

# Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Prevalence and Rapid Screen Method of Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research Syndromes in Human Papillomavirus-Infected Patients

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

#### Published Version:

Cui, X., Ding, L., Xu, Y., Yuan, X., Zhang, Q., Rafanelli, C., et al. (2024). Prevalence and Rapid Screen Method of Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research Syndromes in Human Papillomavirus-Infected Patients. PSYCHOTHERAPY AND PSYCHOSOMATICS, 93(4), 271-277 [10.1159/000539471].

Availability:

This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/1001678 since: 2025-01-15

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1159/000539471

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/). When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

## Prevalence and Rapid Screen Method of Diagnostic Criteria for 1 Psychosomatic Research Syndromes in Human Papillomavirus-Infected 2 **Patients** 3 Xuelian Cui<sup>a</sup>, Lixin Ding<sup>bc</sup>, Yongjuan Xu<sup>d</sup>, Xiaosong Yuan<sup>e</sup>, Qiaoli Zhang<sup>bc</sup>, Chiara Rafanelli<sup>f</sup>, 4 Sara Gostoli<sup>f</sup>, Zhiwei Liu<sup>g</sup>, Jianxin Cao<sup>bc</sup> 5 <sup>a</sup> Department of Psychology, Changzhou Maternal and Child Health Care Hospital, Changzhou 6 7 Medical Center, Nanjing Medical University, Changzhou, Jiangsu, China 8 <sup>b</sup> Department of Psychosomatic Gastroenterology, Third Affiliated Hospital of Soochow 9 University, Changzhou, Jiangsu, China 10 <sup>c</sup> Soochow University Psychosomatic Gastroenterology Institute, Changzhou, Jiangsu, China 11 <sup>d</sup> Department of Cervical, Changzhou Maternal and Child Health Care Hospital, Changzhou 12 Medical Center, Nanjing Medical University, Changzhou, Jiangsu, China 13 e Department of Medical Genetics, Changzhou Maternal and Child Health Care Hospital, Changzhou Medical Center, Nanjing Medical University, Changzhou, Jiangsu, China 14 15 f Department of Psychology, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy g Changzhou Maternal and Child Health Care Hospital, Changzhou Medical Center, Nanjing 16 17 Medical University, Changzhou, Jiangsu, China 18 19 Short Title: Prevalence and screen of DCPR syndromes in patients with HPV 20 Corresponding Author: 21 Jianxin Cao, jianxincao0723@suda.edu.cn 22 Zhiwei Liu, Izwei117@163.com 23 24 Xuelian Cui and Lixin Ding are the two first authors and have contributed equally to this 25 work. 26 Keywords: Psychosomatic syndromes · Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research 27 (DCPR) · Human papillomavirus · DSM-5 28 29 30

31

Abstract Introduction: The early and rapid identification of psychosomatic symptoms is crucial to prevent harmful outcomes in patients with human papillomavirus (HPV) infection in busy comprehensive clinics. This study aimed to explore the prevalence and rapid screening method of the Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research-Revised (DCPR) syndromes in patients with HPV infection. Methods: A total of 504 participants underwent a clinical assessment, that included DCPR, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental (DSM)-5, the Social Support Rating scale (SSRS), the Simplified Coping Style Questionnaire (SCSQ), fear of disease, sociodemographic and clinical characteristics. The prevalence of DCPR syndromes and DSM-5 diagnoses were compared between the HPV-positive and negative patients using chi-square tests. We explored the rapid screen indicator through multiple logistic regression analyses of the participants' psychosocial factors, sociodemographic and clinical characteristics. **Results:** The incidence of DCPR syndromes in HPV-positive patients (56.6%) was significantly greater than that in HPV-negative patients (17.3%) and DSM-5 diagnoses (8.5%) in the HPV positive group. Health anxiety, irritable mood, type A behavior and demoralization were the most common psychosomatic syndromes in HPV-positive patients. As the degree of fear increased from 0 to 5 to 10, the risk of DCPR increased from 1.27 (95% CI: 0.21-7.63) to 3.24 (score range: 1-5, 95% CI: 1.01-10.39) to 9.91 (score range: 6-10, 95% CI: 3.21-30.62) in the HPV-positive group. Conclusion: The degree of fear, as an independent risk factor, could be used to quickly screen outpatients with a high risk of DCPR syndrome among women with HPV infection.

