Accelerated aging in adults with knee osteoarthritis pain: consideration for frequency, intensity, time, and total pain sites
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Abstract

Introduction: Individuals with osteoarthritis (OA) show increased morbidity and mortality. Telomere length, a measure of cellular aging, predicts increased morbidity and mortality. Telomeres shorten with persisting biological and psychosocial stress. Living with chronic OA pain is stressful. Previous research exploring telomere length in people with OA has produced inconsistent results. Considering pain severity may clarify the relationship between OA and telomeres.

Objectives: We hypothesized that individuals with high OA chronic pain severity would have shorter telomeres than those with no or low chronic pain severity.

Methods: One hundred thirty-six adults, ages 45 to 85 years old, with and without symptomatic knee OA were included in the analysis. Peripheral blood leukocyte telomere length was measured, and demographic, clinical, and functional data were collected. Participants were categorized into 5 pain severity groups based on an additive index of frequency, intensity, time or duration, and total number of pain sites (FITT). Covariates included age, sex, race or ethnicity, study site, and knee pain status.

Results: The no or low chronic pain severity group had significantly longer telomeres compared with the high pain severity group, \( P = 0.025 \). A significant chronic pain severity dose response emerged for telomere length, \( P = 0.034 \). The FITT chronic pain severity index was highly correlated with the clinical and functional OA pain measures. However, individual clinical and functional measures were not associated with telomere length.

Conclusion: Results demonstrate accelerated cellular aging with high knee OA chronic pain severity and provide evidence for the potential utility of the FITT chronic pain severity index in capturing the biological burden of chronic pain.
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1. Introduction

Approximately 22.7% of adults in the United States are diagnosed with osteoarthritis (OA). Osteoarthritis is not only a leading cause of disability, it is also associated with increased morbidity and mortality. OA may also contribute toward a biological footprint. Telomere length is a marker of cellular aging. Telomeres are the DNA repeats that attrite with cell divisions, a natural process of aging. Leukocyte telomere length (LTL) is negatively associated with biological and...
psychosocial stress\textsuperscript{13,41} and is predictive of morbidity and mortality.\textsuperscript{7,16,51}

The relationship between LTL and OA is unclear.\textsuperscript{55,60} In a population-based study of women, LTL was shorter in individuals with hand OA than those without the condition and negatively associated with radiographic disease severity.\textsuperscript{55} By contrast, a second study found no differences in LTL between individuals diagnosed with OA and healthy controls.\textsuperscript{55} Sample size, type, and extent of OA are a few factors likely contributing to these discrepancies. In addition, based on LTL studies across differing health conditions, clinical factors such as the severity and persistence are important to consider.

Leukocyte telomere length is indicated as a “downstream” marker of cumulative, persistent, biological, or psychosocial stress.\textsuperscript{11} Qualities of the “stressor” such as frequency, intensity, and duration seem to be particularly relevant in driving the biological burden of various life experiences.\textsuperscript{12,15,26,37,51,58} Pain is stressful. Over time, OA pain extends to other body regions and is associated with hyperalgasia, allodynia, and decreased efficiency of endogenous inhibitory mechanisms.\textsuperscript{19,23,36,43,50} Decreased physical activity and a decline in functioning are key features in OA, both of which are primarily attributable to pain.\textsuperscript{29,42}

A few publications have explored the possible relevance of LTL in chronic pain conditions.\textsuperscript{22,52,54} With an improved understanding of stress-related qualities that contribute to a cumulative biological burden (frequency, intensity, duration, and type or extent of stress)\textsuperscript{26} and the limitation of current pain measures in capturing duration beyond 3 to 6 months, we recently investigated a new measure of chronic pain severity.\textsuperscript{53} The chronic pain severity index is an additive index comprising 4 pain characteristics (FITT): (1) frequency of pain (intermittent or persistent); (2) intensity of pain; (3) time (duration) of chronic pain; and (4) total number of pain sites. In a large population study of individuals endorsing chronic pain, the chronic pain severity index was positively associated with biological burden, and the combined index appears to be a better predictor compared with individual pain domains.\textsuperscript{53}

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between chronic pain severity and LTL in individuals with and without symptomatic knee OA. We hypothesized that (1) individuals with high chronic knee pain severity would have shorter telomeres compared with individuals with no or low chronic knee pain severity, (2) the individual FITT domains would not be associated with LTL, (3) the FITT index would be associated with OA pain and functioning measures, and (4) OA pain and functioning measures would not be associated with LTL.

2. Methods

2.1. Study design

Participants were recruited for a cross-sectional study from the communities surrounding the University of Florida (UF) and the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) from 2010 to 2013. Participants involved in the current investigation are from a larger study titled Understanding Pain and Limitations in Osteoarthritic Disease (UPLOAD), which involved a biopsychosocial investigation of ethnically diverse individuals with and without symptomatic knee OA, see Table 1 for inclusion and exclusion criteria. Participants with available baseline telomere length measures and complete data on the FITT chronic pain severity questions (described below) were considered in the current investigation. All procedures described were reviewed and approved by the University of Florida and University of Alabama at Birmingham institutional review boards.

