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Abstract

In low-back pain patients, a ‘Patient Specific Approach’ (PSA) is introduced to evaluate treatment effect. In this approach, the patient is asked to choose, from the activities that are impaired, the activity which is most important in daily life. Aims: To evaluate the choices of activities on the PSA in a sample of TMD patients and to determine the clinimetric properties of the VAS scores of the PSA, in terms of reproducibility and responsiveness were determined. Methods: At treatment start, TMD patients reported the PSA-activity which is impaired due to their TMD complaints. The amount of hindrance during this activity was rated on a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS). During two follow-up measurements, patients rated the VAS and appraised their overall complaints in terms of ‘much worsened’, ‘slightly worsened’, ‘remained stable’, ‘slightly improved’, or ‘much improved’. Results: Of the 132 patients who fulfilled baseline measurements, 13% reported an activity that is not included in existing TMD-disability questionnaires. The reproducibility of the VAS scores of the 78 patients who reported that their complaints had ‘remained stable’ at second measurement, was good (ICC=0.73). The responsiveness of the PSA was high (AUC=0.91), and the cutoff score for important improvement, where sensitivity (0.85) and specificity (0.84) were as much as possible the same was 58%. Conclusion: The PSA for TMD patients is a new and easy-to-use tool in treatment evaluation. Moreover, the VAS score of the PSA has good reproducibility and responsiveness.
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Introduction

Musculoskeletal disorders are characterized by pain and dysfunction (1-3). Traditionally, success of treatment in these disorders is measured with physical findings like range of motion, muscle pain and muscle strength. Nowadays, patients' self-report on the relief of complaints is considered to be increasingly important in medical decision making and determining the success of treatment (4).

One way to measure complaints is by the use of questionnaires. For example, functional (dis-)abilities can be evaluated by disorder-specific questionnaires, such as the Oswestry Low Back Pain Disability Questionnaire (5) or the Neck Disability Index (6). For Temporomandibular Disorders (TMD), amongst others the Mandibular Function Impairment Questionnaire (MFIQ) and the Jaw Disability Index (JDI) can be used to measure disability in functions like chewing and yawning (7, 8). A consequence of using this type of questionnaires is that the activity that is of greatest importance to the patient, may not be included in the questionnaire. To overcome this problem, in the treatment of low-back pain patients, a measure is introduced that is tailored to the patient's specific complaints (9, 10). In this ‘Patient Specific Approach’ (PSA), the patient is asked to report the most important activity that is difficult to perform because of the back pain. The amount of hindrance the patient experiences when performing this activity is measured by a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS). The change in hindrance of the activity during treatment is then used as a measure for treatment effect. Such an approach, in which improvement is measured only in the activity that is relevant to the individual patient, may not only be promising in low-back pain patients, but also in treatment evaluation of TMD patients. Therefore, the aim of this study was twofold: First, to evaluate the choice of activities on the Patient Specific Approach in a sample of TMD patients. Second, to determine the clinimetric properties of the VAS scores of the PSA, in terms of reproducibility and responsiveness.

Materials and Methods

Study population

Between summer 2006 and winter 2008, TMD patients from the department of Oral Kinesiology of the ACTA, were invited to participate in the study. Patients were excluded if they were aged <18 years or unable to read Dutch. Written informed consent of all participants was obtained. In total, 132 TMD-patients (114 female), with a mean age of 39 years (sd = 14), participated. Based on the Research Diagnostic Criteria (7), group I (muscle) disorder was found in 78% of these patients; group II (disc displacement) disorder was found in 35%; group III (arthralgia, arthritis, arthrosis) disorder was found in 24% of the patients. The medical ethical review board of the VU University Amsterdam approved to this study.
Procedure

Prior to the patient’s first visit to the department, as part of a routine set of questionnaires, patients received written instructions by mail regarding the use of the patient specific approach (PSA). They were asked to consider the activity that is most important and difficult to perform because of their complaints, without examples given. The dentist discussed this consideration and gave further verbal instructions on the use of the PSA at the first visit. Then, when good understanding of the PSA was achieved, the patients made a final choice on the activity that was most important to them, and the amount of hindrance performing this activity was rated on a 100mm Visual Analogue Scale (VAS). The left anchor of this VAS represents “no hindrance”, and the right anchor represents “worst possible hindrance”. This activity and its VAS score were considered the baseline measurement.