## Introduction

Human Papillomavirus (HPV) is a sexually transmitted virus that is very common and is responsible for causing more than 99% of cervical cancers [1]. In recent years, studies using self-rated scales have shown that there are psychosocial factors that affect HPV-positive patients [2,3], and only one study used a structured clinical interview to assess mental disorders (e.g., DSM) [4]. However, these studies did not assess psychosomatic symptoms or provide specific guidance for clinical interventions.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) is considered as the gold standard in psychiatry [5,6]. However, it may not always be effective at detecting psychological problems that are less severe, known as "subclinical" problems [7]. A new Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research (DCPR) assessment tool was developed in 1995 [8] to address this issue. 2017, a revised DCPR version was released, including a semi-structured interview [9]. Reports have shown that the DCPR has clinical utility in (1) subtyping medical patients, (2) identifying undetected syndromes, (3) evaluating the burden of somatic syndromes, and (4) predicting treatment outcomes and identifying risk factors [10]. The DCPR has been used to supplement DSM diagnosis in oncology [11], dermatology, endocrinology, cardiology [12–15], and gastroenterology studies [16,17]. Its reliability and advantages relative to the DSM were previously verified [18], and its clinimetric properties were confirmed [19].

It is essential to assess the psychological health of patients who are HPV-positive. However, routine assessment can be time-consuming (i.e., more than 30 minutes) and require a specialized psychological clinic referral. Structured interviews require specialized clinical experience and skills [20]. Therefore, doctors who do not have specialized psychological training can use a more rapid screening method. In this study, we investigated the prevalence and psychosocial factors that contribute to DCPR syndromes in patients with HPV infection. We used multivariate analysis to develop a rapid screening method to help doctors quickly identify patients at high risk of DCPR syndromes. This is the first study to examine DCPR syndromes in obstetric and gynecological illnesses worldwide.

## **Materials and Methods**

Study design and Participants

This cross-sectional study investigated risk factors associated with DCPR syndromes in HPV infection patients. The study enrolled patients who visited the HPV Special Disease Clinic of the Cervical Diseases Department of Changzhou Maternal and Child Health Care Hospital consecutively from January 2022 to December 2022 and met the following criteria: (1) aged

20–66 years; (2) positivity for one or more HPV types 16, 18, 26, 31, 33, 35, 39, 45, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 66, 68, or 82; (3) normal or abnormal cytological type; (4) Chinese maternal history; and (5) primary school education or above. Patients who had cervical cancer or any other cancer, hysterectomy, acute or fatal cardiovascular, kidney, liver, nervous system disease, or immune system disease were excluded. Participants in the control group were without HPV infection, the other inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria were the same as the HPV positive group.

#### **Procedures and outcomes**

The primary measure to evaluate psychosomatic syndromes was through semi-structured interviews using the DCPR tool [21]. In addition to this, other measures like DSM-5 diagnoses [22], Social Support Rating Scale (SSRS) [23], Simplified Coping Style Questionnaire (SCSQ) [24], and the level of fear was also evaluated (instruments available within the online supplement). The sociodemographic and clinical data were collected by a trained psychologist independently.

