

### **HHS Public Access**

Author manuscript

Psychiatry Res. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2018 December 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Psychiatry Res. 2017 December; 258: 337–343. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2017.08.049.

# Group differences in pain interference, psychiatric disorders, and general medical conditions among Hispanics and whites in the U.S. general population

Declan T. Barry<sup>a,b</sup>, Corey Pilver Glenn<sup>c</sup>, Rani A. Hoff<sup>a,d</sup>, and Marc N. Potenza<sup>a,d,e,f,g</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

<sup>b</sup>APT Foundation Pain Treatment Services, New Haven, CT, USA

<sup>c</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

<sup>d</sup>Department of Neuroscience, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

eYale Child Study Center, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

<sup>f</sup>National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

<sup>9</sup>Connecticut Mental Health Center, New Haven, CT, USA

#### **Abstract**

The cross-sectional retrospective study examined whether ethnicity moderates relationships between pain interference and both psychopathology and general medical conditions among Hispanic and non-Hispanic white adults. Participants comprised 32,574 (14% Hispanic; 86% white) National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions respondents. While Hispanic respondents were less likely than white respondents to report severe pain interference (11.4% vs. 11.9%) or moderate pain interference (5.7% vs. 7.8%), and were more likely to report no or low pain interference (82.9% vs. 80.3%), the magnitude of these ethnic group differences was relatively small. Pain interference was associated with multiple past-year Axis-I psychiatric disorders and general medical conditions in both Hispanic and white respondents. Stronger relationships were observed in Hispanic compared to white respondents between moderate pain interference and any heart condition, tachycardia, and hypertension, and between severe pain interference and any mood disorder. Stronger relationships were observed in white compared to Hispanic respondents between severe pain interference and both social phobia and any stomach

All authors report that they have no conflicts of interest over the past five years to report as related to the subject of the report. DISCLOSURES

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Declan T. Barry, Ph.D., Yale University School of Medicine, CMHC/SAC Room 220, 34 Park Street, New Haven CT 06519-1187. Tel: 203-285-2708; Fax: 203-781-4681. declan.barry@yale.edu.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Dr. Pilver has no disclosures to report.

Dr. Hoff has consulted with law firms on issues related to PTSD.

condition. Differences between Hispanic and white respondents on the prevalence of pain interference and on the strength of the associations between pain interference and specific psychiatric disorders and general medical conditions underscore the complexity of ethnic health disparities and suggest the importance of further study of underlying mechanisms.

#### Keywords

pain; mental disorders; physical disorders; comorbidity; ethnicity

#### 1. Introduction

It is estimated that over 100 million adults in the U.S. experience problems with pain (Institute of Medicine, 2011). Pain interference, the perceived disruption in functioning resulting from physical pain, is an important focus of pain assessment and treatment (Kalliomäki et al., 2008). Higher levels of pain interference are associated with increased risk of psychopathology and general medical conditions (Barry et al., 2012), and can attenuate treatment response for anxiety and depression (Kroenke et al., 2008; Means-Christensen et al., 2008; Teh et al., 2009). Although Hispanic individuals comprise about 17% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015), few studies have systematically examined their pain experiences. Research comparing Hispanic and white individuals on pain interference has focused on individuals with chronic pain (i.e., non-cancer-related pain lasting at least three months). A national survey study of adults with chronic pain found that Hispanic and white respondents had comparable levels of pain interference, but white respondents were more likely to visit a physician for pain (Portenoy et al., 2004). In a study of treatment-seeking patients with chronic pain, Hispanic and white participants exhibited similar levels of psychiatric symptoms (Edwards et al., 2005). Few studies have examined ethnic group differences in pain among non-clinical samples in the U.S. In the 2000 Health and Retirement Study, which included community-dwelling adults aged 51 years or older, Hispanic and white respondents did not differ significantly on rates of moderate or severe pain interference (Reyes-Gibby et al., 2007). One laboratory study of healthy adults examined ethnic group differences in response to pain-related cold and heat, and found that Hispanic subjects exhibited lower pain tolerance than their white counterparts (Rahim-Williams et al., 2007).

Researchers have largely ignored an examination of pain interference and associated psychiatric or medical morbidity among Hispanic and white individuals in the general U.S. population. Epidemiological databases frequently omit variables targeting pain and ethnicity or contain insufficient samples of minority members to facilitate ethnicity-based comparisons (Tait et al., 2004). One notable exception is the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC), a nationally representative survey, which oversampled Hispanic respondents and assessed pain interference as well as both psychopathology and general medical conditions. The purpose of the current study was to extend prior work on pain interference by comparing levels of pain interference and associated psychopathology and general medical conditions in Hispanic and white NESARC respondents. Given that white respondents were more likely to seek help for pain while

experiencing similar levels of pain interference (Portenoy et al., 2004), we hypothesized that Hispanic respondents would have weaker relationships between pain interference and both general medical as well as psychiatric conditions.

#### 2. Methods

#### 2.1. Sample

The NESARC was conducted by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the U.S. Census Bureau, and recruited a nationally representative sample of non-institutionalized U.S. citizens and non-citizens aged 18 years and older (Grant et al., 2003a; Grant et al., 2004a). To facilitate the investigation of alcohol use in ethnic minority and young populations, the NESARC over-sampled Hispanic households and individuals 18 to 24 years of age. Multi-stage cluster sampling was used to identify respondents: Census sampling units, households, and then members of households were sequentially sampled. Individuals residing in hospitals, jails, or prisons were excluded. The sample was augmented with residents of group living environments, such as shelters, dormitories, group homes, and facilities for housing workers. Weights have been calculated to adjust standard errors for these over-samples, the cluster sampling strategy, and non-responses (Grant et al., 2003b).

The NESARC sample consisted of 43,093 respondents with an overall response rate of 81 percent. For the purposes of the present study, we restricted the sample to 32,574 respondents who self-identified as Hispanic or non-Hispanic white and provided information about their level of pain interference. Respondents provided informed consent. The current cross-sectional retrospective study of publicly accessible, population-based, de-identified data from the NESARC was presented to the Yale Human Investigations Committee, and was exempted from IRB review.

#### 2.2. Measures

- **2.2.1. Sociodemographics**—Respondents provided information about their gender (male, female), ethnicity/race (Hispanic or Latino, white), marital status (married, previously married, never married), education (less than high-school, high-school graduate, some college, college or higher), employment (full-time, part-time, not working), age, and household annual income.
- 2.2.2. Psychiatric disorders—Trained lay interviewers collected information on specific DSM-IV Axis-I psychiatric disorders using the Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disability Interview Schedule-DSM-IV version (AUDADIS-IV) (American Psychiatric Association, 2000; Grant et al., 2003a). The AUDADIS-IV is a structured diagnostic interview with demonstrated test-retest reliability and has been found to be useful for detecting psychiatric disorders in community samples (Grant et al., 2003a). The NESARC did not assess all DSM-IV Axis-I psychiatric disorders because of concerns about respondent burden and time constraints (Grant et al., 2005). Consistent with prior research (Grant et al., 2009), we used the following psychiatric disorders and categories (accessible at http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/NESARCDRM/NESARCDRM.htm): mood disorders (major depression, dysthymia, mania, hypomania); anxiety disorders (panic disorder without

agoraphobia, panic disorder with agoraphobia, social phobia, specific phobia, generalized anxiety disorder); and substance-use disorders (alcohol abuse or dependence, nicotine dependence, drug abuse or dependence). Past-year Axis-I diagnoses with general-medical-condition and substance-use exclusions were used; thus, research diagnoses can be viewed as primary or orthogonal as per DSM-IV/DSM-IV-TR guidelines (American Psychiatric Association, 2000; Desai and Potenza, 2008).