### Table 1

| Inclusion and exclusion criteria. |
|----------------------------------|
| **Exclusion Criteria**            |
| Prosthetic knee replacement or nonarthroscopic surgery to the symptomatic knee |
| Serious medical conditions (eg, uncontrolled hypertension ≥ 150/95, heart failure, history of acute myocardial infarction) |
| Peripheral neuropathy             |
| Systemic rheumatologic disorders (eg, rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, fibromyalgia) |
| Daily opioid use                  |
| Mini-Mental Status Examination (MMSE) score ≤ 22 |
| Excessive anxiety regarding protocol procedures (eg, intravenous catheter insertion, experimental pain procedures) |
| Psychiatric hospitalization within the preceding year |

| **General inclusion criteria**     |
|-----------------------------------|
| Between the ages of 45 and 85     |
| Self-identified as either African American or non-Hispanic white |

| **Knee osteoarthritis screening questions** |
|--------------------------------------------|
| During the last 4 wk, have you had knee pain on most days? |
| During the last 4 wk, have you had knee pain while climbing down stairs or walking down slopes? |
| During the last 4 wk, have you had swelling in one or both knees? |
| Do you have knee osteoarthritis? (if you do, was the diagnosis made by a rheumatologist or a general practitioner?) |

2.2. Participants

With an initial sample size of 229, 138 individuals had complete FITT data and were eligible for inclusion in the current analysis. Two individuals had conflicting phenotyping data and were excluded resulting in a sample size of 136 adults aged 45 to 85 with and without symptomatic knee OA pain. The measures and procedures described are limited to those included in the current investigation. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are listed in Table 1. After a phone screening,\textsuperscript{49} participants were seen for 2 appointments. All measures were typically collected within a 2- to 3-week period. A health assessment and physical examination were completed, knee radiographs taken, and Kellgren Lawrence scores were determined.\textsuperscript{1} Demographics and health history information were collected. Additional measures are described below.

2.3. Clinical pain and functioning measures

Participants completed self-report measures of clinical pain and functional limitations. The Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Index of Osteoarthritis (WOMAC) is a 24-item scale assessing knee OA symptoms in the last 48 hours. A 5-point Likert scale was used with items ranging from 0 to 4 (higher scores reflect greater symptom severity). Three subscales comprise the WOMAC, including pain during activities (5 items), daytime stiffness (2 items), and impairments in physical function (17 items).\textsuperscript{5} The Graded Chronic Pain Scale (GCPS) consists of 7 items (rated on a 0-10 scale) and examines pain severity and disability over the last 6 months. Participants rate the intensity of their current knee pain and their worst and average knee pain during the previous 6 months (characteristic pain intensity score). A disability score is also obtained by having participants rate the degree to which their knee pain interfered with daily activities during the last 6 months. Items are averaged and multiplied by 10 to generate index scores for characteristic pain intensity and disability, with higher scores indicating greater symptoms. Disability points are computed by adding points for disability days over the last 6 months with the disability score. The overall pain grade is determined by characteristic pain intensity and disability points and range
2.4. Chronic pain severity

Pain domains of frequency of knee pain, intensity of knee pain, duration of knee pain on most days (time), and total number of pain sites were assessed. Knee pain frequency is a categorical variable (knee pain on most days, no or yes). Median splits were computed for the other 3 variables. Computation of the median splits for characteristic knee pain intensity and knee pain time (duration) were limited to those reporting knee pain in the overall sample (n = 169) and based on available data for each variable. Of note, the cut points incorporated in the study align for average pain intensity in adults with knee and hip OA reported by Kapstad and colleagues: 1 to 4 = mild pain, >4 to 6 = moderate pain, and >6 to 10 = severe pain. Thus, the cut point in our article falls between the “no to mild pain” and “moderate to severe pain.” In addition, the cut point is similar to the average pain intensity cut point incorporated in the FITT index in the previously reported population-based study.

A median split for total number of pain sites was computed for the overall sample of those with and without knee pain (n = 229, median of 3) and for the knee pain group only (median of 4). Noteworthy, Lacey and colleagues reported that the median number of pain sites lasting 1 day or more in the previous 4 weeks in a community-based group of adults in the United Kingdom ≥50 years of age was 4. Similarly, the cut point for the total number of pain sites incorporated in the FITT index in the previously reported population-based study was 3 or less and 4 or greater. In this study, the total number of pain sites with pain more days than not over the last 3 months was defined as 0 to 3 and 4 or greater. Once median splits were computed, an additive index was compiled as previously described, see Table 2.

2.5. Telomere length analysis

A blood sample was collected during the second study session and placed on ice. It was centrifuged at 4°C for 10 minutes at 3000 rpm. Once a sample was received, the blood was mixed and placed on ice. It was centrifuged at 4°C for 10 minutes at 3000 rpm. Once a sample was received, the blood was mixed and placed on ice. It was centrifuged at 4°C for 10 minutes at 3000 rpm.

