010;12:87–94. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/14038191003706545
- 14. Dragesund T, Målfrid R, Liv Inger S. Body awareness rating questionnaire: measurement
- 326 properties. Physiother. Theory Pract. 2012;28:515–28.
- 327 15. Dragesund T, Strand LI, Grotle M. The Revised Body Awareness Rating Questionnaire:
- 328 Development Into a Unidimensional Scale Using Rasch Analysis. Phys. Ther. 2018;98:122–
- 329 32.
- 330 16. Bretas RV, Taoka M, Suzuki H, Iriki A. Secondary somatosensory cortex of primates:
- beyond body maps, toward conscious self-in-the-world maps. Exp. Brain Res.
- 332 2020;238:259–72.
- 17. Van de Winckel A, De Patre D, Rigoni M, Fiecas M, Hendrickson TJ, Larson M, Jagadeesan
- BD, Mueller BA, Elvendahl W, Streib C, Ikramuddin F, Lim KO. Exploratory study of how
- 335 Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation restores parietal operculum connectivity and improves
- 336 upper limb movements in chronic stroke. Sci Rep. 2020 Nov 20;10(1):20278. doi:
- 337 10.1038/s41598-020-77272-y.
- 18. Jeste DV, Palmer BW, Appelbaum PS, Golshan S, Glorioso D, Dunn LB, et al. A new brief
- instrument for assessing decisional capacity for clinical research. Arch Gen Psychiatry.
- 340 2007;64: 966–974.

- 19. Mallinson T, Kozlowski AJ, Johnston MV, Weaver J, Terhorst L, Grampurohit N, Juengst S,
- 342 Ehrlich-Jones L, Heinemann AW, Melvin J, Sood P, Van de Winckel A. Rasch Reporting
- 343 Guideline for Rehabilitation Research (RULER): The RULER Statement. Arch Phys Med
- 344 Rehabil. 2022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.013
- 345 20. Van de Winckel A, Kozlowski AJ, Johnston MV, Weaver J, Grampurohit N, Terhorst L,
- 346 Juengst S, Ehrlich-Jones L, Heinemann AW, Melvin J, Sood P, Mallinson T. Reporting
- 347 Guideline for RULER: Rasch Reporting Guideline for Rehabilitation Research Explanation
- 348 & Elaboration manuscript. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2022.
- 349 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.019
- 350 21. Andrich D, Marais I. A Course in Rasch Measurement Theory: Measuring in the
- 351 Educational, Social and Health Sciences. Springer; 2019.
- 352 22. McHorney CA, Tarlov AR. Individual-patient monitoring in clinical practice: are available
- health status surveys adequate? Qual Life Res. 1995;4: 293–307. doi:10.1007/BF01593882
- 23. Reliability and separation of measures [Internet]. [cited 2020 Sep 16]; Available from:
- 355 https://www.winsteps.com/winman/reliability.htm
- 24. Linacre JM. Standard errors and reliabilities: Rasch and raw score. Rasch Measurement
 Transactions. 2007;20:1086.
- 358 25. Kozlowski AJ, Cella D, Nitsch KP, Heinemann AW. Evaluating Individual Change With the
- 359 Quality of Life in Neurological Disorders (Neuro-QoL) Short Forms. Arch. Phys. Med.
- 360 Rehabil. 2016;97:650–4.e8.
- 361 26. Minnesota Population 2022 (Demographics, Maps, Graphs) [Internet]. [cited 2022 Apr 18].
- 362 Available from: https://worldpopulationreview.com/states/minnesota-population

364 Figure Legends

365 Fig. 1. Person-item threshold distribution maps

- 366 *Legend:* The histogram shows A: the frequency of adults with musculoskeletal pain at their
- 367 level of body awareness ability, **B**: the frequency of community-dwelling adults at their level of
- 368 body awareness ability, **C**: the frequency of adults with SCI and neuropathic pain at their body
- awareness ability. Body awareness ability ranges from a high (lowest logit value on the left side
- of the scale) to low (highest logit value on the right side of the scale). At the bottom of the figure,
- 371 the blue histogram represents the frequency of item threshold. Following the same logit scale,
- the easiest items are shown on the left and the hardest items are shown on the right.
- 373

374 Fig. 2. Item threshold map

- 375 *Legend:* The item threshold map shows the easiest items on the top to the hardest items on the
- bottom for A: Adults with musculoskeletal pain, B: community-dwelling adults, and C: adults
- 377 with SCI and neuropathic pain. Using an interval logit scale, the horizontal black line at the
- 378 bottom represents the location of the thresholds between the scoring as well as the body
- awareness ability level (higher scores indicating lower body awareness ability) of each
- 380 participant.

