



Assessment and Management of Acute Pain in Adult Medical Inpatients: A Systematic Review

April 2008

Prepared for:

Department of Veterans Affairs
Veterans Health Administration
Health Services Research & Development Service
Washington, DC 20420

Prepared by:

Portland Veterans Affairs Healthcare System
Oregon Evidence-based Practice Center
Portland, OR

Investigators:

Mark Helfand, MD, MPH
Director

Michele Freeman, MPH
Research Associate



PREFACE

VA's Health Services Research and Development Service (HSR&D) works to improve the cost, quality, and outcomes of health care for our nation's veterans. Collaborating with VA leaders, managers, and policy makers, HSR&D focuses on important health care topics that are likely to have significant impact on quality improvement efforts. One significant collaborative effort is HSR&D's Evidence-based Synthesis Program (ESP). Through this program, HSR&D provides timely and accurate evidence syntheses on targeted health care topics. These products will be disseminated broadly throughout VA and will: inform VA clinical policy, develop clinical practice guidelines, set directions for future research to address gaps in knowledge, identify the evidence to support VA performance measures, and rationalize drug formulary decisions.

HSR&D provided funding for the two Evidence Based Practice Centers (EPCs) supported by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) that also had an active and publicly acknowledged VA affiliation—Southern California EPC and Portland, OR EPC—so they could develop evidence syntheses on requested topics for dissemination to VA policymakers. A planning committee with representation from HSR&D, Patient Care Services, Office of Quality and Performance, and the VISN Clinical Management Officers, has been established to identify priority topics and to ensure the quality of final reports. Comments on this evidence report are welcome and can be sent to Susan Schiffner, ESP Program Manager, at Susan.Schiffner@va.gov.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	iii
INTRODUCTION	
Historical Background	1
METHODS	
Topic Development	3
Search Strategy	6
Study Selection	7
Data Abstraction and Quality Assessment.....	7
Data Synthesis	8
Rating the Body of Evidence	8
Peer Review	9
RESULTS	
KEY QUESTION #1:	
How do differences in timing and frequency of assessment, severity of pain, and follow-up of pain affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?	9
In medical inpatients with acute pain, does routine assessment of pain affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?	9
Does the choice of assessment measure affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?	10
Do protocols for assessing pain improve outcomes?	11
Are there gaps in quality even when pain is assessed routinely?	13
Specific condition – abdominal pain	14
KEY QUESTION #2:	
How do the timing and route of administration of pain interventions compare in effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in inpatient care settings?.....	15
Do acute pain management teams and other institutional initiatives improve effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in medical inpatients?.....	16
Do acute pain management teams and other institutional initiatives improve effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in other settings?.....	18
How does coordination with the patient’s primary care physician affect outcomes?	19
How does the choice of treatment modality affect effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in inpatient care settings?.....	19
Effectiveness and safety of patient-controlled analgesia (PCA)	21
Specific conditions	
Renal colic and biliary stone pain	22
Phantom limb pain	23

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

KEY QUESTION 3:

For inpatients with impaired self-report due to any of several factors, including delirium or confusion, pre-existing severe dementia, closed head injury, stroke, and psychosis, how do differences in assessment and management of acute pain affect clinical outcomes or safety?25

KEY QUESTION 4:

For inpatients with dependencies on tobacco, alcohol, stimulant, marijuana, or opioids, how do differences in assessment and management of acute pain affect clinical outcomes or safety?.....28

How do the assessment and management of acute pain differ between patients on pre-existing opioid therapy and patients with opiate addiction?.....29

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of evidence by key question..... 31

Recommendations for future research..... 36

REFERENCES..... 39

TABLES

Table 1. Self-Assessment Pain Measures10

Table 2. Some elements of institution-wide efforts to improve pain assessment and management16

Table 3. Treatments for acute pain19

Table 4. Pain observation scales28

Table 5. Summary of systematic evidence review by key question32

Table 6. Examples of indicators for measuring aspects of pain management37

FIGURES

Figure 1. Analytic framework showing relationships among key questions5

Figure 2. Inpatient nursing acute pain algorithm12

Figure 3. Pain algorithm evaluated in Vila et al.13

APPENDIX A. Search strategy and table of systematic reviews

APPENDIX B. Inclusion/exclusion criteria

APPENDIX C. Quality rating criteria

APPENDIX D. Table of reviewer comments and responses

APPENDIX E. Evidence Summary Tables

Summary Table 1. Studies on the effectiveness and safety of patient-controlled analgesia for acute pain