Table 2

| Chronic pain severity pain domains and FITT groups. |
|---------------------------------------------------|
| Pain domains | Question | Median and score |
|-------------|----------|-----------------|
| Frequency   | Do you currently experience knee pain on most days? | 0 = no | 1 = yes |
| Intensity   | GCPS characteristic pain intensity (current + worst + average pain over last 6 mo/3 × 10) | 0 = 0–47 | 1 = 48–100 |
| Time or duration | How long have you experienced knee pain on most days (in months)? | 0 = 0–23 mo | 1 = 24–360 mo |
| Total number of pain sites | Number of body regions with pain more days than not over the last 3 months | 0 = 0–3 | 1 = 4–18 |

FITT Groups Classification Domain total
1 | No or low pain | 0 |
2 | Mild pain | 1 |
3 | Moderate pain | 2 |
4 | Moderate to high pain | 3 |
5 | High pain | 4 |

GCPS, Graded Chronic Pain Scale.
the human fibroblast primary cell line IMR90 at different population doublings, as well as with the telomerase protein subunit gene (hTERT) transfected into a lentiviral construct. The mean terminal restriction fragment (TRF) length from these DNA samples was determined using Southern blot analysis, and the slope of the plot of mean TRF length vs T/S for these samples served as the conversion factor for calculation of telomere length in base pairs from the T/S ratio. The equation for conversion from T/S ratio to base pairs for this study was base pairs

\[ 5 \times 3274 \times \frac{1}{2413} \times (T/S) \]

2.6. Data analysis

Descriptive analyses for the categorical and continuous variables were completed. Differences by chronic pain severity (FITT) groups were tested using either analysis of variance F-test or \( \chi^2 \) test. Pearson and Spearman correlational analyses were calculated between telomere length and the following variables: age, race or ethnicity (African American, non-Hispanic whites), sex, waist–hip ratio (WHR), employment (8 categories), exercise (≥1 time a week or ≤1 time a week), smoking status (nonsmoker or current smoker), comorbidities (cumulative total past and cumulative total current), education (≤high school or ≥some college), annual income (1–10 categorical), and Kellgren Lawrence knee OA radiograph score (0–4). An analysis of covariance was conducted to compare the no or low chronic pain severity group (FITT 1) with the high chronic pain severity group (FITT 5) adjusting for primary covariates which included age, race or ethnicity, sex, study site, and knee pain status. Secondary analyses for additional covariates were completed, which were selected based on variables associated with telomere length after controlling for age which was limited to WHR. Linear regression models were used to conduct model-based tests for analyses of FITT domains and FITT as an interval variable predicting telomere length and for clinical and functional pain measures predicting FITT and telomere length adjusting for primary and secondary covariates. The data analysis was conducted using SAS 9.4.

3. Results

3.1. Demographics and clinical and functional descriptors by FITT

Tables 2 and 3 provide a descriptive overview across demographic, biobehavioral, and clinical pain and functional measures by the FITT chronic pain severity groups. Telomere length was correlated with age (\( r = -0.398, P < 0.0005 \)); race or ethnicity (\( r = -0.229, P = 0.007 \)); WHR (\( r = -0.222, P = 0.009 \)); past comorbidities (\( \rho = -0.191, P = 0.026 \)), and employment status (\( \rho = -0.219, P = 0.01 \)). Telomere length was not