**2.2.3. Pain interference**—Pain interference was assessed using a subscale from the 12-item short form self-report scale (SF-12) of health-related quality of life (HRQL) (Ware et al., 1996). Similar to previous studies, respondents' answers to the 5-point item: "During the past 4 weeks, how much did pain interfere with your normal work (including both work outside the home and housework)" were used to classify them into one of three groups: a) "no or low pain interference" (i.e., those reporting their pain interference as "not at all" or "a little bit"); b) "moderate pain interference" (i.e., those reporting their pain interference as "moderate"); and c) "severe pain interference" (i.e., those reporting their pain interference as "a lot" or "extreme") (Barry et al., 2012; Novak et al., 2009).

**2.2.4. General medical conditions**—Respondents were asked whether they had experienced in the past year any of the following 11 general medical conditions: angina, tachycardia, myocardial infarction, other heart disease, cirrhosis, other liver disease, stomach ulcer, gastritis, arthritis, arteriosclerosis, and hypertension. For each condition reported, respondents were asked whether a physician or other medical professional had diagnosed it. Only general medical conditions which respondents reported were diagnosed by a physician or other medical professional were considered positive (Goldstein et al., 2009).

#### 2.3. Data analysis

The primary research question concerned differences among Hispanic and white respondents in the association between past-month pain interference and psychiatric disorders or general medical conditions. Data analyses proceeded in multiple steps. First, using chi-square tests  $(\chi^2)$ , we examined the associations between pain interference and sociodemographics (gender, marital status, education, employment, age, and household annual income), stratified by ethnicity (Hispanic and white). Second, we examined unadjusted weighted rates of psychiatric disorders and general medical conditions according to levels of pain interference (i.e., no or low pain interference [NPI], moderate pain interference [MPI], severe pain interference [SPI]), stratified by ethnicity. Third, we fitted a series of multivariable logistic regression models to examine the relationships between any Axis-I psychiatric disorder and any general medical condition and pain interference within ethnicity/race. We conducted subsequent analyses with subgroupings and individual disorders or conditions to determine the provenance of significant findings. We adjusted for potentially confounding sociodemographic variables (i.e., gender, marital status, education, employment, age, and household annual income). The NPI category was used as a reference level for two sets of adjusted odds ratios: MPI versus NPI and SPI versus NPI. Interaction odds ratios were calculated to assess whether the adjusted odds ratios for Hispanic respondents were significantly different from those for white respondents. Given the configuration of the study sample and the goal of estimating as accurately as possible the

national rates of comorbid psychiatric disorders and general medical conditions, analyses were performed using NESARC-calculated weights and SUDAAN software (Research Triangle Institute, 2001). Thus, sample proportions are based on weighted percentages. The statistical significance of the interaction term was evaluated with statistical significance set at p < 0.05.

#### 3. Results

Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 90 years (M = 45.8, SE = 0.20); 48.5 % were men (n = 14,467) and 51.5% were women (n = 18,107). More than one-half (64.1% [n = 17,996]) of the sample was married, 84.9% (n = 26,836) had graduated high school, and 53.4% (n = 16,785) worked fulltime. A minority of the sample (26.6% [n = 7,004]) reported an annual household income of at least \$70,000 (weighted percentages provided). Of the respondents, 14.03% self-identified as Hispanic (n = 8,257) and 85.97% as non-Hispanic white (n = 24,317). In comparison to white respondents, Hispanic respondents were more likely to be male (50.8% vs. 48.1%), have never married (24.4% vs. 17.8%), have less than a high-school level of education (38.8% vs. 11.3%), be younger (38.4 years old vs. 47.0 years old), and to have an annual household income below \$20,000 (28.8% vs. 18.5%) (all p's <0.01).

Associations between pain-interference levels and sociodemographic characteristics were largely similar for Hispanic and white respondents (Table 1). The NPI, as compared to the MPI and SPI groups, more frequently acknowledged having never married, having at least some college, being employed full-time, being younger, and having an annual household income of at least \$70,000.

#### 3.1. Pain interference

The majority (n=26,005; 80.7%) of respondents reported no or low levels of pain interference. Significant ethnic/racial differences in pain interference were observed (p<0.001); relative to white respondents, Hispanic respondents had lower rates of moderate (5.7% vs. 7.8%) and severe pain interference (11.4% vs. 11.9%), and higher rates of no or low pain interference (82.9% vs. 80.3%).

#### 3.2. Pain interference and psychopathology

Table 2 summarizes the patterns of associations observed between pain-interference levels and psychiatric morbidity among Hispanic and white respondents. Significant associations were observed between pain interference and any Axis-I disorder, any mood disorder, and any anxiety disorder in both Hispanic and white respondents. The association between pain interference and any substance-use disorder was significant in white but not in Hispanic respondents. Differences were suggested between Hispanic and white respondents within three of the contributing categories in the Axis-I disorder domain (mood disorder, anxiety disorder and substance-use disorder). The associations between pain interference levels and mania, hypomania, social phobia, specific phobia, and nicotine dependence were significant at p<0.05 for white but not for Hispanic respondents.

Adjusted odds ratios from multivariable models investigating the strengths of associations between psychiatric disorders and pain-interference-level groups are presented for Hispanic

and white respondents, using same-ethnicity NPI group as the reference group (Table 3). In both Hispanic and white respondents, the odds of any Axis-I disorder were elevated in association with moderate or severe pain interference. Additionally, in white but not Hispanic respondents, the odds of any anxiety disorder and any substance-use disorder were elevated in association with severe pain interference, and the odds of any mood disorder, major depression, any anxiety disorder, panic disorder without agoraphobia, generalized anxiety disorder, any substance-use disorder and nicotine dependence were elevated in association with moderate pain interference. Interaction analyses indicated different relationships for Hispanic and white respondents for two psychiatric disorders. A stronger relationship was observed in Hispanic compared to white respondents between severe pain interference and any mood disorder (OR = 1.36, p < 0.05), and a stronger relationship was observed in white as compared to Hispanic respondents between severe pain interference and social phobia (OR = 0.42, p < 0.05).

#### 3.3. Pain interference and general medical conditions

As summarized in Table 2, for both Hispanic and white respondents, general medical conditions tended to occur more frequently among those with moderate or severe compared to no or low pain interference. The most frequently occurring general medical conditions among NPI, MPI, and SPI groups were arthritis and hypertension. As summarized in Table 3, for both Hispanic and white respondents, the adjusted odds of any general medical condition were elevated in association with moderate and severe pain interference compared to no or low pain interference. Interaction analyses yielded significant ethnicity-/race-related differences in the relationship between pain interference and four general medical conditions. Compared to white respondents, Hispanic respondents exhibited a stronger relationship between moderate pain interference and any heart condition (OR=1.58, p<0.05) tachycardia (OR=2.13, p<0.05), and hypertension (OR=1.34, p<0.05). Compared to Hispanic respondents, white respondents exhibited a stronger relationship between severe pain interference and any stomach condition (OR=0.73, p<0.05).