The participant was asked to rate the amount of hindrance again a second time (at the second visit, before treatment started) and a third time (six to eight weeks after treatment started), without insight in the earlier VAS score. Moreover, at these follow-up measurements, patients were also asked to judge whether their general TMD complaints had changed by answering the following question: “Since my initial visit at ACTA my TMD complaints: worsened much, worsened slightly, remained stable, improved slightly, improved much”.

Statistical Analyses

Reproducibility. The baseline- and second-measurement VAS scores of those patients who reported that their TMD complaints ‘remained stable’ were used to calculate the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC). A two-way effects model, based on absolute agreement measures was used. The (conservative) single measure ICCs were calculated. An ICC lower than 0.40 suggests poor agreement; 0.40-0.75 fair to good agreement; >0.75-1 excellent agreement (11).

Responsiveness. First, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients were used to evaluate whether change in hindrance (baseline – third measurement) was associated with the amount of hindrance at baseline. The correlation coefficient was calculated both for the change in hindrance expressed in millimeters and for the relative change in hindrance expressed as a percentage of the baseline score. Then, the change in hindrance (expressed either in millimeters or as a percentage) with the lowest association with the baseline score was used in a Receiver Operating Characteristics analysis (ROC)-curve. Patients who judged their complaints as ‘improved much’ on third measurement were classified as ‘improved’, while patients who judged their complaints as ‘worsened much’, ‘worsened slightly’, ‘remained stable’ or ‘improved slightly’, were classified as ‘non-improved’. In this ROC-analysis, sensitivity represents the percentage of correctly classified ‘improved’ patients, whereas specificity represents the percentage of correctly classified ‘non-improved’ patients. The ROC curve displays sensitivity versus 1-specificity rates each change in hindrance. The area under curve (AUC) can be interpreted as the
The probability of correctly identifying improved patients (12). The AUC is a measure for responsiveness; an AUC of 0.50-0.70 represents low discriminative power; 0.70-0.90 moderate and >0.90 represents high discriminative power (13). From this curve, the change in hindrance where sensitivity and specificity were as much as possible the same, was considered the cutoff that best discriminates between improved and non-improved patients (9, 14, 15). This indicates that a patient that has a decrease in hindrance ≥ cutoff has improved. The 95%-confidence intervals were determined using the Wilson-score method (16). The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16.0) was used to analyze the data (α = 0.05).

Results

One-hundred-and-thirty-two patients completed the baseline measurement. They reported a wide variety of activities that were most important and difficult to perform to them (Table 1). Thirteen percent of the patients reported activities (relaxing, sleeping and others) that were not included in other disability questionnaires for TMD complaints (7, 8). The amount of hindrance patients experienced while performing the activities, rated on the VAS, varied widely (mean ± standard deviation [SD] = 57; 20 mm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Frequency of Patient Specific Activities Selected at Baseline (n = 132)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating</td>
<td>83 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening mouth</td>
<td>14 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yawning</td>
<td>12 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping</td>
<td>5 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>5 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (eg, singing, playing an instrument)</td>
<td>9 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reproducibility

One-hundred-and twenty-three patients completed the second measurement (response rate = 93%), and 78 patients reported that their TMD complaints had ‘remained stable’. They were included in the reproducibility analysis, which showed that the reproducibility of the PSA measurement was good (ICC = 0.72; 95% confidence intervals = 0.57-0.82).

Responsiveness

From 109 participants, also the third measurement data were collected (response rate = 83%). Forty patients judged their complaints as ‘improved much’ on third measurement and were classified as ‘improved’, while 69 patients judged their complaints as ‘worsened much’ (n=1), ‘worsened slightly’ (n=2), ‘remained stable’ (n=26) or ‘improved slightly’ (n=39), and were classified as ‘non-improved’. A 64 year old woman judged her complaints as ‘improved slightly’, while her VAS score worsened from 9 mm on baseline measurement, to 41 mm on third measurement, which suggests that she misinterpreted the instructions. The data of this outlier were excluded from the responsiveness analysis.

Figure 1 plots the change in hindrance and Figure 2 plots the relative change in hindrance against the amount of hindrance at baseline (N = 108). While no significant association was found between the amount of hindrance at baseline and the relative change in hindrance (\(r_s = 0.15; p = 0.12\)), a strong association was found with the change in hindrance expressed in millimeters (\(r_s = 0.44; p = 0.00\)). Therefore, the relative change in hindrance was used for the ROC analysis.