---

Table 3

| FITT groups by demographics, bio-behavioral measures, and FITT domains. |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Demographics             | FITT 1 (n = 21)  | FITT 2 (n = 17)  | FITT 3 (n = 22)  | FITT 4 (n = 41)  | FITT 5 (n = 35)  |
| Age, mean (SD), y         | 60.43 (7.74)     | 56.88 (8.92)     | 57.14 (8.03)     | 57.66 (7.79)     | 54.11 (8.27)     |
| Race/Ethnicity, %         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| African Americans         | 33.33            | 58.82            | 54.55            | 41.46            | 77.14            |
| Non-Hispanic Whites       | 66.67            | 41.18            | 45.45            | 58.54            | 22.86            |
| Gender, %                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Female                    | 76.19            | 70.59            | 68.18            | 65.85            | 60.00            |
| Male                      | 23.81            | 29.41            | 31.82            | 34.15            | 40.00            |
| Site, %                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| UF                        | 90.48            | 76.47            | 54.55            | 29.27            | 40.00            |
| UAB                       | 9.52             | 23.53            | 45.45            | 70.73            | 60.00            |
| Employment, %             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Employed                  | 47.62            | 52.94            | 54.55            | 60.98            | 54.29            |
| Not employed              | 52.38            | 47.06            | 45.45            | 39.02            | 45.71            |
| Marital Status, %         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Married                   | 33.33            | 35.29            | 45.45            | 46.34            | 31.43            |
| Not married               | 66.67            | 64.71            | 54.55            | 53.66            | 68.57            |
| Bio-behavioral            |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| BMI, mean (SD), kg/m\(^2\) | 25.85 (6.01)     | 30.41 (6.72)     | 31.03 (8.03)     | 31.15 (6.38)     | 34.94 (10.51)    |
| Smoker, %                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Non-smoker                | 55.00            | 47.06            | 50.00            | 53.66            | 40.00            |
| Former smoker             | 25.00            | 29.41            | 36.36            | 19.51            | 22.86            |
| Current smoker            | 20.00            | 23.53            | 13.64            | 26.83            | 37.14            |
| Exercise frequency, %     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| <1 time/wk                | 20.00            | 52.94            | 27.27            | 26.83            | 40.00            |
| 1–3 times/wk              | 60.00            | 29.41            | 45.45            | 51.22            | 40.00            |
| ≥4 times/wk               | 20.00            | 17.65            | 27.27            | 21.95            | 20.00            |
| KL scores, mean (SD)      | 0.43 (0.75)      | 0.93 (1.22)      | 1.35 (1.42)      | 1.38 (1.48)      | 1.68 (1.59)      |
| FITT Domains              |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Frequency, %              |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Yes                       | 0               | 41.18            | 86.36            | 100              | 100              |
| No                        | 100             | 58.52            | 13.64            | 0                | 0                |
| GCPS CPI                  | 13.33           | 33.33            | 46.67            | 50               | 73.33            |
| Time/Duration             | 0               | 0                | 12               | 36               | 50               |
| Total Pain Sites          | 1               | 3                | 3                | 5                | 7                |

GCPS CPI, Graded Chronic Pain Scale Characteristic Pain Intensity; KL, Kellgren Lawrence score.

* Spearman’s rho.
associated with Kellgren Lawrence knee OA radiograph scores on the most affected knee ($\rho = -0.094, P = 0.311$).

### 3.2. FITT groups and telomere length

The no or low FITT group had significantly longer telomeres compared with the high chronic pain severity FITT group ($P = 0.025$), see Figure 1. These findings persisted with a secondary analysis with WHR added in the model ($P = 0.036$).

### 3.3. FITT domains, FITT, and telomere length

Linear regression analyses were conducted with the individual FITT components and primary covariates (age, race or ethnicity, sex, study site, and knee pain status) as predictor variables. These analyses showed that individual FITT domains were not predictive of telomere length (all $P > 0.05$). An additional linear regression analysis was completed with FITT index as a numerical predictor with primary covariates in the model. This analysis showed that FITT significantly predicted telomere length ($P = 0.034$), and this relationship persisted with the addition of WHR in the model ($P = 0.048$).

### 3.4. FITT groups and clinical and functional measures

FITT was significantly associated with all WOMAC and GCPS measures (all $P < 0.0001$) and with performance on the SPPB Chair Stand ($P = 0.02$), but not with other SPPB subscales and total, Table 4. These findings, with the exception of the SPPB Chair Stand, persisted after controlling for WHR and incorporating Bonferroni correction adjustments.

### 3.5. Clinical or functional knee osteoarthritis measures and telomere length

The WOMAC, SPPB, and GCPS and associated subscales were not associated with telomere length (all $P > 0.07$), Table 5.

### 4. Discussion

There are a number of key findings from our investigation. First, as hypothesized, individuals with high knee OA chronic pain severity based on an FITT index had shorter telomeres compared with individuals with no/low knee OA chronic pain severity. Second, as anticipated, the individual FITT domains were not associated with telomere length. However, the combined FITT index captures a cumulative contribution from each domain that has an additive predictive value as demonstrated in a significant dose-response relationship. Third, the FITT index was highly associated with recognized and frequently used measures of OA pain and functioning. However, recognized and frequently used measures of OA pain and functioning were not associated with telomere length. Our findings suggest that the FITT chronic pain severity index seems to capture the biological interface of knee OA chronic pain severity more effectively than commonly used clinical and functional measures of OA which assess symptom severity over a shorter duration (48 hours to 6 months) and do not include measures of frequency or extent of body sites with pain.