## Statistical analyses

The statistical analyses were conducted using Empower Stats software version 2.2 (X&Y Solutions, Inc., USA) and R (version 3.4.2; http://www.R-project.org). We compared the sociodemographic and clinical characteristics, including age, educational level, income, occupation status, marital status, infection duration, DCPR, DSM-5, degree of fear, medical history, coping styles, SSRS, and incidence knowledge between HPV-positive and HPV-negative groups using independent t-tests or Kruskal–Wallis tests. Similarly, we used the same method to compare DCPR = 0 with DCPR  $\geq$  1. Chi-square test was used to analyze the prevalence of DCPR syndromes and DSM-5 diagnoses. The age, education, income, SSRS, degree of fear, HPV positivity, active coping, passive coping and infection duration were used to evaluate the associations of psychosocial factors with DCPR syndromes (DCPR  $\geq$  1) using univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses. We also assessed the potential effect of advanced fear on the relationship between DCPR risk and HPV positivity by interaction analysis and obtained odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). We considered a two-tailed P < 0.05 to indicate statistical significance.

## Results

A total of 504 (249 HPV-positive and 255 negative) patients were enrolled in the study, as detailed in online supplementary Fig. 1. The demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients were analyzed to determine the risk factors associated with DCPR syndromes in HPV infection patients.

Age, infection duration, degree of fear, DSM-5 diagnoses, and DCPR syndromes showed significant differences between the HPV-positive and HPV-negative groups (all P values < 0.05), as detailed in online supplementary Table 1. Among the participants, 141 patients (56.6%) reported at least one diagnosed DCPR syndrome, with the most common syndromes being health anxiety (30.9%, n = 77), irritable mood (26.5%, n = 66), type A behavior (22.5%, n = 56), and demoralization (16.7%, n = 33). Conversely, 44 individuals who tested negative for HPV reported at least one DCPR syndrome, constituting 17.3% of the study population. In contrast, 21 individuals who tested positive for HPV were diagnosed with at least one mental disorder by DSM-5 criteria, accounting for 8.4% of the participants. The incidence of DCPR syndromes was significantly higher in HPV-positive patients than the incidence of DSM-5 diagnoses ( $\chi^2$  = 131.75, P < 0.001). For further details, please refer to the (supplemental) Table 2.

The study revealed significant differences between participants with at least one DCPR syndrome and those without regarding age, degree of fear, coping styles, educational levels, income levels, and infection duration (all P values < 0.05–0.001), as indicated in Table 1. Further analysis demonstrated that age (33–39 years: OR: 2.37, 95% CI: 1.15–4.90), SSRS score (OR: 0.95, 95% CI: 0.92–0.99), degree of fear (6–10: 4.43, 95% CI: 1.86–10.53), and HPV positivity (OR: 3.51, 95% CI: 2.04–6.04) were independent influencing factors of DCPR syndrome (all P values < 0.05), as outlined in Table 2.

We found a significant relationship between fear and HPV positivity when it comes to the risk of presenting at least one DCPR syndrome (see online suppl. Table 3). Our analysis showed that as the degree of fear increased from zero to 1–5 to 6–10, the risk of DCPR syndrome also increased from (95% CI: 0.59 to 14.54, P=0.1877) to 6.48 (95% CI: 2.35-17.84, P=0.003) to 18.94 (95% CI:7.05-50.91, P<0.0001) respectively, in the crude model. However, after considering various factors such as age, education level, duration, income, coping style, and SSRS score, the risk of DCPR syndrome still increased in the adjusted model from 1.27 (95% CI=0.21 to 7.63, P=0.7918) to 3.24 (score range=1-5, 95% CI=1.01 to 10.39, P=0.0477) to 9.91 (score range=6-10, 95% CI=3.21 to 30.62, P<0.0001) respectively.

## **Discussion**

Patients with HPV, the most common sexually transmitted disease, are increasingly aware of the link between HPV infection and cervical cancer. In addition to worrying about their health, patients also fear disclosing their test results to their partners, family, or friends due to the stigma associated with the infection. This has led to an increase in anxiety, distress, and shame among patients [27, 28, 29]. In this study, it was found that both depressive

disorder and anxiety disorder were more common in HPV-positive patients compared to negative ones. However, the differences were not statistically significant. According to the DSM-5, only 8.5% of the patients displayed symptoms that indicated a psychiatric diagnosis. However, a much higher percentage of patients (56.6%) met the criteria for DCPR syndrome. This suggests that the DCPR can identify subthreshold or subsyndromal disorders related to HPV that may have gone undiagnosed by DSM-5 alone. This finding is consistent with previous research in other medical settings [30,31].