Summary Table 2. Studies on the timing and frequency of pain assessment, and timing of treatment

Summary Table 3. Studies on the effectiveness and safety of patient-controlled analgesia for acute pain

Summary Table 4. Studies on the management of acute pain in renal colic and biliary stone

Summary Table 5. Studies on the effectiveness and safety of neural blockade for acute pain

INTRODUCTION

*“With the exception of the PACU, the floor will be the most common place where hospitalized patients may need acute pain management.”*¹

Many guidelines and previous reviews address pain assessment and management in surgical inpatients, trauma patients, inpatients with cancer, and inpatients with sickle cell crisis. In contrast, pain in medical inpatients with other conditions has received little attention. The prevalence of pain on the inpatient medical ward is lower than that of a surgical service, but is still substantial. In one hospital survey, 43% of medical ward patients experienced pain, and 12% reported unbearable pain. Twenty per cent of elderly care and general medical patients reported pain scores greater than or equal to 6.² In a survey of patients consecutively admitted to a London hospital, 13% had severe pain 15% had moderate pain at rest, and half had moderate or severe pain with movement.³ A few more European surveys have also tried to assess the prevalence of pain among hospital patients.⁴⁻⁶

On a medical service the etiology of pain is diverse, and may be hard to ascertain. Data on the course and treatment of pain in medical inpatients are absent. Little is known about how intravenous opioid therapy, considered the treatment of choice for patients with severe, acute pain, is used on a medical service. In contrast to the post-operative setting, on a medical service the patient's course is less predictable, making it difficult to establish standards for when and how to change pain therapy and how to deliver it.

Textbooks and professional societies provide relatively straightforward guidance for managing acute pain in the perioperative setting and acute or chronic cancer pain. In contrast, in the U.S. no guidelines have not been proposed for the management of pain in acute inpatient medical care settings. Similarly, there are currently no performance measures in place to enhance pain management. The current VA Office of Research and Development pain-relevant research portfolio has no projects designed to examine the quality of pain care in the general medical or neurology ward setting.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In 1986, the National Institutes of Health held a consensus development conference entitled “The Integrated Approach to the Management of Pain.”⁷ It focused on causes of undertreatment of pain, in particular, excessive concern about the problems of addiction and respiratory depression. The panel endorsed the principle that the most reliable measure of acute pain is the patient's self-report, but recognized limitations in the evidence, recommending future research on the “appropriateness of using existing research measures in clinical settings and...their validity as adjuncts to clinical judgments in pain assessment.” They also cited innovations such as patient-controlled analgesia, but noted that clinical evaluation of PCA, sustained release formulations, epidural administration, and transdermal absorption of narcotic drugs to improve pain management were inadequate.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

Since 1986, it has been widely recognized that a large minority of surgical patients have moderate to severe pain throughout their postoperative hospital course.⁸ Poor pain management in inpatient surgical settings has been associated with slower recovery,⁹ greater morbidity, longer lengths of stay, lower patient satisfaction, and higher costs of care, suggesting that optimal pain care in these settings is of utmost importance in promoting acute illness management, recovery, and adaptation.

In February, 1992, the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research released a guideline for the management of acute pain in trauma patients and in patients undergoing surgical or medical procedures.¹⁰ In 1994, AHCPH published a guideline for managing cancer pain.¹¹ The AHCPH guidelines brought attention to deficiencies in the quality of care and endorsed several principles that became the foundation of inpatient pain management, including

- Clinicians should reassure patients and their families that most pain can be relieved safely and effectively.
- Clinicians should assess patients and, if pain is present, provide optimal relief throughout the course of illness.
- Health professionals should ask about pain, and the patient's self-report should be the primary source of assessment.
- Giving patients pain medicine only "as needed" resulted in prolonged delays because patients may delay asking for help.
- Aggressive prevention of pain is better than treatment because, once established, pain is more difficult to suppress.
- Physicians need to develop pain control plans before surgery and inform the patient what to expect in terms of pain during and after surgery.
- Fears of postsurgical addiction to opioids are generally groundless.
- Patient-controlled medication via infusion pumps is safe.¹²