**Table 4**

| Clinical measures | FITT groups by clinical and functional measures: unadjusted mean and SD with adjusted group comparisons. |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                   | 1 (n = 21)       | 2 (n = 17)       | 3 (n = 22)       | 4 (n = 41)       | 5 (n = 35)       | P            |
| WOMAC             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |              |
| Pain              | 1.67 (2.39)     | 4.76 (2.41)     | 6.14 (3.36)     | 7.56 (3.47)     | 10.26 (3.73)    | <0.0001    |
| Stiffness         | 0.90 (1.45)     | 2.18 (1.13)     | 2.86 (1.52)     | 4.27 (1.63)     | 5.31 (1.81)     | <0.0001    |
| Physical function | 6.00 (7.54)     | 16.59 (9.09)    | 17.86 (9.77)    | 26.34 (12.31)   | 35.66 (13.4)    | <0.0001    |
| Total             | 8.57 (10.26)    | 23.53 (11.87)   | 26.86 (12.8)    | 38.16 (16.54)   | 51.23 (17.88)   | <0.0001    |
| GCPS              |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |              |
| CPI               | 11.75 (10.63)   | 35.29 (18.49)   | 48.48 (17.17)   | 53.17 (15.11)   | 72.57 (14.14)   | <0.0001    |
| Disability        | 0 (0)           | 0.94 (1.53)     | 2.00 (1.9)      | 2.02 (1.75)     | 3.60 (1.91)     | <0.0001    |
| Pain grade        | 0.71 (0.46)     | 1.38 (0.96)     | 2.10 (1.14)     | 2.15 (0.90)     | 3.06 (0.87)     | <0.0001    |
| SPPB              |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |              |
| Chair stand       | 3.00 (0.84)     | 2.59 (1.33)     | 2.73 (1.39)     | 2.66 (1.32)     | 2.17 (1.44)     | 0.02       |
| Gait              | 3.71 (0.72)     | 3.82 (0.39)     | 3.41 (1.01)     | 3.59 (0.84)     | 3.34 (1.1)      | 0.47       |
| Balance           | 3.86 (0.36)     | 3.82 (0.39)     | 3.73 (0.94)     | 3.9 (0.3)       | 3.74 (0.85)     | 0.77       |
| Total             | 10.57 (1.03)    | 10.24 (1.48)    | 9.86 (2.53)     | 10.15 (1.84)    | 9.26 (2.25)     | 0.12       |

CPI, Characteristic Pain Intensity; GCPS, Graded Chronic Pain Scale; SPPB, Short Physical Performance Battery; WOMAC, Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Index of Osteoarthritis. P-value reflects adjusted comparison controlling for age, race, sex, site, and knee pain status.

---

**Figure 1.** Telomere length by FITT groups—groups defined by combined scores for frequency, intensity, and time or duration of knee pain on most days, and total number of pain site. Covariates in the model: age, race or ethnicity, sex, site, and knee pain status. *Significant difference for FITT 1 and FITT 5, $P = 0.025$.**
compared with those with high chronic knee pain severity. This association persisted with secondary covariates in the model. Importantly, the observed difference in telomere length reflects an increase of approximately 16 years of accelerated aging between the no or low and moderate or high and high severity groups. Importantly, in this study, telomere length was appropriately associated with age, race, and WHR. As joint changes in the knee can occur without indications of pain and functional limitations,9,17 the lack of association between Kellgren Lawrence scores and telomere length is not surprising.

### 4.2. FITT domains and telomere length

A burgeoning body of evidence indicates the importance of considering frequency, intensity, duration, and extent or severity of stress in the evaluation of physiological dysregulation and pain-related biological and health-related changes.25,33,38 For example, pain intensity and pain duration contribute toward the functional limitations and disability in individuals with knee OA23 and predict functional and structural changes in the brain.3,18,30 In addition, pain intensity and number of pain sites are predictive of mortality.40,56 Likewise, pain frequency contributes to the biological burden of pain. Leistad and colleagues demonstrated that after an acute stressor, individuals with chronic pain compared with those with episodic pain demonstrated dysregulated stress system responses.39 Pain frequency has also been linked to pain-related changes in the brain. In individuals with chronic migraines for 3 years or more, individuals who have experienced frequent, persisting duration, and moderate-to-high stress,15,19,59 Failure to adequately characterize various stressors (frequency, intensity, duration, and severity) may explain inconsistencies in previous clinical investigations of telomere length.39,48,50 Importantly, our findings indicate that the additive combination of factors rather than any individual dimension (frequency, intensity, time or duration, and total number of pain sites) is negatively associated with telomere length. Similar patterns have emerged in other lines of investigation.2,30,53

### 4.3. Clinical and functional knee osteoarthritis measures, FITT, and telomere length

Although FITT was highly correlated with the OA clinical and functional measures, the clinical and functional measures were not associated with telomere length. The WOMAC is a frequently used measure that assesses lower extremity pain and function over a timeframe of 48 hours. It is designed to capture recent pain and, although correlated with a measure of chronic pain (GCPS), it will capture dynamic pain experiences and may poorly reflect other characteristics of chronic pain such as duration, frequency, and extent of body pain.

The SPPB is a functional screening measure and in our sample showed a limited score range. Although correlated with clinical measures of knee pain, it is a measure of current functional performance that does not capture features of clinical pain (frequency, intensity, duration, and body sites with pain). The GCPS is a well-recognized measure of chronic pain evaluating intensity of pain and pain-related disability over the last 6 months. However, it may not accurately reflect the overall duration of pain beyond 6 months and does not capture the frequency of pain experience or the extent of pain across other areas of the body. Thus, the findings that telomere length is not associated with the WOMAC, SPPB, or the GCPS are not surprising and are consistent with other telomere findings in which phenotypes were not characterized and differentiated by duration, severity, and persistence of stress.