#### 4. Discussion

To our knowledge, this cross-sectional retrospective study is among the first to both compare the prevalence of pain interference levels in a nationally representative U.S. sample of Hispanic and white adults and to examine whether ethnicity moderates relationships between pain interference and psychiatric disorders as well as general medical conditions. Rates of moderate and severe pain interference were higher in white compared to Hispanic respondents. Multiple potentially important group differences emerged in the strength of the associations between pain interference and both psychiatric disorders and general medical conditions, which only partially confirmed our hypotheses.

#### 4.1. Pain interference

Findings from the current study indicating that white respondents had higher rates of moderate and severe pain interference contrast with those from prior studies on a) patients with chronic pain in which Hispanics and white respondents had similar levels of pain interference (Portenoy et al., 2004), b) middle-aged and older community-dwelling adults in

which Hispanic and white respondents reported comparable rates of moderate and severe pain interference (Reyes-Gibby et al., 2007), and c) healthy adults which found that Hispanic laboratory subjects exhibited lower pain tolerance than white subjects in response to pain-related cold and heat (Rahim-Williams et al., 2007). The extent to which differences in study samples (e.g., clinical vs. non-clinical), types of pain (e.g., chronic vs. acute), design (e.g., survey vs. experimental), data analytic procedures (e.g., covariates), and measures (e.g., wording of pain interference measures) account for possible inconsistencies in study findings is unclear and merits further investigation. The higher rates of severe pain interference in white compared to Hispanic respondents differ from NESARC findings indicating that African American respondents exhibited higher rates of severe pain interference than white respondents (Barry et al., 2016). In the current study, ethnic group differences in pain interference levels were statistically significant (and relatively small); given the psychiatric and medical burden accompanying moderate and severe levels of pain interference, even small statistically significant differences may have important clinical relevance.

#### 4.2. Pain interference and psychopathology

Consistent with findings from previous epidemiological studies, respondents with moderate or severe pain interference compared to those with no or low pain interference had elevated rates of mood and anxiety disorders (McWilliams et al., 2008; McWilliams et al., 2003; McWilliams et al., 2004; Ohayon and Schatzberg, 2010; Scudds and Ostbye, 2001; Thomas et al., 2007). Our findings extend those from prior studies by demonstrating a stronger relationship in Hispanic compared to white respondents between severe pain interference and any mood disorder as well as a stronger relationship in white compared to Hispanic respondents between severe pain interference and social phobia. Research to date on the associations between pain and depression in Hispanic and white individuals has focused on clinical samples and has yielded mixed findings. Survey studies of respondents with chronic pain found no significant differences between Hispanic and white respondents on self-reported mood (Portenoy et al., 2004) or depressive symptoms (Edwards et al., 2005), while a study of patients with rheumatoid arthritis found that Hispanic participants were more likely than white ones to screen positive for depression (Escalante et al., 2000).

To assist in the interpretation of the findings of the current study, we note that prior research on the NESARC has found that white compared to Hispanic respondents exhibit higher lifetime and current rates of mood disorder (20.6% vs. 14.1% and 5.5% vs. 2.9%) and social phobia (9.4% vs. 7.9% and 3.0% vs. 1.9%) (Damush et al., 2016; Grant et al., 2004b). Since untreated pain can attenuate treatment response to depression, and depression, in turn, can worsen treatment outcomes for patients with pain (Means-Christensen et al., 2008, Teh et al., 2009), the stronger relationship between severe pain interference and any mood disorder among Hispanic compared to white respondents represents a potentially important health-related ethnic disparity. Findings from this study suggest that it may be particularly important for clinicians to assess for pain interference in Hispanic patients with depression (and to assess for mood disorders in those who present with severe pain interference). While effective treatment for co-occurring chronic pain and depression has traditionally proven

elusive, a recent study suggests the possible merits of a combined pharmacologic and behavioral treatment approach for these co-existing conditions (Damush et al., 2016).

The current study builds on previous research by documenting the rates of anxiety disorders associated with pain interference levels in Hispanic individuals (Hollingshead et al., 2016). The stronger association between social phobia and severe pain interference in white compared to Hispanic respondents is noteworthy since many interdisciplinary treatment programs for persistent pain use group modalities; patients with social anxiety may not benefit from group therapies and may require more individual modality treatments (Wurm et al., 2016). Currently, the temporal associations between psychiatric variables and pain interference among Hispanic and white respondents are unclear and merit further investigation. While the odds ratios for many of observed statistical differences were relatively modest, psychiatric disorders and general medical conditions can significantly diminish functioning; thus, even small increases in the likelihood of occurrence of psychiatric and general medical conditions among respondents with moderate or severe pain interference (compared to those with no or low) may be clinically important.

#### 4.3. Pain interference and general medical conditions

Multivariate analyses revealed ethnicity-related differences in the relationships between pain interference and multiple general medical conditions, including any heart condition, tachycardia, any stomach condition, and hypertension. Given the cross-sectional design, the temporal associations of these study variables were unclear. For example, it is possible that Hispanic and white respondents respond differently to pain interference (e.g., diet, exercise, medications used), which may affect their subsequent risk for developing hypertension and any heart condition, generally, or tachycardia, specifically. Alternatively, respondents may vary by ethnicity in the extent to which they seek (or receive) treatment for any heart condition, tachycardia, any stomach condition, and hypertension, which in turn may result in differing susceptibility to moderate or severe pain interference. Regardless of etiology, these findings highlight the challenges faced by providers in redressing possible ethnicity-based disparities in pain management, which requires attending to both comorbid psychiatric and medical conditions in addition to levels of pain interference (Barry et al., 2016). Compared to white individuals, Hispanic individuals are less likely to visit physicians for pain (Portenoy et al., 2004) and little is known about their willingness to use nonpharmacological treatments for pain (e.g., psychosocial interventions, physical therapy) (Hollingshead et al., 2016).

#### 4.4. Limitations

This study has limitations. The cross-sectional design precludes statements regarding causation among study variables. A single item from the SF-12 Pain interference was used to assess pain interference. Although this measure has been used in prior epidemiologic and community studies (Barry et al., 2012; Blyth et al., 2004; Goldstein et al., 2009; Novak et al., 2009; Thomas et al., 2007), further research in this area may benefit from a more comprehensive measure of pain interference (e.g., West Haven-Yale multidimensional Pain Inventory (Kerns et al., 1985); Brief Pain Inventory-Short Form (Cleeland, 1991)). Given concerns about response burden, the NESARC did not exhaustively assess psychiatric

disorders and general medical conditions. Consequently, specific diagnoses of potential clinical relevance to pain interference were not assessed, such as sleep-wake disorders and sexual dysfunctions and disorders. Future investigations of the psychiatric correlates of pain interference might benefit from the inclusion of measures that assess these conditions. Several components of respondents' pain experiences which might have informed the findings regarding associations between pain interference and psychiatric as well as medical conditions were not measured, including pain characteristics (e.g., intensity, duration), pain response (e.g., catastrophizing, treatments used), and resources (e.g., social support). Finally, findings from the NESARC may not generalize to individuals seeking or enrolled in treatment.

#### 4.5. Conclusions

Despite these limitations, this study represents an important initial examination of differences in the pattern of psychiatric and medical comorbidity associated with varying levels of pain interference among a nationally representative sample of Hispanic and white adults in the U.S. These differences underscore the complexity of ethnic health disparities, and suggest the importance of further study of possible underlying mechanisms, including sociocultural factors (Bui et al., 2011; Zamora-Kapoor et al., 2015) and attitudes and behaviors related to pain and healthcare (Hollingshead et al., 2016; Shavers et al., 2010).