The VHA National Pain Management Strategy, initiated November 12, 1998, established Pain Management as a national priority. The goals of the strategy included (1) the provision of a system-wide VHA standard of care for pain management to reduce suffering from preventable pain; (2) assurance that pain assessment is performed in a consistent manner and that pain treatment is prompt and appropriate; (3) the inclusion of patients and families as active participants in pain management; (4) the provision for continual monitoring and improvement in outcomes of pain treatment; (5) an interdisciplinary, multi-modal approach to pain management; and (6) assurance that clinicians practicing in the VA healthcare system are adequately prepared to assess and manage pain effectively. In 2000, VA published a toolkit for implementing these goals. (http://www1.va.gov/pain_management/docs/TOOLKIT.pdf)

The strategy led to rapid improvement in performance as measured by documentation of a pain assessment and pain care plans in the medical record and a lower proportion of patients with moderate or severe pain on study units.^{13,14} In 2000, for example, a survey conducted in VA inpatients with cancer found that only 42% of charts showed evidence

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

that a pain rating scale was used¹⁵ The VA and Institute for Healthcare Improvement initiated a collaborative project that used learning sessions, monthly team conference calls, and monitoring of results and sharing of improvement methods via Internet to promote routine assessment of pain and related goals. The learning sessions emphasized reliable and standardized measurement, strategies for interval sampling, and strategies for plotting and analyzing data. From May 2000 to January 2001, when the VA-IHI Joint Collaborative was conducted; moderate or severe pain on study units dropped from 24% to 17%; pain assessment increased from 75% to 85%; pain care plans for patients with at least mild pain increased from 58% to 78%; and number of patients provided with pain educational materials increased from 35% to 62%.^{13, 14} By 2003, chart audit indicated that approximately 98% of veterans receiving care at a VHA facility had a documented pain score within the past 12 months.¹⁶

In July, 2002, VA/DoD developed a Clinical Practice Guideline for the management of acute post-operative pain. The basis for many of the recommendations was expert consensus rather than empirical evidence. To assess intensity, the VA/DOD CPG recommended use of a visual 1-10 numeric rating scale in the context of a complete pain history. Most of the guideline consists of site-specific recommendations for pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic therapy.

In 2003, VHA DIRECTIVE 2003-021 solidified previous accomplishments, leading to creation of a national pain management infrastructure. It requires implementation of “Pain as the 5th Vital Sign” in all clinical settings; establishment of pain management protocols in all clinical settings; and, for each patient, comprehensive pain assessment and development of a pain treatment plan.. It also encourages use of the pain reminders and dialogs sponsored by the VHA National Pain Management Strategy Coordinating Committee.

In 2004, the VHA National Pain Management Strategy Coordinating Committee issued a consensus statement on Assessing Pain in the Patient with Impaired Communication (available from http://www1.va.gov/Pain_Management/page.cfm?pg=41.)

METHODS

Topic Development

This project was nominated by Robert Kerns, Ph.D, VA National Coordinator for Pain Management, with input from a technical expert panel. Dr. Kerns proposed that we integrate the existing literature on the delivery of effective pain care in the acute inpatient medical ward. The results will be used to inform the VA’s National Pain Management Strategy.

Key questions were discussed and finalized during a conference call that included the Steering Committee of the Evidence Synthesis Project and the Portland VAMC project site director. The questions apply only to the target population of inpatients on medical

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

and neurology wards, not to surgical patients, patients with cancer, or patients with sickle cell crisis.

The final key questions are:

- 1. For inpatients who have acute pain, how do differences in timing and frequency of assessment, severity of pain, and follow-up of pain affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?*
- 2. How do the timing and route of administration of pain interventions compare in effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in these inpatient care settings?*
- 3. For inpatients with impaired self-report due to any of several factors, including delirium or confusion, pre-existing severe dementia, closed head injury, stroke, and psychosis, how do differences in assessment and management of acute pain affect clinical outcomes or safety?*
- 4. For inpatients with dependencies on tobacco, alcohol, stimulant, marijuana, or opioids, how do differences in assessment and management of acute pain affect clinical outcomes or safety? How do the assessment and management of acute pain differ between patients on preexisting opioid therapy and patients with opiate addiction?*


We developed an analytic framework (Figure 1) to depict the clinical logic underlying these questions and the rationale for study selection. **Figure 1** shows the relationship between pain assessment and improved pain outcomes. For Key Question 1, we sought direct evidence linking improved pain assessment to improvements in pain outcomes (Arrow 1a), earlier or better treatment (Arrow 1b), or better detection and monitoring (Arrow 1c). Interventions to improve pain assessment could include a better choice of pain measure or different protocols for the frequency and timing of assessment.