The responsiveness of the PSA, as illustrated in the ROC curve (Fig 3), was high (AUC = 0.91; 95% confidence intervals = 0.86-0.97). A relative change of 58% was considered the optimal cutoff to discriminate between ‘improved’ and ‘non-improved patients’ (sensitivity = 0.85; 95% confidence intervals = 0.79-0.91; specificity = 0.84; 95% confidence intervals = 0.77-0.91).
Fig 1  Scatterplots of the change in hindrance expressed in millimeters plotted against the baseline VAS scores (n = 108).

Fig 2  Scatterplots of the relative change in hindrance expressed in millimeters plotted against the baseline VAS scores (n = 108).
Fig 3  The ROC curve for relative change in amount of hindrance on the PSA. * = cutoff (58%; sensitivity = 0.85; specificity = 0.84).
Discussion

In this study, the patient specific approach (PSA) is introduced as a new instrument for TMD-treatment evaluation. It is designed to evaluate the amount of hindrance a patient perceives from the activity that is most important and difficult to perform because of his/her complaints. The concept of this patient-tailored instrument was found in low-back pain literature (9, 10). In this study, an earlier suggestion for improvement of the methods was adopted (10): of the initial two intake visits, one visit was replaced by written instructions patients received by mail.

So far, disability from mandibular activities can be measured by questionnaires like the Mandibular Function Impairment Questionnaire (MFIQ) or the Jaw Disability Index (JDI) (7, 8). In these questionnaires, the amount of disability from a predetermined list of mandibular activities is used as outcome measure. The PSA focuses on the most important activity the patient is hindered from. In this study, 13% of the patients reported an activity that is not included in the before mentioned lists. A possible weakness of the PSA may be that the patients’ choice on the most important activity cannot be revised after baseline measurement. This issue has also been addressed in the low back pain literature (10). However, whether this happens and how this would influence the usefulness of the PSA is unknown. Further research is needed to explore this issue.

To determine the reproducibility, only the outcomes of those patients who indicated that their TMD complaints had not changed between the baseline and the second visit were used. The agreement between these measurements was good (it almost reached the level of excellent agreement), and is comparable to the reproducibility of the PSA in knee-dysfunction patients (17). Moreover, it is also comparable to the reproducibility found for other uses of the VAS, like for pain intensity or health-related quality of life (18, 19). To determine the responsiveness, the TMD patients were asked to rate their hindrance from the PSA again 6-8 weeks after treatment started. At the third measurement, 40 patients showed that their complaints “improved much”. The responsiveness reached the level of high discriminative power (Area Under the Curve = 0.91), and was comparable to the responsiveness found in other studies (9, 14, 15, 20, 21) (AUC = 0.80 - 0.89).

The correlation analyses showed that the change in hindrance during treatment expressed in millimeters was positively associated with the amount of hindrance at baseline. Consequently, the cutoff to recognize patients who have improved is lower for patients with a low baseline score than for patients with a high baseline score. For practical use it is preferable to use one cutoff for all patients regardless of their baseline score. Since the relative change in amount of hindrance was not associated with the amount of hindrance at baseline, this change was used as measure for treatment effect.

To be able to use the PSA in the decision to end treatment, a cutoff to recognize important improvement is needed. Therefore, the patients who judged their complaints
as “improved much” were discriminated from those who did not reach this level of improvement yet. Since, in our opinion, “to unnecessarily continue treatment” is as harmful as “to prematurely end treatment”, that cutoff was chosen for which sensitivity and specificity were the same. The estimate for the cutoff found in this study was 58% (sensitivity = 0.85; specificity = 0.84). Other studies on treatment evaluation that used pain intensity as outcome measure, found slightly lower cutoffs (47-55%) (14, 15, 20, 21).

So, the outcome of this study indicates that when a TMD patient shows a decrease in hindrance of at least 58%, a clinically important improvement is achieved. For practical reasons a cutoff of 60% can be used.

**Conclusion**

The patient specific approach for TMD patients is a new and easy-to-use tool in treatment evaluation. Moreover, the VAS score of the patient specific approach for TMD patients has good reproducibility and responsiveness.
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