#### **Acknowledgments**

This study was supported in part by (1) the National Institute of Health (RL1 AA017539, T32 MH014235); (2) the National Center for Responsible Gaming; and (3) the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse.

Dr. Barry has consulted for a law office in issues concerning chronic pain and substance-use disorders; presented academic lectures in CME events, and other clinical or scientific venues; has received research support from the National Institutes of Health and the APT Foundation; and has conducted grant reviews for the National Institutes of Health and other agencies.

Dr. Potenza has consulted for Ironwood, Lundbeck, Boehringer Ingelheim, Shire, INSYS, RiverMend Health, Opiant/Lakelight Therapeutics and Jazz Pharmaceuticals; has received research support from the National Institutes of Health, Veteran's Administration, Mohegan Sun Casino, the National Center for Responsible Gaming, Pfizer, and Psyadon Pharmaceuticals; has participated in surveys, mailings or telephone consultations related to drug addiction, impulse control disorders or other health topics; has consulted for gambling and legal entities on issues related to impulse control disorders; provides clinical care in the Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services Problem Gambling Services Program; has performed grant reviews for the National Institutes of Health and other agencies; has guest-edited journal sections; has given academic lectures in grand rounds, CME events and other clinical or scientific venues; and has generated books or book chapters for publishers of mental health texts.

#### References

- American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 4th. text revision American Psychiatric Association; Washington, DC: 2000.
- Barry DT, Pilver C, Potenza MN, Desai RA. Prevalence and psychiatric correlates of pain interference among men and women in the general population. J Psychiatr Res. 2012; 46(1):118–127. [PubMed: 21944430]
- Barry DT, Pilver Glenn C, Hoff RA, Potenza MN. Pain interference, psychopathology, and general medical conditions among black and white adults in the US general population. J Addict Med. 2017 In Press.
- Blyth FM, March LM, Brnabic AJM, Cousins MJ. Chronic pain and frequent use of health care. Pain. 2004; 111(1–2):51–58. [PubMed: 15327808]

Bui Q, Doescher M, Takeuchi D, Taylor V. Immigration, acculturation and chronic back and neck problems among Latino-Americans. J Immigr Minor Health. 2011; 13(2):194–201. [PubMed: 20680453]

- Cleeland, CS. Pain assessment in cancer. In: Osaba, D., editor. Effect of Cancer on Quality of Life. CRC Press; Boca Raton, FL: 1991. p. 293-305.
- Damush T, Kroenke K, Bair M, Wu J, Tu W, Krebs E, Poleshuck E. Pain self-management training increases self-efficacy, self-management behaviours and pain and depression outcomes. European Journal of Pain. 2016; doi: 10.1002/ejp.830
- Desai RA, Potenza MN. Gender differences in the associations between past-year gambling problems and psychiatric disorders. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2008; 43(3):173–183. [PubMed: 18080792]
- Edwards RR, Moric M, Husfeldt B, Buvanendran A, Ivankovich O. Ethnic similarities and differences in the chronic pain experience: a comparison of African American, Hispanic, and white patients. Pain Med. 2005; 6(1):88–98. [PubMed: 15669954]
- Escalante A, del Rincón I, Mulrow CD. Symptoms of depression and psychological distress among Hispanics with rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis Care & Research. 2000; 13(3):156–167. [PubMed: 14635289]
- Goldstein BI, Houck PR, Karp JF. Factors associated with pain interference in an epidemiologic sample of adults with bipolar I disorder. J Affect Disord. 2009; 117(3):151–156. [PubMed: 19203799]
- Grant BF, Dawson DA, Stinson FS, Chou PS, Kay W, Pickering R. The Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule-IV (AUDADIS-IV): reliability of alcohol consumption, tobacco use, family history of depression and psychiatric diagnostic modules in a general population sample. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2003a; 71(1):7–16. [PubMed: 12821201]
- Grant BF, Hasin DS, Stinson FS, Dawson DA, Chou SP, Ruan WJ, Huang B. Cooccurrence of 12-month mood and anxiety disorders and personality disorders in the US: results from the national epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions. J Psychiatr Res. 2005; 39:1–9. [PubMed: 15504418]
- Grant, BF., Moore, TC., Shepard, J., Kaplan, K. Source and accuracy statement: Wave 1 National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC). National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism; Bethesda, MD: 2003b.
- Grant BF, Stinson FS, Dawson DA, Chou SP, Dufour MC, Compton W, Pickering RP, Kaplan K. Prevalence and co-occurrence of substance use disorders and independent mood and anxiety disorders: results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2004a; 61:807–816. [PubMed: 15289279]
- Grant BF, Stinson FS, Hasin DS, Dawson DA, Chou SP, Anderson K. Immigration and lifetime prevalence of DSM-IV psychiatric disorders among mexican americans and non-Hispanic whites in the United States: results from the national epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2004b; 61(12):1226–1233. [PubMed: 15583114]
- Grant JE, Desai RA, Potenza MN. Relationship of nicotine dependence, subsyndromal and pathological gambling, and other psychiatric disorders: data from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. J Clin Psychiatry. 2009; 70(3):334–343. [PubMed: 19254518]
- Hollingshead NA, Ashburn-Nardo L, Stewart JC, Hirsh AT. The pain experience of Hispanic Americans: A Critical Literature Review and Conceptual Model. J Pain. 2016; 17(5):513–528. [PubMed: 26831836]
- Institute of Medicine. Relieving pain in America: a blueprint for transforming prevention, care, education and research. The National Academies Press; Washington, DC: 2011.
- Kalliomäki ML, Meyerson J, Gunnarsson U, Gordh T, Sandblom G. Long-term pain after inguinal hernia repair in a population-based cohort; risk factors and interference with daily activities. Eur J Pain. 2008; 12(2):214–225. [PubMed: 17606392]
- Kerns RD, Turk DC, Rudy TE. The West Haven-Yale Multidimensional Pain Inventory (WHYMPI). Pain. 1985; 23(4):345–356. [PubMed: 4088697]

Kroenke K, Shen J, Oxman TE, Williams JW Jr, Dietrich AJ. Impact of pain on the outcomes of depression treatment: results from the RESPECT trial. Pain. 2008; 134:209–215. [PubMed: 18022319]