Most interventions to improve pain assessment are part of broader systemwide programs that combine strategies to improve the timeliness and frequency of assessment with strategies to increase awareness and responsiveness to pain. When it comes to assessing effects on treatment and pain outcomes, the components aimed at assessment cannot be separated from other components, such as acute pain management teams. We discuss these interventions in the section about Key Question 2.

For Key Question 2, we assessed the timing and route of administration of therapy affect outcomes. At a system level, systemwide programs, acute pain management services, preprinted orders, clinical algorithms, and other management interventions may affect the timing and route of administration of pain treatments. At a more clinical level, we evaluated the use of intravenous versus other routes, prn orders, and patient-controlled analgesia.

Key Questions 3 and 4 follow the logic depicted in Figure 1, applied to patients with cognitive impairment and substance abuse problems, respectively.

Figure 1. Analytic Framework Showing Relationships among Key Questions.



*** KQ 1a, b, c** The following types interventions might improve assessment:

- Better choice of pain measure
- Systemwide programs to improve the timeliness and frequency of assessment
 - numerical pain assessment algorithms
 - clinical pathways, guidelines, performance measurement

**** KQ 2** Interventions include

- Acute pain management services and other system interventions
- Greater use of patient-controlled analgesia
- Greater use of IV vs. IM and PO routes
- Greater use of scheduled administration instead of just prn orders

Search Strategy

Initially, we searched for previous systematic reviews in Medline, PubMed Clinical Queries, and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (1996 to April, 2007.) We identified several previous reviews:

Acute Pain Management: Scientific Evidence, 2nd edition (2005)¹⁷. The ANZCA review and guideline covers scientific articles published after 1998; it does not specify the closing date of the searches. ANZCA is a good-quality systematic review and guideline from Australia that provides the best available summary of research findings and recommendations for future research for many of the questions addressed in our report.¹⁷ The guideline covers post-operative pain as well as acute pain associated with non-surgical conditions such as spinal cord injury, burns, cancer, acute zoster, neurological diseases, haematological disorders (e.g. sickle cell disease) and HIV/AIDS, as well as abdominal (e.g. renal and biliary colic), cardiac, musculoskeletal and orofacial pain and headache. It also covered acute pain management in the elderly, opioid-tolerant patients, patients with obstructive sleep apnea, renal or hepatic impairment or a substance abuse disorder.¹⁸

Institutional Approaches to Pain Assessment and Management (2003). This National Institute of Clinical Studies Literature Review, also from Australia, covers literature published between 1995 and May, 2002.¹⁹ This systematic review covers multi-level institutional strategies, Acute Pain Services, and other dedicated-service strategies to improve pain assessment and management.

ICSI Healthcare Guideline: Assessment and Management of Acute Pain, 5th ed. 2006. This guideline provides algorithms for managing acute somatic, visceral, and neuropathic pain. It cites some pertinent articles published 2005 or before, and suggests some performance measures,²⁰ but is not based on a systematic review.

Pain: Current Understanding of Assessment, Management, and Treatments (2001)²¹ and **Improving the quality of pain management through measurement and action (2003)**,²² address the application of continuous quality improvement techniques to pain assessment and management and the implementation of performance measurement processes. Both reports were prepared by the National Pharmaceutical Forum in collaboration with JCAHO.

International Association for the Study of Pain consensus guidelines on assessing pain in the elderly (2007)²³ While not evidence-based, these guidelines cite a large body of evidence about different approaches to assessing pain and includes a section about assessing pain in patients with cognitive impairment.

We proceeded to conduct a targeted search in Medline for primary research studies published from 1950 to July 2007 that address KQ1 or KQ2, the use of PCA for non-surgical pain. A list of studies included in the previous reviews, as well as the search terms and MeSH headings for the various search strategies, are found in Appendix A.