### 4.4. Relevance of telomere length and FITT to osteoarthritis and pain research

Telomeres are dynamic and influenced by the biochemical environment (cortisol, inflammation, and oxidative stress). Essentially, they are molecular measures of life experience, altered by persisting biological and psychosocial stress, and to some degree reflect general health and disease susceptibility.8,27 As such, telomeres are not specific to OA or chronic pain but seem to provide a relative indication of whether a system is in balance vs overloaded. In addition, there is evidence that telomere shortening may be reduced or buffered by health promoting interventions14,26,49,46 which could reduce the biological burden of chronic pain and associated psychosocial stress on the individual.28

### 4.5. Limitations and future directions

Although the findings reported are encouraging, the next phase of investigation requires prospective analysis. The relevance of telomere length and the FITT index in OA and chronic pain research will best be determined by the replication of findings and longitudinal investigations. Second, phenotyping with

### Table 5

| Measures          | F Value | P  |
|-------------------|---------|----|
| WOMAC             |         |    |
| Pain              | 1.32    | 0.25|
| Stiffness         | 1.60    | 0.21|
| Physical function | 3.30    | 0.07|
| Total             | 2.93    | 0.09|
| SPPB              |         |    |
| Chair stand       | 0.01    | 0.94|
| Gait              | 1.96    | 0.16|
| Balance           | 2.59    | 0.11|
| Total             | 0.02    | 0.90|
| GCPS              |         |    |
| Characteristic pain intensity | 0.96 | 0.33 |
| Total disability points | 0.05 | 0.82 |
| Pain grade        | 0.12    | 0.73 |

Covariates: age, race or ethnicity, sex, site, and knee pain status. SPPB, Short Physical Performance Battery; GCPS, Graded Chronic Pain Scale; WOMAC, Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Index of Osteoarthritis.
comprehensive and detailed biopsychosocial and behavioral data will be essential to confirm the sensitivity of telomere length to changes in the OA pain severity experience. Longitudinal data and access to medical records that provide information regarding frequency, intensity, and duration of pain would greatly improve the phenotyping process. Third, confounding factors that contribute to the pathophysiological mechanisms may influence findings and warrant further investigation. Fourth, in this study, 3 domains of FITT were assessed specific to knee pain experiences. It is anticipated that an FITT index reflective of the cumulative pain experience in individuals with OA or other chronic pain conditions might be a more “effective” index than the typical assessment of a site-specific pain. Fifth, median splits were used to create the FITT chronic pain severity index. Although the cut points align with previous findings, investigations to determine the weighting of domains and actual clinical ranges would be helpful in better understanding the characteristics of pain that facilitate biological burden and accelerated aging. Sixth, little is known regarding the relationship between telomeres and pharmacological management of pain. Findings on psychotropics and telomeres can provide guidance to these important future investigations.35 Finally, the biological burden equation is not unidirectional, as protective factors can reduce the load of biopsychosocial stress.28,45,46,53 A better understanding of this dynamic multidimensional relationship will help facilitate efforts to promote resilience and buffer the biological burden of chronic pain and associated psychosocial stress, thus promoting more optimal health outcomes and possibly improved quality of life.

5. Conclusions
Our findings demonstrate accelerated cellular aging with increasing severity of knee OA pain. Importantly, telomere length is predictive of morbidity and mortality; chronic pain and OA are related to increasing morbidity and mortality; and now, telomere length shortening is associated with knee OA chronic pain severity. In addition, we replicate a chronic pain severity dose–response pattern in telomere length that was previously demonstrated in a population-based study investigating an immune and metabolic risk factor composite.53 Results suggest there may be a biological burden associated with chronic OA pain and clinical measures capturing the frequency, intensity, time or duration, and extent of body pain which may help elucidate those changes.

Disclosures
The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Supported by the National Institutes of Health/National Institute on Aging (R37AG033906 and OppNet AG0333906 OTS1), the University of Florida Clinical and Translational Science Institute (UL1TR000064), and the University of Alabama at Birmingham Center for Clinical and Translational Science (UL1TR000165); the American Pain Society Future Leaders in Pain Research Grant awarded to K. T. Sibille. K. T. Sibille is funded by the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases K23AR062099, E.J. Bartley is funded by the National Institute on Aging K99AG052842-01, C. D. King by the National Institute on Dental and Craniofacial Research K99DE022386, and Y. Cruz-Almeida is funded by the National Institute on Aging K01AG048259. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Acknowledgements
The authors express their appreciation to the UPLOAD investigators, to the UF and UAB research teams for assisting with data collection, the UF CTSI CRC RNs, John Marks DSc, CCORP for assistance with formatting the manuscript, the UF Pharmacogenomics Lab with a special thanks to Cheryl Galloway for her contributions, the Blackburn lab, and for the mentoring and guidance of Bruce McEwen, PhD, in measuring the biological interface of chronic pain.