- McWilliams LA, Clara IP, Murphy PDJ, Cox BJ, Sareen J. Associations between arthritis and a broad range of psychiatric disorders: findings from a nationally representative sample. J Pain. 2008; 9(1): 37–44. [PubMed: 17890160]
- McWilliams LA, Cox BJ, Enns MW. Mood and anxiety disorders associated with chronic pain: an examination in a nationally representative sample. Pain. 2003; 106(1–2):127–133. [PubMed: 14581119]
- McWilliams LA, Goodwin RD, Cox BJ. Depression and anxiety associated with three pain conditions: results from a nationally representative sample. Pain. 2004; 111(1–2):77–83. [PubMed: 15327811]
- Means-Christensen AJ, Roy-Byrne PP, Sherbourne CD, Craske MG, Stein MB. Relationships among pain, anxiety, and depression in primary care. Depress Anxiety. 2008; 25(7):593–600. [PubMed: 17932958]
- Novak SP, Herman-Stahl M, Flannery B, Zimmerman M. Physical pain, common psychiatric and substance use disorders, and the non-medical use of prescription analgesics in the United States. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2009; 100:63–70. [PubMed: 19010611]
- Ohayon MM, Schatzberg AF. Chronic pain and major depressive disorder in the general population. J Psychiatr Res. 2010; 44(7):454–461. [PubMed: 20149391]
- Portenoy RK, Ugarte C, Fuller I, Haas G. Population-based survey of pain in the United States: differences among white, African American, and Hispanic subjects. J Pain. 2004; 5(6):317–328. [PubMed: 15336636]
- Rahim-Williams FB, Riley JL, Herrera D, Campbell CM, Hastie BA, Fillingim RB. Ethnic identity predicts experimental pain sensitivity in African Americans and Hispanics. Pain. 2007; 129(1): 177–184. [PubMed: 17296267]
- Research Triangle Institute. SUDAAN Software. Research Triangle Institute; Research Triangle Park, Durham, NC: 2001.
- Reyes-Gibby CC, Aday LA, Todd KH, Cleeland CS, Anderson KO. Pain in aging community-dwelling adults in the United States: non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, and Hispanics. J Pain. 2007; 8(1):75–84. [PubMed: 16949874]
- Scudds RJ, Ostbye T. Pain and pain-related interference with function in older Canadians: the Canadian study of health and aging. Disabil Rehabil. 2001; 23(15):654–664. [PubMed: 11720115]
- Shavers VL, Bakos A, Sheppard VB. Race, ethnicity, and pain among the US adult population. J Health Care Poor Underserved. 2010; 21(1):177–220. [PubMed: 20173263]
- Tait RC, Chibnall JT, Andresen EM, Hadler NM. Management of occupational back injuries: differences among African Americans and Caucasians. Pain. 2004; 112(3):389–396. [PubMed: 15561395]
- Teh CF, Morone NE, Karp JF, Belnap BH, Zhu F, Weiner DK, Rollman BL. Pain interference impacts response to treatment for anxiety disorders. Depress Anxiety. 2009; 26:222–228. [PubMed: 19133701]
- Thomas E, Mottram S, Peat G, Wilkie R, Croft P. The effect of age on the onset of pain interference in a general population of older adults: prospective findings from the North Staffordshire Osteoarthritis Project (NorStOp). Pain. 2007; 129:21–27. [PubMed: 17084980]
- U.S. Census Bureau. Annual Estimates of the Resident Population by Sex, Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin for the United States and States: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2014. 2015
- Ware JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. Med Care. 1996:220–233. [PubMed: 8628042]
- Wurm M, Edlund S, Tillfors M, Boersma K. Characteristics and consequences of the cooccurrence between social anxiety and pain-related fear in chronic pain patients receiving multimodal pain rehabilitation treatment. Scandinavian Journal of Pain. 2016; 12:45–52. [PubMed: 28850490]
- Zamora-Kapoor A, Omidpanah A, Monico E, Buchwald D, Harris R, Jimenez N. The role of language use in reports of musculoskeletal pain among Hispanic and non-Hispanic white adolescents. J Transcult Nurs. 2017; 28(2):124–151.

#### Highlights

- Examined pain interference in Hispanic and white adults
- Hispanic adults were less likely to report moderate or severe pain interference
- Ethnicity moderated links between pain, psychopathology and medical conditions

**Author Manuscript** 

Table 1

Sociodemographic characteristics of black and white respondents by pain interference levels. 1