The prevalence of DCPR syndromes has been studied in patients with various illnesses, revealing different syndromes as the most common. In congestive heart failure patients, the three most common syndromes were irritable mood (12.9%), illness denial (22.9%), and demoralization (15.7%) [31]. In primary care patients, the main DCPR syndromes were maladaptive illness behavior (26.5%), allostatic overload (15.5%), and demoralization (15%) [30]. Patients who underwent coronary artery bypass grafting surgery had type A behavior (14.7%), irritable mood (14.7%), and health anxiety (11.8%) [14]. For migraine, the most frequent syndromes were allostatic overload (29%), type A behavior (10.5%), and persistent somatization (8%) [18]. In HPV-positive patients, the most common DCPR syndromes were health anxiety (30.9%), irritable mood (26.5%), type A behavior (22.5%), and demoralization (16.7%) [33]. These three, along with demoralization, were among the four major psychosocial aspects of a medical disorder in the biopsychosocial model based on clinimetric methods of classification [32].

Health anxiety is a condition where an individual experiences excessive and persistent worrying about their health, often accompanied by intense bodily preoccupations and an inclination to amplify physical sensations [20]. Fortunately, several effective treatments have been identified for this condition, including Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) [33], imagery techniques [34], mindfulness training, and acceptance and commitment therapy. These treatments can be administered individually or in group settings, both in-person or virtually over the Internet, and be efficacious in the short and long term [35].

Demoralization is a term used to describe the feelings of helplessness, despair, and subjective incompetence that people experience when they believe they are not meeting their or others' expectations while coping with difficulties [36, 37]. Identifying demoralization, which can also manifest as hopelessness in severe cases, can help identify patients who are more susceptible to nonspecific elements of treatment [38]. CBT combined with WBT, bedside psychotherapy [39], and existential inquiry [40] can be effective in addressing demoralization based on preliminary findings [41].

In this research, it was found that HPV-positive women with a fear level ranging from 6 to 10 had a risk of DCPR that was up to 9.91 times greater than that of HPV-negative women, even when other factors were taken into account [42]. According to the hypnosis theory of Milton Erickson, each person responds to questions based on their inner needs. The degree of fear reported by the participants was influenced by their personality traits, coping styles, and cognitive levels. This, in turn, reflected their attitudes and behaviors toward the disease. As the literature suggests, listening to the patient's beliefs about the illness and its treatment can help identify inadequate expectations and convictions that may lead to health-damaging behaviors [20]. Therefore, self-reported fear levels could be used as a quick method to screen for DCPR syndrome in outpatients with HPV infection. Further research is needed to determine whether this approach could be applied to other diseases

The current study has a few limitations that should be considered. First, it was a single-center cross-sectional study that may not accurately represent the general population. Thus, the conclusions drawn from this study need to be validated before being extended. Second, the focus of this study was on the Chinese population, and since HPV-positive rates vary according to race, further well-designed multicountry studies are required. Lastly, this study only examined one illness; future studies should determine if these findings apply to other diseases.

## Conclusion

The DCPR tool clinicians administer requires proper training and familiarity with the literature on DCPR. It also requires prior knowledge of a patient's medical and psychiatric diagnosis, disease course, and treatment history. A joint psychiatric assessment is recommended. This study aimed to fill the gap in knowledge on the use of DCPR syndrome in obstetrics and gynecology illnesses. It also explored a rapid screening method for doctors with no special psychological training rather than simplifying assessment scales or training more psychiatrists, as done in previous research. The findings showed that over 85% of patients with a fear score of 6–10 had at least one DCPR syndrome, and the detection efficiency improved significantly when applying the results of this experiment to the clinic.