Study Selection

Two reviewers assessed for relevance the abstracts of citations identified from literature searches, using the criteria described in Appendix B. Full-text articles of potentially relevant abstracts were retrieved and a second review for inclusion was conducted by reapplying the inclusion criteria. Eligible articles had English-language abstracts and provided primary data relevant to the key questions. We included studies that were conducted in inpatients with acute pain and reported data on any of the following: Association between timing and frequency of pain assessment, severity of pain, and choice of treatment (e.g. regional blocks, medications, or other therapies); method of pain assessment (e.g. 11-point pain scale, visual analog scale, verbal descriptor scale; timing and route of administration of pain interventions (e.g. oral intermittent pharmacotherapy, intravenous therapy, psychological interventions, positioning, neural blockade, and patient-controlled analgesia); timeliness of enactment of treatment plans, changes in treatment plans; effect of coordination of care with the patient's primary care physician or with a pain consultation service on choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety; patient outcomes, including degree of pain relief, pain intensity, emotional well-being, patient satisfaction, physical function, and fitness for rehabilitation of the underlying condition; safety outcomes; severity and frequency of side effects (including somnolence, respiratory depression, confusion, constipation, ileus, vomiting, non-allergic itching, weakness/numbness, and use of naloxone); length of stay; or follow-up of pain. We excluded studies of interventions that were not routinely available in the VA health system. We excluded studies of post-operative pain, sickle cell disease, cancer pain, chronic pain in patients hospitalized 10 days or longer for whom pain is chronic or refractory, except when studies of adverse effects were not available in the target population.

Data Abstraction and Quality Assessment

We abstracted the following data from included studies: Study Design/setting, Objective, eligibility criteria / method for assembling cohort, exclusion criteria, sample size, years of enrollment/observation, duration of follow-up, demographics, clinical category/baseline pain, method used to assess pain, intervention/exposure of interest, outcomes measured, potential confounders considered, results, conclusions. Although the studies were heterogeneous in design, objectives, and outcomes, we rated the quality of evidence of studies when applicable, using the criteria of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force for evaluating randomized controlled trials and cohort and studies (Appendix C).²⁴ For example, for randomized trials, we abstracted data on treatment allocation; \ the method of randomization; concealment of treatment allocation; similarity of groups at baseline regarding the most important prognostic indicators; blinding of the outcome assessor, care provider; and patients; loss to followup and use of intention-to-treat analysis.

Data Synthesis

We constructed evidence tables showing the study characteristics and results for all included studies, organized by key question, intervention, or clinical condition, as appropriate. We critically analyzed studies to compare their characteristics, methods, and findings. We compiled a summary of findings for each key question or clinical topic, and drew conclusions based on qualitative synthesis of the findings.

Rating the body of evidence

We assessed the overall quality of evidence for outcomes using a method developed by the Grade Working Group, which classified the grade of evidence across outcomes according to the following criteria:

- **High** = Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence on the estimate of effect.
- **Moderate** = Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
- **Low** = Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
- **Very Low** = Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

GRADE also suggests using the following scheme for assigning the “grade” or strength of evidence:

Criteria for assigning grade of evidence

Type of evidence

Randomized trial = high

Observational study = low

Any other evidence = very low

Decrease grade if:

- Serious (-1) or very serious (-2) limitation to study quality
- Important inconsistency (-1)
- Some (-1) or major (-2) uncertainty about directness
- Imprecise or sparse data (-1)
- High probability of reporting bias (-1)

Increase grade if:

- Strong evidence of association-significant relative risk of > 2 (< 0.5) based on consistent evidence from two or more observational studies, with no plausible confounders (+1)
- Very strong evidence of association-significant relative risk of > 5 (< 0.2) based on direct evidence with no major threats to validity (+2)
- Evidence of a dose response gradient (+1)
- All plausible confounders would have reduced the effect (+1)

For this report, we used both this explicit scoring scheme and the global implicit judgment about “confidence” in the result.

Peer Review

Four peer reviewers provided feedback on the draft version of this report. Their comments and our responses are presented in Appendix D. One peer reviewer identified a potentially relevant article²⁵ and criticized the search strategy. In response, we conducted supplemental searches that identified 76 citations, two of which proved relevant to this report. The remaining citations concerned surgical, trauma, prehospital, emergency, and chronic patient settings.

RESULTS

There is much more evidence about outpatients with chronic pain, post-operative inpatients and patients with cancer than patients within the target population for this report. Throughout this report, we give precedence to the few studies that directly observed medical inpatients. We did not systematically review the literature about chronic pain, post-operative pain, or cancer pain assessment and management, but we invoke evidence from other populations when it is pertinent.

Key Question #1. How do differences in timing and frequency of assessment, severity of pain, and follow-up of pain affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?

Routine standardized pain assessment is usually implemented as part of a broader effort to coordinate pain management, particularly for post-operative patients. Usually, it is not possible to isolate timing and frequency of assessment from other components of these programs, which are discussed below in Key Question #2.

In medical inpatients with acute pain, does routine assessment of pain (for example, as the 5th vital sign) affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety (Arrows 1a and 1b)?