No/Low Pain         Moderate Pain         Severe Pain $\chi^2$ p         No/Low Pain $n=6,745^2$ $n=539^2$ $n=973^2$ $n=19,260^2$ $m=19,260^2$ $8$ $8$ $8$ $8$ $8$ $8$ $4.78$ $5.54$ $5.59$ $2.00$ $2.00$ $2.00$ $6.28$ $44.6$ $44.1$ $8.62$ $6.01$ $49.4$ $2.00$ $6.28$ $64.9$ $64.8$ $61.8$ $8.6$ $6.01$ $49.4$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$ $1.00$		His	Hispanic Respondents	S			W	White Respondents			
istics % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % % %		No/Low Pain	Moderate Pain	Severe Pain	$\chi^{2}$	d	No/Low Pain	Moderate Pain	Severe Pain	$\chi^2$	d
instics		$n=6,745^2$	$n=539^2$	$n=973^2$			$n=19,260^2$	$n=2,001^2$	$n=3,056^2$		Ī
tatus         7.00         .002           sutus         52.2         44.6         44.1         8.62         <.001           sutus         62.8         64.9         61.8         8.62         <.001           y married         10.9         20.4         23.1         7.         49.4           m         26.3         14.7         15.1         7.         49.2           HS         37.0         47.9         47.0         7.         9.0           ate         26.0         24.4         21.8         7.         30.0           ate         26.0         24.4         21.8         7.         30.0           ate         10.0         9.7         8.4         7.         30.0           ate         10.0         9.7         8.4         4.0         4.2.4           ate         28.2         40.2         5.5         4.0         4.2.4           ate </td <td>Characteristics</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td>%</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Characteristics	%	%	%			%	%	%		
state         55.4         55.9         8.62         8.06           status         44.6         44.1         8.62         < 6001         49.4           status         62.8         64.9         61.8         8.62         < 6001         49.4           y married         10.9         20.4         23.1         7         15.7         15.7           mried         26.3         14.7         15.1         7         15.2         19.2           r HS         37.0         47.9         47.0         7         9.0         9.0           ate         26.0         24.4         21.8         7         9.0         9.0           sege         24.5         20.5         21.5         7         9.2         30.0           rent         61.8         41.1         35.1         25.5          30.0           rent         61.8         41.1         35.1         25.5          40.1         35.0           rent         61.8         41.1         35.1         42.2         40.0         45.2 ± 0.2           rent         62.3         42.4          42.2          42.2	Gender				7.00	.002				25.02	<0.001
satus     52.2     44.6     44.1     862     <.001       y married     62.8     64.9     61.8     65.1       y married     10.9     20.4     23.1     7     15.7       urried     26.3     14.7     15.1     7     15.7       n     10.9     20.4     21.8     7     9.0       i HS     37.0     47.9     47.0     9.0     9.0       i HS     26.5     21.5     7.2     9.7     30.0       lege     24.5     20.5     21.5     7     9.2       lege     24.5     20.5     21.5     7     30.0       sent     61.8     41.1     35.1     7     30.0       sent     61.8     41.1     35.1     7     57.9       ing     28.2     49.2     56.5     85.9     <001	Female	47.8	55.4	55.9			50.6	57.3	57.5		
8.62     64.9     61.8     8.62     <.001       y married     10.9     20.4     23.1     15.7     15.7       n     26.3     14.7     15.1     15.7     19.2       n     37.0     47.9     47.0     9.0       tHS     37.0     47.9     47.0     9.0       tHS     26.0     24.4     21.8     21.5     29.2       tege     24.5     20.5     21.5     21.5     30.0       nt higher     12.5     7.2     9.7     31.8       nt higher     12.5     7.2     9.7     30.0       nent     61.8     41.1     35.1     25.5     40.1       ing     28.2     49.2     56.5     20.1     45.2±0.2       ing     28.2     40.2     45.6±0.9     85.94     <001	Male	52.2	44.6	44.1			49.4	42.7	42.5		
y married 10.9 20.4 61.8 5.1 15.1 15.1 15.7 15.7 15.7 15.1 15.1	Marital status				8.62	<.001				38.56	<0.001
ried 26.3 14.7 15.1 3.32 0.007 19.2 ried 26.3 14.7 15.1 3.32 0.007 19.2 ried 26.3 14.7 15.1 3.32 0.007 19.2 ried 26.0 24.4 21.8 21.8 20.5 21.5 21.5 21.8 30.0 ent 12.5 7.2 9.7 21.5 21.8 30.0 ent 10.0 9.7 8.4 20.0 19.2 28.2 49.2 56.5 20.1 25.0 11.4 age ± SE) 3 6.8 ± 0.4 47.0 ± 1.1 45.6 ± 0.9 56.5 20.1 25.9 40.4 47.0 ± 1.1 45.6 ± 0.9 56.5 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.9 20.1 25.	Married	62.8	64.9	61.8			65.1	62.6	60.4		
rried 26.3 14.7 15.1 3.32 0.007 9.0 9.0 14.3 14.2 15.1 3.32 0.007 9.0 14.0 15.1 3.32 0.007 9.0 14.0 15.1 3.32 0.007 9.0 14.0 15.2 15.2 15.2 15.2 15.2 15.2 15.2 15.2	Previously married	10.9	20.4	23.1			15.7	25.5	27.5		
HS 37.0 47.9 47.0 9.0 ute 26.0 24.4 21.8 21.8 29.2 ege 24.5 20.5 21.5 21.5 31.8 30.0 ent 12.5 12.5 20.5 21.5 21.5 21.8 31.8 20.2 20.5 21.5 21.5 21.8 31.8 20.0 ent 12.5 20.5 21.5 21.5 21.8 30.0 ent 10.0 9.7 8.4 21.1 35.1 25.0 20.1 25.0 40.4 47.0±1.1 45.6±0.9 85.94 <0.001 45.2±0.2 21.5 25.0 40.4 43.8 23.9 24.3 23.9 24.3 23.9 24.3 24.3 23.9 24.3 24.3 23.9 24.3 24.3 23.9 24.3 24.3 23.9 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3	Never married	26.3	14.7	15.1			19.2	11.9	12.1		
HS 37.0 47.9 47.0 9.0 et te 26.0 24.4 21.8 21.8 29.2 ege 24.5 20.5 21.5 7.2 9.7 31.8 31.8 et thigher 12.5 7.2 9.7 4.1 35.1 9.25 <.001 1.1.4 et thigher 10.0 9.7 8.4 5.0 1 11.4 et thigher 10.0 10.0 9.7 8.4 5.0 1 11.4 et thigher 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.	Education				3.32	0.007				27.65	<0.001
tee 26.0 24.4 21.8 2.9.2 29.2 29.2 21.5 21.5 21.5 21.5 21.5 21.5 21.5 21	Less than HS	37.0	47.9	47.0			9.0	18.1	22.1		
ege 24.5 20.5 21.5 3.18 30.0 ent thigher 12.5 7.2 9.7 4.2 30.0 ent thigher 12.5 7.2 9.7 4.1 35.1 20.0 ent thigher 10.0 9.7 8.4 5.5 6.001 28.2 49.2 56.5 30.7 anage±SE) <sup>3</sup> 36.8±0.4 47.0±1.1 45.6±0.9 85.94 6.0001 45.2±0.2 ent thigh	HS graduate	26.0	24.4	21.8			29.2	32.9	34.3		
ent 61.8 7.2 9.7 <.001 ent 61.8 41.1 35.1 ng 28.2 49.2 age ± SE) 3 6.8±0.4 annual income 40.4 47.0±1.1 25.9 40.4 43.8 25.9 40.4 43.8 25.9 40.4 53.9 54.3 25.9 56.5 25.9 40.4 43.8 25.9 56.5 25.9 40.4 43.8 25.9 56.5 25.9 40.4 43.8 25.9 56.5 25.9 56.5 26.0 56.5 27.0 56.5 <td>Some college</td> <td>24.5</td> <td>20.5</td> <td>21.5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>31.8</td> <td>30.7</td> <td>28.0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Some college	24.5	20.5	21.5			31.8	30.7	28.0		
ent 61.8 41.1 35.1 57.9    ng 28.2 49.2 56.5 3.7 30.7    nage ± SE) 3 36.8±0.4 47.0±1.1 45.6±0.9 85.94 <.0001 45.2±0.2    nage ± SE) 3 40.4 43.8 15.5    11.4 11.4 11.4 11.4 11.4 11.4 11.4 1	College or higher	12.5	7.2	6.7			30.0	18.3	15.6		
ng 28.2 49.2 56.5 11.4 11.4 11.4 11.4 11.4 11.4 11.4 11	Employment				9.25	<.001				54.40	<0.001
$10.0 \qquad 9.7 \qquad 8.4 \qquad 11.4$ $28.2 \qquad 49.2 \qquad 56.5 \qquad 30.7$ $al income$ $25.9 \qquad 40.4 \qquad 43.8 \qquad 15.5$ $26.7 \qquad 24.3 \qquad 40.4 \qquad 43.8$ $26.7 \qquad 25.6 \qquad 20.1 \qquad 18.0$ $32.4 \qquad 23.9 \qquad 24.3 \qquad 35.2$	Full time	8.19	41.1	35.1			57.9	36.3	28.6		
$28.2 \qquad 49.2 \qquad 56.5 \qquad 30.7$ $= SE)^3 \qquad 36.8\pm0.4 \qquad 47.0\pm1.1 \qquad 45.6\pm0.9 \qquad 85.94 \qquad <.0001 \qquad 45.2\pm0.2$ $25.9 \qquad 40.4 \qquad 43.8 \qquad 15.5$ $26.7 \qquad 25.6 \qquad 20.1 \qquad 18.0$ $32.4 \qquad 23.9 \qquad 24.3 \qquad 35.2$	Part time	10.0	7.6	8.4			11.4	10.1	7.0		
alincome $47.0\pm1.1$ $45.6\pm0.9$ $85.94$ <.0001 $45.2\pm0.2$ $4.0\pm0.0$ $4.42$ <.001 $45.2\pm0.2$ $40.4$ $43.8$ $45.8$ $15.5$ $26.7$ $25.6$ $20.1$ $18.0$ $32.4$ $23.9$ $24.3$ $35.2$	Not working	28.2	49.2	5.95			30.7	53.6	64.4		
al income 4.42 <.001 25.9 40.4 43.8 15.5 26.7 25.6 20.1 18.0 32.4 23.9 24.3 35.2	$Age\ (mean\ age\pm { m SE})^{\mathcal{J}}$	$36.8\pm0.4$	47.0±1.1	$45.6\pm0.9$	85.94	<.0001	$45.2\pm0.2$	54.3±0.5	54.4±0.4	293.64	<0.001
25.9     40.4     43.8     15.5       26.7     25.6     20.1     18.0       32.4     23.9     24.3     35.2	Household annual income				4.42	<.001				33.30	<0.001
26.7 25.6 20.1 18.0 32.4 23.9 24.3 35.2	\$0-19,999	25.9	40.4	43.8			15.5	25.6	33.7		
32.4 23.9 24.3 35.2	\$20,000–34,999	26.7	25.6	20.1			18.0	22.8	22.5		
	\$35,000–69,999	32.4	23.9	24.3			35.2	32.1	27.6		
\$70,000+ 15.1 10.1 11.8 31.3 19.5	\$70,000+	15.1	10.1	11.8			31.3	19.5	16.2		

 $I_{\mbox{\footnotesize Proportions}}$  in table represent weighted percentages, stratified by race

3 Numbers represent weighted mean values, stratified by ethnicity/race

 $\overset{\mathcal{A}}{\operatorname{For}}$  the continuous variable of age, we conducted a Wald F test

Barry et al. Page 15

Table 2

Prevalence of psychiatric diagnoses and general medical conditions by pain interference severity among Hispanic and white respondents.