Table 1. Demographics of the study sample

	Community-	Musculo-	SCI and	Total
	dwelling	skeletal pain	neuropathic	(n=667)
	(n=471)	(n=152)	pain (n=44)	
Age (years, Mean±SD)	49.63±17.57	52.26±16.13	55.45±13.47	50.61±17.1
Sex (n)				
Male	33.97	23.03	70	36.28
Female	66.03	76.97	30	63.72
Other	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.15
Racial background (%)				
Asian	2.12	5.26	2.27	5.55
Black/ African American	1.91	2.63	2.27	2.10
White	88.54	88.16	93.18	89.00
Multi-racial	2.12	0.66	0.00	1.65
Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
American Indian/Alaskan	2.27	1.32	0.00	0.00

Table 2. Iteration table

Analysis	Items	Rating scale cate-	Person Mean (SD)	Mean error variance	Floor Effect n (%)	Ceiling Effect n (%)	Overall Chi- square	PSR	Number of items with disordered	Number of misfitting	PCAR Eigenvalue 1st contrast	Number and % mis-
		gories	logits				(DF) <i>p</i> -value		thresholds	ltems	(%)	fitting persons
Dragesund (n=48) Adults with musculo- skeletal pain	12	48	-0.04 (0.74)	NA	NA	NA	13.63, <i>p</i> =0.95	0.76	0	0	NA	NA
	1	1	1		r	OUR ANA	LYSIS	•		1		
Adults with musculo- skeletal pain (n=152)	12	44	-0.36 (0.88)	0.17	2 (1.32%)	0	149.91 (108), <i>p</i> =0.005	0.75	0	0	2.47 (20.55%)	2 (1.32%)
Adults with SCI (n=44)	12	48	-0.11 (0.58)	0.11	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	156.97 (108) <i>p</i> =0.0015	0.68	5 (items 6, 8,9,11,12	1 (item 12) Res = 2.56, <i>p</i> =.00012	2.80 (23.36%)	0 (0.00%)
Adults with SCI (n=44) rescored 6 (0011), 8 (0012), 9 (0012), 11(0012), 12(0011)	12	41	-0.29 (0.63)	0.15	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	108.09 (108) <i>p</i> =0.48	0.64	2 (items 2,3)	0	2.81 (23.44%)	0 (0.00%)
Adults with SCI (n=44) rescored 2 (0012) 3 (0011)	12	38	-0.33 (0.71)	0.18	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	115.16 (96) <i>p</i> =0.09	0.65	0	0	2.48 (20.66%)	0 (0.00%)
Community -dwelling adults (n=471)	12	48	-0.46 (0.87)	0.16	5 (1.06%)	2 (0.42%)	255.20 (96) <i>p</i> <.00001	0.74	2 (items 2, 12)	1 (item 11) Res=2.77, <i>p</i> =.000004	2.32 (19.33%)	6 (1.27%)

Community -dwelling adults (n=471) rescored 2 (0012), 12 (0011)	12	45	-0.55 (0.91)	0.18	6 (1.27%)	2 (0.42%)	244.10 (108) <i>p</i> <.00001	0.73	0	1 (item 11) Res=3.03, <i>p</i> =.000004	2.31 (19.27%)	5 (1.06%)
Community -dwelling Adults (n=471) delete item 11	11	41	-0.57 (0.94)	0.20	6 (1.27%)	2 (0.42%)	251.76 (99) <i>p</i> <.00001	0.73	0	2 (item 3) Res=3.33, p=.000092 (item 4) Res=2.89, p=.00016	2.10 (19.10%)	4 (0.85%)
Community -dwelling Adults (n=471) delete items 3,4	9	33	-0.62 (1.09)	0.27	8 (2.63%)	2 (0.42%)	135.44 (81) <i>p</i> =0.0001 5	0.74	0	0	1.88 (20.85%)	4 (0.85%)

Legend: DF=degrees of freedom; PCAR=Principal Components Analysis of Residuals; PSR=Person Separation Reliability; SD=standard deviation

Table 3: Residual Correlation by group

Items	Correlation
Musculoskeletal Pain $r = 0.29$ (correlation shown	is +0.2 above average)
3. I am not aware of the way I breathe.1. I am often tense.	-0.34
6. My body is tense without me knowing why.1. I am often tense.	0.31
11. I avoid paying too much attention to my body.1. I am often tense.	-0.33
3. I am not aware of the way I breathe.2. My body is affected by how I feel.	-0.30
3. I am not aware of the way I breathe.4. I don't pay attention to the way I move.	0.55
11. I avoid paying too much attention to my body.5. I struggle to relax.	-0.30
SCI-related neuropathic pain $r = 0.28$ (correlation	shown is +0.2 above average)
 I don't pay attention to the way I move My body is affected by how I feel 	-0.38
8. My digestion is affected by how I feel2. My body is affected by how I feel	0.36
3. I am not aware of the way I breathe4. I don't pay attention to the way I move	0.29
5. I struggle to relax3. I am not aware of the way I breathe	-0.33
9. I can't get comfortable when I'm lying down3. I am not aware of the way I breathe	-0.29
 My body is unpredictable I am not aware of the way I breathe 	-0.33
4. I don't pay attention to the way I move5. I struggle to relax	-0.42
 My body is unpredictable I don't pay attention to the way I move 	-0.57
 I avoid paying too much attention to my body I struggle to relax 	-0.37