We need to investigate further whether the correlation between the level of fear and the incidence of DCPR syndrome applies to other diseases. Furthermore, this method can aid clinicians in rapidly identifying outpatients at a greater risk of developing DCPR syndrome. This would promote efficient and systematic DCPR assessment in various clinical environments.

#### Acknowledgments

The authors thank all the subjects and psychiatrist involved in the study, as well as the nonauthor team members Wang Li, Hu Huiwen and Zhu Haiyan, for collection and preparation of the data presented herein.

## **Statement of Ethics**

The authors assert that all of the procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975 as revised in 2008. All of the participants provided written informed consent, and all procedures for the study were approved by the Ethics Committee of Nanjing Medical University (Approval number 2022(491)).

#### **Statement of Ethics**

The study was conducted ethically in accordance with the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. All participants gave their written informed consent to participate in the study. The Ethics Committee of Nanjing Medical University approved the study with Approval Number 2022-491.

#### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

#### **Funding Sources**

The work presented here was funded by the Top Talent of Changzhou "The 14th Five-Year Plan" High-Level Health Talents Training Project, and the Changzhou Science and Technology Plan (Social development science and technology support) project (CE20215023).

#### **Author Contributions**

X. Cui, L. Ding, and Y. Xu designed the study. X. Cui, L. Ding and Q. Zhang extracted the data, conducted, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. X. Yuan cross-checked the statistical analyses. C. Rafanelli and S. Gostoli critically reviewed and interpreted the manuscript. Z. Liu and J. Cao are the principal investigators, providing resources and supervising all steps of this project. All authors contributed to the interpretation, review, and editing the manuscript, and approved the submission of the final version.

## **Data Availability Statement**

The data cannot be shared due to patient confidentiality and privacy concerns. Further enquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

## 270 **References**

- 271 1 Schiffman M, Castle PE, Jeronimo J, Rodriguez AC, Wacholder S. Human papillomavirus
- and cervical cancer. Lancet. 2007; 370(9590):890-907.
- 273 2 Marlow L A V, McBride E, Ridout D. Patterns of anxiety and distress over 12
- 274 months following participation in HPV primary screening. Sex Transm Infect. 2022;
- 275 98(4):255-261.
- 276 3 McBride E, Marlow LAV, Forster AS, Ridout D, Kitchener H, Patnick J. Anxiety and
- 277 distress
- following receipt of results from routine HPV primary testing in cervical screening: The
- psychological impact of primary screening (PIPS) study. Int J Cancer. 2020; 146(8):
- 280 2113-2121.
- 4 Henry M, Arnovitz E, Frenkiel S, Hier M, Zeitouni A, Kost K, et al. Psychosocial outcomes
- of human papillomavirus (HPV)-and non-HPV-related head and neck cancers: A
- 283 longitudinal study. Psycho-Oncology. 2022; 31(2):185–197.
- 284 5 Guidi J, Piolanti A, Berrocal C, Gostoli S, Carrozzino D. Incremental Validity Of The
- 285 Diagnostic Criteria For Psychosomatic Research Revised (DCPR) To Clinical Assessment
- 286 In Primary Care. Psychiatry Res. 2020;291:113233.
- 287 6 Porcelli P, De Carne M, Leandro G. Distinct associations of DSM-5 Somatic Symptom
- 288 Disorder, the Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research-Revised (DCPR) and
- 289 symptom severity in patients with irritable bowel syndrome. Gen Hosp Psychiatry.
- 290 2020;64:56-62.
- 291 7 Häuser W, Bialas P, Welsch K, Wolfe F. Construct validity and clinical utility of current
- research criteria of DSM-5 somatic symptom disorder diagnosis in patients with
- fibromyalgia syndrome. J Psychosom Res. 2015;78 (6):546–552.
- 294 8 Fava GA, Freyberger HJ, Bech P, Christodoulou G, Sensky T, et al. Diagnostic criteria for
- use in psychosomatic research. Psychother Psychosom. 1995;63(1):1-8.
- 296 9 Guidi J, Fava GA. The clinical Science of Euthymia: A Conceptual Map. Psychother
- 297 Psychosom. 2022; 91(3):156-167.
- 298 10 Porcelli P, Guidi J. The Clinical Utility of the Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic
- 299 Research: A Review of Studies. Psychother Psychosom. 2015; 84(5):265–272.
- 300 11 Grassi L, Sabato S, Rossi E, Biancosino B, Marmai L. Use of the Diagnostic Criteria for
- Psychosomatic Research in Oncology. Psychother Psychosom. 2005; 74(2):100–107.
- 302 12 Porcelli P, Guidi J. The clinical utility of the diagnostic criteria for psychosomatic research:

- a review of studies. Psychother Psychosom. 2015; 84 (5):265–272.
- 304 13 Rafanelli C, Roncuzzi R, Milaneschi Y, Tomba E, Colistro MC, Pancaldi LG, et al. Stressful
- 305 Life Events, Depression and Demoralization as Risk Factors for Acute Coronary Heart
- 306 Disease. Psychother Psychosom. 2005;74(3):179–184.
- 307 14 Rafanelli C, Roncuzzi R, Milaneschi Y. Minor Depression as a Cardiac Risk Factor After
- 308 Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery. Psychosomatics. 2006; 47(4):289-295.
- 309 15 Gostoli S, Buzzichelli S, Guidi J, Sirri L, Marzola E, Roncuzzi R, et al. An innovative
- approach to the assessment of mood disturbances in patients with acute coronary
- 311 syndrome. CNS Spectrums. 2023; 28(1):78-89.
- 312 16 Cao JX, Ding LX. Psychosomatic Practice in Gastroenterology: New Insights and Models
- 313 from China. Psychother Psychosom. 2019;88(6):321-326.
- 314 17 Gostoli S, Montecchiarini M, Urgese A, Ferrara F, Polifemo AM, Ceroni L, et al. The
- 315 clinical utility of a comprehensive psychosomatic assessment in the program for
- 316 colorectal cancer prevention: a cross-sectional study. Scientific Reports. 2021; 11 (1),
- 317 15575.
- 318 18 Cosci F, Svicher A, Romanazzo S, Maggini L, Cesaris FD, Benemei S, et al. Criterion-related
- 319 validity in a sample of migraine outpatients: the diagnostic criteria for psychosomatic
- 320 research . CNS Spectr. 2020 ;25(4):545-551.
- 321 19 Romaniello C, Romanazzo S, Cosci F. Clinimetric properties of the diagnostic criteria for
- psychosomatic research among the elderly. Clin Psychol Psychother. 2023;30(3):611-619
- 323 20 Fava GA, Cosci F, Sonino N, Guidi J. Understanding Health Attitudes and Behavior. Am J
- 324 Med. 2023; 136:252-259.
- 325 21 Fava GA, Cosci F, Sonino N. Current Psychosomatic Practice. Psychother Psychosom.
- 326 2017; 86(1):13-30.
- 327 22 American Psychiatric Association- APA,. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental
- Disorders, fifth edition. American Psychiatric Publishing, Arlington, VA.2013.
- 329 23 Xiao S. The theoretical basis and research application of "Social Support Rating Scale". J
- 330 Clin Psychiatry. 1994; 4:98–100.
- 331 24 Xie YN. A preliminary study of the reliability and validity of the simplified coping style
- 332 questionnaire (in Chinese). Chin J Clin Psychol. 1998;6:114–115.
- 25 Piccinelli M, Bisoffi G, Bon MG, Cunico L, Tansella M. Validity and test-retest reliability of
- the italian version of the 12-item General Health Questionnaire in general practice: A
- comparison between three scoring methods. Compr Psychiatry. 1993;34(3):198-205.
- 336 26 Bystad M, Grønli O, Lilleeggen C, Aslaksen PM. Fear of diseases among people over 50