Article history:
Received 25 October 2016
Received in revised form 23 January 2017
Accepted 23 February 2017

References
[1] Altman R, Asch E, Bloch D, Bole G, Borenstein D, Brandt K, Christy W, Cooke TD, Greenwald R, Hochberg M. Development of criteria for the classification and reporting of osteoarthritis. Classification of osteoarthritis of the knee. Diagnostic and Therapeutic Criteria Committee of the American Rheumatism Association. Arthritis Rheum 1986;29:1039–49.
[2] Apkarian A, Hashmi J, Baikli M. Pain and the brain: specificity and plasticity of the brain in clinical chronic pain. PAIN 2011;152:S49–64.
[3] Apkarian A, Sosa Y, Sony S, Levy R, Harden R, Parrish T, Gitelman D. Chronic back pain is associated with decreased prefrontal and thalamic gray matter density. J Neurosci 2004;24:10410–15.
[4] Barbour K, Helmick C, Boring M, Zhang X, Lu H, Holt J. Prevalence of doctor-diagnosed arthritis at state and county levels—United States, 2014. MMWR Mortal Mortal Wkly Rep 2016;65:489–94.
[5] Beery AK, Lin J, Biddle JS, Francis DD, Blackburn EH, Epel ES. Chronic stress elevates telomerase activity in rats. Biol Lett 2012;8:1063–6.
[6] Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, Campbell J, Stitt LW. Validation study of WOMAC: a health status instrument for measuring clinically important patient relevant outcomes to antirheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. J Rheumatol 1989;15:1833–40.
[7] Blackburn E, Epel E. Too toxic to ignore. Nature 2012;490:169–71.
[8] Blackburn E, Tucker E. Q & A: end-game winner. Nature 2015;526:567–7.
[9] Carlesso LC, Segal N, Curtis JR, Wise BL, Law LF, Nevitt M, Neogi T. Knee pain severity rather than structural damage is a risk factor for incident widespread pain: the Multicenter Osteoarthritis (MOST) Study. Arthritis Care Res 2016.
[10] Cawthon R. Telomere measurement by quantitative PCR. Nucleic Acids Res 2002;30:e47.
[11] CDC. Prevalence and most common causes of disability among adults—United States 2005. MMWR Mortal Mortal Wkly Rep 2009;58:421–26.
[12] Damjanovic A, Yang Y, Glaser R, Kiecolt-Glaser J, Nguyen H, Laskowski B, Zou Y, Beversdorf D, Wing N. Accelerated telomere erosion is associated with a declining immune function of caregivers of Alzheimer’s disease patients. J Immunol 2007;179:4249–54.
[13] Epel E. Telomeres in a life-span perspective: a new “Psychobiomarker”? Curr Dir Psychol Sci 2008;17:6–10.
[14] Epel E. How “reversible” is telomeric aging? Cancer Prev Res (Phila) 2012;5:1163–8.
[15] Epel E, Blackburn E, Lin J, Dhabhar F, Adler N, Morrow J, Cawthon R. Accelerated telomere shortening in response to life stress. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2004;101:17312–15.
[16] Epel E, Merkin S, Cawthon R, Blackburn E, Adler N, Fletcher M, Seeman T. The rate of leukocyte telomere shortening predicts mortality from cardiovascular disease in elderly men. Aging (Albany NY) 2008;10:191–8.
[17] Finan PH, Buenaver LF, Bounds SC, Hussain S, Park RJ, Haque UJ, Campbell CM, Haythornthwaite JA, Edwards FR, Smith MT. Discordance between pain and radiographic severity in knee osteoarthritis findings from quantitative sensory testing of central sensitization. Arthritis Rheum 2013;65:363–72.
[18] Flor H. Cortical reorganization and chronic pain: implications for rehabilitation. J Rehabil Med 2003:41:66–72.
[19] Giribes E, Duenas L, Barbero M, Falla D, Baert I, Meeus M, Sanchez-Frutos J, Aguilella L, Nijs J. Central sensitization in individuals with symptomatic knee osteoarthritis. Phys Ther 2016;96.

Supported by the National Institutes of Health/National Institute on Aging (R37AG033906 and OppNet AG0333906 OTS1), the University of Florida Clinical and Translational Science Institute (UL1TR000064), and the University of Alabama at Birmingham Center for Clinical and Translational Science (UL1TR000165); the American Pain Society Future Leaders in Pain Research Grant awarded to K. T. Sibille. K. T. Sibille is funded by the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases K23AR062099, E.J. Bartley is funded by the National Institute on Aging K99AG052842-01, C. D. King by the National Institute on Dental and Craniofacial Research K99DE022386, and Y. Cruz-Almeida is funded by the National Institute on Aging K01AG048259. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.
increased risk of cancer and cardiovascular-related mortality. Rheumatology 2009;48:74–7.

[41] McEwen B. Biomarkers for assessing population and individual health and disease related to stress and adaptation. Metabolism 2015;64: S2–S10.