12. I don't like to be touched	-0.28
10. My body is unpredictable	

Total BARQ-R Score	Logit	Converted logits to 0- 100
0	-3.95	0.00
1	-3.15	15.94
2	-2.60	26.79
3	-2.24	34.16
4	-1.95	39.85
5	-1.71	44.59
6	-1.51	48.66
7	-1.33	52.32
8	-1.16	55.65
9	-1.00	58.75
10	-0.86	61.69
11	-0.72	64.48
12	-0.58	67.20
13	-0.45	69.84
14	-0.32	72.43
15	-0.19	74.99
16	-0.06	77.55
17	0.07	80.10
18	0.20	82.70
19	0.33	85.32
20	0.46	88.01
21	0.60	90.81
22	0.75	93.71
23	0.90	96.76
24	1.06	100.00

Table 4. Rasch-based score-to-measure tables for adults with musculoskeletal pain

Total BARQ-R Score	Logit	Converted logits to 0- 100
0	-3.87	0.00
1	-3.05	10.40
2	-2.48	17.66
3	-2.08	22.71
4	-1.77	26.71
5	-1.50	30.11
6	-1.27	33.13
7	-1.05	35.90
8	-0.85	38.50
9	-0.65	40.99
10	-0.46	43.41
11	-0.27	45.79
12	-0.09	48.18
13	0.10	50.57
14	0.29	53.02
15	0.49	55.55
16	0.70	58.21
17	0.92	61.03
18	1.16	64.09
19	1.43	67.45
20	1.73	71.26
21	2.08	75.74
22	2.51	81.31
23	3.12	89.10
24	3.98	100.00

Table 5. Rasch-based score-to-measure tables for community-dwelling adults

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.19.22274054; this version posted April 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint STROBE Statement in a constraint of the presence of the statement of

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or	1
		the abstract	
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what	2-3
		was done and what was found	
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation	4-5
-		being reported	
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of	5
		recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection	5-6
		of participants	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential	6-7
		confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods	6-7
measurement		of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment	
		methods if there is more than one group	
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	N/A
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	N/A
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If	N/A
		applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for	6-7
		confounding	
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	N/A
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	N/A
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling	N/A
		strategy	
		(<i>e</i>) Describe any sensitivity analyses	N/A
Results			•
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers	N/A
		potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included	
		in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	N/A
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical,	7
		social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of	N/A
		interest	
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	8-9
			Table 1
			Table 2

Table 3

medRxiv preprint doi: https (which was not certified	://doi.org/1 1 by peer r	0.1101/2022.04.19.22274054; this version posted April 21, 2022. The copyright holder eview) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint t is made available under a CC-BX-ND 4.0 International license.	f or this propri nt n parnetuity.
			Table 5
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted	N/A
		estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear	
		which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were	N/A
		categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute	N/A
		risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions,	N/A
		and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	9-11
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential	11
		bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any	
		potential bias	
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives,	11-12
		limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and	
		other relevant evidence	
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	12
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present	12
		study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present	
		article is based	

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.











R

My body is affected by how I feel	0		1		2	
I try not to show how I'm feeling	0	1	2		3	
l am often tense	0	1	2		3	
I struggle to relax	0		1 2		3	I
am not aware of the way I breathe	0		1	2	3	
y is tense without me knowing why	0		1	2	3	l
comfortable when I'm lying down		0	1	2	3	
My body is unpredictable		0	1	2	3	
n't pay attention to the way I move	0		1	2	3	
digestion is affected by how I feel		0	1		2	
ing too much attention to my body	()		2	3	
I don't like to be touched		0			1	
		2 .1	l 0	+	1	

I try not to show how I'm feelin I am often tens I struggle to rela I am not aware of the way I breath My body is tense without me knowing wh I can't get comfortable when I'm lying dow My body is unpredictable I don't pay attention to the way I mov My digestion is affected by how I fe I avoid paying too much attention to my boo I don't like to be touche



My body is affected by how I feel My digestion is affected by how I feel I try not to show how I'm feeling I am often tense I struggle to relax My body is tense without me knowing why My body is unpredictable I can't get comfortable when I'm lying down I don't like to be touched



I try not to show how I'm feeling My body is affected by how I feel My body is unpredictable I struggle to relax I am not aware of the way I breathe I don't pay attention to the way I move I can't get comfortable when I'm Iving down I am often tense My digestion is affected by how I feel My body is tense without me knowing why I avoid paying too much attention to my body I don't like to be touched