- years of age: A survey. Scandinavian Psychologist. 2016; 3.
- 338 27 Dodd RH, Mac O, Brotherton JML, Cvejic E, McCaffery KJ. Levels of anxiety and distress
- following receipt of positive screening tests in Australia's HPV-based cervical screening
- programme: a cross-sectional survey. Sex Transm Infect. 2020;96(3):166-172.
- 341 28 Emily M, Marlow LAV, Forster AS, Ridout D, Kitchener H, Patnick J, et al. Anxiety and
- distress following receipt of results from routine HPV primary testing in cervical
- 343 screening: The psychological impact of primary screening (PIPS) study. Int J Cancer. 2020;
- 344 146(8):2113-2121.
- 345 29 Waller J, Marlow LAV , Wardle J.The association between knowledge of HPV and feelings
- of stigma, shame and anxiety. Sex Transm Infect. 2007; 83(2):155–159.
- 30 Piolanti A, Gostoli S, Gervasi J, Sonino N, Guidi J. A Trial Integrating Different Methods to
- Assess Psychosocial Problems in Primary Care. Psychother Psychosom. 2019; 8(1):30-36.
- 349 31 Guidi J, Rafanelli C, Roncuzzi R, Sirri L, Fava GA. Assessing psychological factors affecting
- medical conditions: comparison between different proposals. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2013;
- 351 35(2):141-6.
- 352 32 Fava G, Patierno C, Sonino N, Cosci, F. Key psychosocial issues in medical care. Acta
- 353 Psychiatr Scand. 2024;1–10. In press.
- 354 33 Cooper K, Gregory JD, Walker I, Lambe S, Salkovskis PM. Cognitive Behaviour Therapy for
- 355 Health Anxiety: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Behav Cogn Psychother.
- 356 2017;45(2):110-123.
- 357 34 Tolgou T, Rohrmann S, Stockhausen C, Krampen D, Warnecke I, Reiss N. Physiological
- and psychological effects of imagery techniques on health anxiety. Psychophysiology.
- 359 2017;1–12.
- 360 35 Tyrer P. Recent Advances in the Understanding and Treatment of Health Anxiety. Curr
- 361 Psychiatry Rep. 2018; 20:49.
- 362 36 Fava GA, Guidi J. Clinical Characterization of Demoralization. Psychother Psychosom.
- 363 2023; 92:139–147.
- 364 37 Woźniewicz A, Cosci F. Clinical utility of demoralization: A systematic review of the
- 365 literature. Clin Psychol Rev . 2023, 99:102227.
- 366 38 Tomba E, Tecuta L, Guidi J, Grandi S, Rafanelli C. Demoralization and Response to
- 367 Psychotherapy: A Pilot Study Comparing the Sequential Combination of
- 368 Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy and Well-Being Therapy with Clinical Management in
- 369 Cyclothymic Disorder. Psychother Psychosom. 2016;85(1):56–57.
- 370 39 Griffith JL, Gaby L. Brief Psychotherapy at the Bedside: Countering Demoralization From

371		Medical Illness. Psychosomatics. 2005; 46(2):109-116.
372	40	Griffith JL . Existential inquiry: Psychotherapy for crises of demoralization. Eur J Psychiat.
373		2013; 27(1):42-47.
374	41	Gostoli S, Subach R, Guolo F, Buzzichelli S, Abbate Daga G, de Figueiredo JM, et al.
375		Demoralization in acute coronary syndrome: treatment and predictive factors
376		associated with its persistence. Int J Clin Health Psychol. 2024; In press.
377	42	Erickson MH, Rossi EL. Experiencing hypnosis: Therapeutic Approaches to Altered States
378		Irvington Publishers. New York; 1981.
379		