			Hisp	anic Res	Hispanic Respondents		White	White Respondents		
	No/low pain <i>n</i> =6,745 <sup><i>I</i></sup>	Moderat e Pain $n=539^{I}$	Severe Pain $n=973^{I}$	$\chi^2$	р	No/low pain $n=19,260^{I}$	Moderat e Pain $n=2,001^{I}$	Severe Pain <i>n</i> =3,056 <sup><i>I</i></sup>	$\chi^2$	р
	%	%	%			%	%	%		
Any Axis I disorder	22.7	30.6	29.3	6.90	0.0019	30.3	37.0	39.3	33.35	<0.0001
Any mood disorder	7.1	9.4	14.2	8.78	0.0004	8.2	13.6	15.1	42.64	<0.0001
Major depression	4.9	7.1	10.8	8.34	0.0006	6.4	10.8	12.0	37.04	<0.0001
Dysthymia	1.1	2.8	4.5	6.97	0.0018	1.4	3.1	4.5	27.88	<0.0001
Mania	1.4	1.9	2.3	1.55	0.2208	1.3	2.5	3.4	16.31	<0.0001
Hypomania	6.0	1.5	0.7	1.11	0.3373	1.2	1.5	2.0	3.93	0.0244
Any anxiety disorder	8.0	12.4	13.3	4.38	0.0164	10.5	16.7	17.6	38.66	<0.0001
Panic disorder without agoraphobia	1.3	3.3	3.3	5.84	0.0047	1.8	4.2	4.9	22.69	<0.0001
Panic disorder with agoraphobia	0.1	0.2	0.0	1.56	0.2185	0.04	0.1	0.1	0.77	0.4660
Social phobia	2.0	2.9	1.5	1.27	0.2882	2.7	3.8	5.2	17.32	<0.0001
Specific phobia	5.3	6.4	8.3	2.23	0.1159	6.9	8.6	10.3	15.27	<0.0001
Generalized anxiety disorder	1.3	2.5	4.2	5.15	0.0084	1.6	4.1	2.0	31.99	<0.0001
Any substance-use disorder	13.3	15.7	12.9	0.55	0.5815	20.0	22.1	23.8	7.74	0.0010
Alcohol abuse or dependence	8.4	7.9	5.3	4.38	0.0164	9.4	7.6	7.1	6.86	0.0020
Nicotine dependence	0.9	7.4	7.7	1.27	0.2867	13.3	17.4	19.5	24.66	<0.0001
Drug abuse or dependence	1.8	1.8	1.5	0.00	0.9102	1.9	1.8	2.2	0.42	0.6585
Any general medical condition	17.2	49.7	45.4	19.11	<0.0001	28.8	63.4	64.7	108.72	<0.0001
Any heart condition	2.6	13.8	14.5	17.91	<0.0001	5.5	17.2	23.7	89.28	<0.0001
Angina	1.2	7.4	10.2	13.87	<0.0001	2.2	9.3	13.2	72.40	<0.0001
Tachycardia	1.2	8.2	8.1	15.41	<0.0001	2.7	8.6	13.3	76.09	<0.0001
Myocardial infarction	0.3	2.2	2.1	7.12	0.0016	0.5	1.8	3.4	26.80	<0.0001
Other heart disease	0.7	2.9	3.5	8.70	0.0004	1.9	8.9	9.7	60.72	<0.0001

			Hisp	Hispanic Respondents	ondents		White	White Respondents		
	No/low pain <i>n=</i> 6,745 <sup><i>I</i></sup>	Moderat e Pain n=539 <sup>I</sup>	Severe Pain $n=973^I$	$\chi^2$	d	No/low pain <i>n</i> =19,260 <sup><i>I</i></sup>	Moderat e Pain $n=2,001^{I}$	Severe Pain <i>n</i> =3,056 <sup><i>I</i></sup>	$\chi^2$	d
	%	%	0%			%	%	%		
Any liver disease	0.4	1.4	2.7	5.30	0.0074	0.7	0.4	1.3	7.22	0.0015
Cirrhosis	0.1	0.7	0.7	2.60	0.0816	0.1	0.3	1.1	7.72	0.0010
Other liver disease	0.3	6.0	2.2	4.20	0.0195	0.3	1.0	1.6	15.75	<0.0001
Any stomach condition	5.1	13.8	13.2	10.80	0.0001	4.0	10.3	14.2	73.40	<0.0001
Stomach ulcer	2.1	4.7	9.9	10.37	0.0001	1.5	4.0	6.4	42.39	<0.0001
Gastritis	4.1	11.4	11.2	7.93	0.0008	3.0	8.0	10.7	55.90	<0.0001
Arthritis	5.6	26.9	27.5	20.73	<0.0001	13.3	42.9	46.2	109.55	<0.0001
Arteriosclerosi s	0.4	3.9	4.5	8.50	0.0005	1.1	3.9	6.1	44.82	<0.0001
Hypertension	8.9	26.2	27.2	15.95	<0.0001	16.1	31.7	35.5	78.44	<0.0001

N's represent actual number in each category. Bold values indicate statistically significant results (p <0.05).

Barry et al.