[42] Murphy SL, Lyden AK, Clay M, Geisser ME, Yung RL, Clauw DJ, Williams DA. Activity pacing for osteoarthritis symptom management: study design and methodology of a randomized trial testing a tailored clinical approach using accelerometers for veterans and non-veterans. BMC Musculoskeletal Disord 2011;12:177.

[43] Murphy S, Phillips K, Williams D, Clauw D. The role of the central nervous system in osteoarthritis pain and implications for rehabilitation. Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep 2012;14:576–82.

[44] Neogi T, Zhang Y. Epidemiology of osteoarthritis. Rheum Dis Clin North Am 2013;39:1–19.

[45] Ornish D, Lin J, Chan JM, Epel E, Kemp C, Weidner G, Marin R, Frenda SJ, Magbanua MJ, Dubenmeyer J, Estay I, Hills NK, Chainani-Wu N, Carroll PR, Blackburn EH. Effect of comprehensive lifestyle changes on telomerase activity and telomere length in men with biopsy-proven low-risk prostate cancer: 5-year follow-up of a descriptive pilot study. Lancet Oncol 2013;14:1112–20.

[46] Puterman E, Lin J, Krauss J, Blackburn EH, Epel ES. Determinants of telomere attrition over 1 year in healthy older women: stress and health behaviors matter. Mol Psychiatry 2015;20:529–35.

[47] Rahman M, Kopec JA, Ciferri L, Goldsmith C. Risk of cardiovascular disease in patients with osteoarthritis: a prospective longitudinal study. Arthritis Care Res 2013;65:1951–58.

[48] Raschenberger J, Kollerits B, Titze T, Kottgen A, Barthlein E, Buikse S, Forer L, Schonherr S, Weissentrüger H, Haen M, Wanner C, Eckardt KU, Kronenberg F; Investigators GS. Do telomeres have a higher plasticity than thought? Results from the German Chronic Kidney Disease (GCKD) study as a high-risk population. Exp Gerontol 2015;72:162–6.

[49] Roux CH, Sarauza A, Mazieres B, Pouchot J, Morvan J, Fautrel B, Testa J, Fardellone P, Rat AC, Coste J, Guillen E, Ziegler S. Screening for hip and knee osteoarthritis in the general population: predictive value of a questionnaire and prevalence estimates. Ann Rheum Dis 2008;67: 1096–111.

[50] Schabih HG. Mechanisms of chronic pain in osteoarthritis. Curr Rheumatol Rep 2012;14:549–56.

[51] Shalave I, Erntscher S, Wahacha P, Wolkowitz O, Puterman E, Lin J, Epel E. Stress and telomere biology: a lifespan perspective. Psychoneuroendocrinology 2013;38:1835–42.

[52] Sibilte KT, Langaae T, Burrkley B, Gong Y, Glover TL, King C, Riley JL, III, Leeswunburgh C, Staud R, Bradley LA, Fillingim RB. Chronic pain, perceived stress, and cellular aging: an exploratory study. Mol Pain 2012;8:12–18.

[53] Sibilte K, Steingrimsdottir O, Fillingim R, Stubhaug A, Schirmer H, Chen H, McEwen B, Nielsen C. Investigating the burden of chronic pain: an inflammatory and metabolic composite. Pain Res Manag 2016;7657529.

[54] Sibilte KT, Witek-Janusek L, Mathews HL, Fillingim RB. Telomeres and epigenetics: potential relevance to chronic pain. PAIN 2012;153: 1789–93.

[55] Tamayo M, Mosquera A, Mazieres B, Pouchot J, Morvan J, Fautrel B, Testa J, Fardellone P, Rat AC, Coste J, Guillen E, Ziegler S. Screening for hip and knee osteoarthritis in the general population: predictive value of a questionnaire and prevalence estimates. Ann Rheum Dis 2008;67: 1096–111.

[56] Torrance N, Elliott A, Lee A, Smith B. Severe chronic pain is associated with increased 10 year mortality. A cohort record linkage study. Eur J Pain 2010;14:380–86.

[57] Veronese N, Trevisan C, De Rui M, Bolzetta F, Maggi S, Zambon S, Crepaldi G, Mansato E, Sergi G. Association of osteoarthritis with increased risk of cardiovascular diseases in the elderly. Arthritis Rheumatol 2016;68:1136–44.

[58] Von Korff M, Ormel J, Keefe FJ, Dworkin SF. Grading the severity of chronic pain. PAIN 1992;50:133–49.

[59] Wolkowitz OM. Psychiatric disorders and leukocyte telomere length: a randomized controlled trial. Brain Behav Immun 2013;28:29–30.

[60] Zhai G, Aviv A, Hunter D, Hart D, Gardner J, Kimura M, Lu X, Valdes A, Spector T. Reduction of leucocyte telomere length in radiographic hand osteoarthritis: a population-based study. Ann Rheum Dis 2006;65: 1444–45.