Table1 Psychosocial factors and health-related information of DCPR syndromes

Characteristics	DCPR		
Characteristics	0 (n=319)	≥ 1 (n=185)	Р
Age (year)	33.8±8.5	37.4±9.2	< 0.001
20-27	72 (22.6)	20 (10.8)	< 0.001
28-32	112 (35.2)	45 (24.3)	
33-39	68 (21.4)	52 (28.1)	
40-66	67 (21)	68 (36.8)	
Education			
High school or below	112 (35.1)	98 (53)	< 0.001
College or above	207 (64.9)	87 (47)	
Income (RMB)			
<5,000	43 (13.5)	42 (22.7)	0.018
5000-10,000	133 (41.7)	76 (41.1)	
>10,000	143 (44.8)	67 (36.2)	
Occupation			
Unemployed	80 (25.1)	44 (23.8)	0.745
Employed	239 (74.9)	141 (76.2)	
Marital Status			
Unmarried	9 (2.8)	12 (6.5)	0.112
Married	301 (94.4)	166 (89.7)	
Divorce	9 (2.8)	7 (3.8)	
Degree of fear			
0	53 (16.6)	8 (4.3)	< 0.002
1-5	176 (55.2)	61 (33)	
6-10	90 (28.2)	116 (62.7)	
Medical history			
0	258 (80.9)	148 (80)	0.810
1	61 (19.1)	37 (20)	
High incidence			
Known	199 (62.4)	99 (53.5)	0.051
Unknown	120 (37.6)	86 (46.5)	
Duration(month)	0 (0-0.6)	1 (0.1-12)	< 0.002
HPV			
Positive	108 (33.9)	141 (76.2)	< 0.001
Negative	211(66.1)	44 (23.8)	
Active coping	37.4±6.6	33.8±7.5	< 0.001
Passive coping	17.2±3.7	17.4±4.1	< 0.001
SSRS	43.0±6.5	38.8±7.1	< 0.001

DCPR, Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research-revised; SSRS, Social Support Rating Scale; DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorder, fifth edition; HPV, human papillomavirus. High incidence, people whether know the lifetime risk of HPV infection is nearly 80%. Duration, the time that people have been diagnosed with HPV-positive.

387 Table 2 Regression analysis of influencing factors of DCPR syndromes

	DCPR				
Characteristics	Univaria	ate	Multivariate		
	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> value	
Age (year)					
20-27	1		1		
28-32	1.45(0.79, 2.65)	0.231	1.70 (0.85, 3.42)	0.135	
33-39	2.75 (1.49, 5.08)	0.001	2.37 (1.15, 4.90)	0.020	
40-66	3.71 (2.04, 6.76)	< 0.001	1.69 (0.80, 3.56)	0.170	
Education					
High school or below	1		1		
College or above	0.48 (0.33, 0.69)	< 0.001	1.04 (0.62, 1.74)	0.895	
Income (RMB)					
<5,000	1		1		
5000-10,000	0.59 (0.35, 0.97)	0.039	1.31 (0.71, 2.39)	0.385	
>10,000	0.48 (0.29, 0.80)	0.005	1.32 (0.69, 2.54)	0.399	
SSRS	0.91 (0.89, 0.94)	< 0.001	0.95 (0.92, 0.99)	0.010	
Degree of fear					
0	1		1		
1-5	2.30 (1.03, 5.10)	0.041	1.74 (0.74, 4.12)	0.206	
6-10	8.54 (3.86, 18.87)	< 0.0001	4.43 (1.86, 10.53)	0.001	
HPV					
Negative	1		1		
Positive	6.26 (4.15, 9.44)	< 0.0001	3.51 (2.04, 6.04)	< 0.0001	
Active Coping	0.93 (0.91, 0.96)	< 0.0001	1.01 (0.95, 1.06)	0.846	
Passive Coping	1.92 (1.89, 1.95)	< 0.0001	1.95 (0.90, 1.01)	0.132	
Duration	1.02(1.01,1.04)	0.000	1.00(0.99, 1.02)	0.757	

<sup>388</sup> DCPR, Diagnostic Criteria for Psychosomatic Research-revised; SSRS, Social Support Rating

<sup>389</sup> Scale; DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorder, fifth edition; HPV,

<sup>390</sup> human papillomavirus