## Table 3

	Hispanic R	Hispanic Respondents	White Respondents	pondents	Interaction OR Hispanic vs. White Respondents	vs. White Respondent
	MPI vs. NPI	IdN 'sa IdS	MPI vs. NPI	SPI vs. NPI	Idn .sv IdM	IdN 'sa IdS
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Any Axis I disorder	1.40 (1.06–1.86)	1.44 (1.14– 1.83)	1.30 (1.14– 1.49)	1.40 (1.24–1.59)	1.08 (0.78–1.50)	1.03 (0.78–1.35)
Any mood disorder $^{I}$	0.84 (0.54–1.32)	1.79 (1.38–2.32)	1.27 (1.03–1.56)	1.31 (1.13–1.53)	0.66 (0.40–1.10)	1.36 (1.02–1.82)
Major depression	0.93 (0.59–1.48)	1.83 (1.36– 2.47)	1.26 (1.01–1.57)	1.31 (1.11–1.55)	0.74 (0.43–1.26)	1.40 (0.99–1.97)
Dysthymia	1.58 (0.81– 3.05)	2.68 (1.72–4.16)	1.38 (0.94– 2.03)	1.75 (1.28– 2.37)	1.14 (0.53– 2.43)	1.53 (0.92–2.55)
Mania	0.88 (0.37–2.10)	1.19 (0.68– 2.09)	1.23 (0.83–1.80)	1.40 (1.05-1.86)	0.72 (0.28–1.84)	0.85 (0.46–1.58)
Hypomania	1.51 (0.55-4.11)	0.88 (0.40–1.94)	1.32 (0.80– 2.19)	0.55 (0.31-0.99)	1.14 (0.38– 3.43)	1.59 (0.60-4.21)
Any anxiety disorder <sup>2</sup>	1.14 (0.72–1.80)	1.31 (0.93-1.85)	1.32 (1.13–1.54)	1.27 (1.08–1.48)	0.87 (0.52–1.44)	1.04 (0.70–1.54)
Panic disorder without agoraphobia	1.75 (0.94– 3.27)	1.55 (0.98– 2.43)	1.65 (1.19– 2.28)	1.56 (1.14-2.13)	1.06 (0.52–2.18)	0.99 (0.59–1.67)
Panic disorder with agoraphobia	1.42 (0.12–16.12)	0.00 (0.00- 0.00)	1.12 (0.13–9.70)	1.40 (0.31–6.33)	1.26 (0.07– 24.11)	N/A
Social phobia	0.95 (0.35–2.57)	0.54 (0.32-0.92)	1.01 (0.74–1.36)	1.28 (1.01- 1.61)	0.95 (0.33– 2.69)	0.42 (0.24-0.76)
Specific phobia	0.87 (0.52–1.43)	1.28 (0.88–1.86)	1.15 (0.95–1.40)	1.12 (0.94–1.32)	0.75 (0.44–1.29)	1.15 (0.75–1.74)
Generalized anxiety disorder	1.24 (0.59– 2.57)	2.07 (1.12– 3.83)	1.68 (1.21– 2.34)	1.79 (1.34- 2.38)	0.74 (0.33–1.65)	1.16 (0.61– 2.20)
Any substance-use disorder <sup>3</sup>	1.34 (0.94–1.90)	1.10 (0.84–1.43)	1.18 (1.01–1.38)	1.35 (1.18–1.54)	1.13 (0.76–1.67)	0.84 (0.61–1.09)
Alcohol abuse or dependence	1.21 (0.64– 2.29)	0.80 (0.52–1.23)	0.95 (0.75–1.20)	0.97 (0.77–1.22)	1.27 (0.66– 2.46)	0.82 (0.51–1.34)
Nicotine dependence	1.17 (0.68– 2.02)	1.31 (0.91–1.87)	1.26 (1.06–1.48)	1.42 (1.24– 1.64)	0.93 (0.52–1.66)	0.92 (0.63–1.34)
Drug abuse or dependence	1.01 (0.15–6.69)	1.04 (0.46– 2.38)	0.90 (0.59–1.38)	1.07 (0.76–1.51)	1.12 (0.16–7.91)	0.98 (0.42–2.26)
Any general medical condition <sup>4</sup>	2.63 (2.05–3.38)	2.44 (1.94–3.06)	2.81 (2.48–3.19)	2.92 (2.58–3.30)	0.94 (0.70–1.25)	0.83 (0.66–1.05)
Any heart condition	3.31 (2.45– 4.48)	3.40 (2.52- 4.58)	2.09 (1.81– 2.42)	2.94 (2.58– 3.36)	1.58 (1.16–2.15)	1.15 (0.85–1.57)
Angina	3.54 (2.33–5.37)	5.00 (3.42-7.31)	2.65 (2.17– 3.23)	3.55 (2.97–4.25)	1.34 (0.85– 2.09)	1.41 (0.94–2.11)
Tachycardia	4.20 (2.81– 6.28)	3.89 (2.74–5.52)	1.97 (1.61– 2.41)	2.91 (2.47– 3.42)	2.13 (1.39–3.26)	1.34 (0.92–1.96)
Myocardial infarction	3.17 (1.20–8.34)	3.16 (1.64-6.07)	1.74 (1.13– 2.67)	3.07 (2.17– 4.34)	1.83 (0.63–5.26)	1.03 (0.50-2.12)
Other heart disease	2.16 (1.06– 4.40)	2.59 (1.60-4.19)	2.15 (1.70– 2.72)	2.97 (2.46–3.59)	1.01 (0.49–2.07)	0.87 (0.52–1.47)
Any Liver Disease	2.39 (0.90– 6.36)	4.39 (2.30-8.38)	2.33 (1.35- 4.00)	3.40 (2.28–5.07)	1.03 (0.33–3.16)	1.29 (0.59–2.82)
Cimhosis	6.07 (1.37- 26.94)	5.19 (1.14-23.58)	1 70 (0 53_ 5 42)	4.47 (2.29-8.72)	(25 cc -25 0) 85 E	1 16 (0 21 - 6 37)

Page 17

**Author Manuscript** 

**Author Manuscript** 

	Hispanic R	Hispanic Respondents	White Res	White Respondents	Interaction OR Hispanic vs. White Respondents	vs. White Respondents
	MPI vs. NPI	SPI vs. NPI	MPI vs. NPI	SPI vs. NPI	MPI vs. NPI	SPI vs. NPI
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Other liver disease	1.82 (0.60–5.51)	4.58 (2.28–9.19) 2.42 (1.38–4.24) 3.36 (2.15–5.23)	2.42 (1.38– 4.24)	3.36 (2.15– 5.23)	0.75 (0.21– 2.66)	1.37 (0.60–3.10)
Any stomach condition	1.84 (1.28– 2.64)	1.85 (1.41– 2.43) 1.89 (1.57– 2.27) 2.53 (2.16– 2.97)	1.89 (1.57– 2.27)	2.53 (2.16– 2.97)	0.97 (0.66–1.44)	0.73 (0.55-0.98)
Stomach ulcer	1.57 (0.93–2.66)	2.18 (1.48–3.22) 1.86 (1.38–2.51) 2.67 (2.12–3.35)	1.86 (1.38– 2.51)	2.67 (2.12– 3.35)	0.84 (0.47–1.50)	0.82 (0.53–1.25)
Gastritis	1.85 (0.17–2.90)	1.96 (1.42–2.72)   1.94 (1.55–2.41)   2.53 (2.11–3.03)	1.94 (1.55– 2.41)	2.53 (2.11– 3.03)	0.95 (0.58–1.57)	0.78 (0.54–1.11)
Arthritis	3.26 (2.51–4.23)	3.75 (3.01-4.67) 3.27 (2.91-3.68) 3.67 (3.27-4.10)	3.27 (2.91– 3.68)	3.67 (3.27–4.10)	1.00 (0.75–1.32)	1.02 (0.80–1.31)
Arteriosclerosis	4.89 (2.13–11.26)	$4.89\ (2.13-11.26)  \left   5.85\ (2.83-12.09)  \right   1.99\ (1.45-2.74)  \left   3.15\ (2.44-4.07) \right $	1.99 (1.45– 2.74)	3.15 (2.44- 4.07)	2.45 (0.99– 6.11)	1.86 (0.87–3.96)
Hypertension	1.97 (1.55– 2.52)	2.33 (1.75- 3.09) 1.48 (1.30- 1.68) 1.75 (1.55- 1.97)	1.48 (1.30–1.68)	1.75 (1.55–1.97)	1.34 (1.01–1.77)	1.33 (1.00–1.77)

All models included the following covariates: sociodemographics (age, race, marital status, educational level, employment, household income), number of stressful life events, number of general medical conditions, and wave-1 Axis-II psychiatric disorders. NPI=no/low pain interference, MPI=moderate pain interference, SPI=severe pain interference. OR=adjusted odds ratio, IOR=interaction odds ratio, CI=confidence interval. Bold values indicate statistically significant results (p <0.05).

I For all mood disorders, we adjusted for wave-1 past-year diagnosis of any substance-use disorder and any anxiety disorder.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>For all anxiety disorders, we adjusted for wave-1 past-year diagnosis of any mood disorder and any substance-use disorder.

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  For all substance-use disorders, we adjusted for wave-1 past-year diagnosis of any mood disorder and any anxiety disorder.

<sup>4</sup> For all general medical conditions, we adjusted for wave-1 past-year diagnosis of mood disorder, anxiety disorder, and substance-use disorder, as well as lifetime personality disorder.