We found no evidence that directly linked the timing, frequency, or choice of measure for assessment with the timeliness, choice, or safety of treatment specifically in medical inpatients. In the postoperative setting, routine numerical assessment of pain intensity increased utilization of intravenous analgesics and patient-controlled analgesia²⁶ and improved patient and staff satisfaction with pain management, but had unclear effects on pain severity and length of stay. In the emergency department, the addition of a mandated numeric pain scale to the medical record resulted in a significant increase in the proportion of patients in the ED who received analgesia, from 25% before implementation to 35% after implementation (Appendix E, Summary Table 1).²⁷ However, the extent of use on a medical ward of patient-controlled analgesia, regional analgesia, and specialized procedures is not well-documented, and experience in the postoperative and emergency care should not be generalized to this setting.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

Does the choice of assessment measure affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?

As described above, since the 1980's there has been almost universal agreement that routine assessment of self-reported pain intensity is a better measure than pain assessed by a nurse or physician. This is because providers underestimate the severity of patients' pain in as many as half of cases. The disparity is greatest (60-68%) among patients with severe pain, and lowest (28-36%) among patients with mild pain.^{28, 29} Routine assessment is encouraged because many patients, especially those who have cognitive impairment, do not always mention pain unless asked.

To be suitable for routine use as a vital sign, a self-reported pain assessment method must be simple to administer, easy for patients to understand, and responsive to changes in pain over time. Table 1 describes the most commonly used pain assessment measures. In case series, these measures have high internal consistency (Cronbach α 0.85 or greater) and at least fair test-retest reliability ($r > 0.5$) in alert, cognitively intact individuals.^{17, 23, 30} They are highly correlated with one another in such individuals, subject to patients' preferences for visual, numerical, or verbal descriptions and their willingness to use them. However, none of these assessment measures is intended to diagnose the cause of pain, and none are perfect across the entire spectrum of etiologies, pain types, comorbid conditions, and patient preferences encountered in a general medical ward.

The single dimension measures assess pain intensity. A 10-point verbal numeric rating scale (VRS or VNRS) is used widely within the VA health care system. Like all of these measures, the VRS has been evaluated more thoroughly in chronic pain and long-term care settings than in acute care settings, although there is one evaluation in medical inpatients undergoing common procedures.³¹ That study compared a ten-point (N = 100) and five-point scale in 30 inpatients and found that the five-point scale exhibited better subject discrimination between experiences.

Table 1. Self-Assessment Pain Measures

Single Dimension	
Scale	Description
Visual analog scale	100 mm scale. Requires examiner to bring printed or on-screen scale and means for the patient to make a mark.
Verbal numeric rating scale	0 to 10 rating.
Verbal description scales	None-mild-moderate-severe.
Facial pain scales	Seven faces (0-6) or 10 faces (0-9) ranging from a neutral face (no pain) to a grimacing face (worst pain).
Multi Dimension	
Brief pain inventory	Assesses pain intensity and disability
McGill pain questionnaire	Assesses sensory, affective, and evaluative dimensions of pain

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

It is important to note the absence of evidence or consensus on what constitutes the *minimal clinically important difference* (MCID) for acute pain management in the hospital setting. The *minimal clinically important difference* is "...the smallest difference in score in the domain of interest which patients perceive as beneficial and which would mandate, in the absence of troublesome side effects and excessive cost, a change in the patient's management."³² The MCID helps define a clinically significant response. A systematic review of pain intensity measurement found that the MCID was defined consistently across studies in chronic pain patients,³³ but this is not the case for acute nonsurgical pain. Determining the MCID for the VRS used in the VA system is a first step in studying and improving inpatient pain management.

Do protocols for assessing pain improve outcomes?


Many algorithms for assessing pain intensity and acting on the information are in use (for an example, see Figure 2.) Most algorithms directly link the intensity of pain to specific therapeutic actions, such as rapid administration of IV opioids.

We found no evaluations specifically of the effect of algorithms, preprinted orders, clinical pathways, or other protocols for assessing pain in the target population. In most cases, these algorithms are part of larger, institution-wide strategies to improve pain management. Although routine standardized assessment of self-reported pain severity is the cornerstone of these efforts, it is not possible to separate the effect of the assessment component from that of other components of these programs, such as an acute pain management service. The effect of these programs is addressed in Key Question #2.

With respect to safety, a study in cancer patients found that opioid-related oversedation and other adverse effects increased substantially after implementation of pain assessment on a numerical scale routinely with other vital signs.³⁴ This was the only study we identified that looked specifically at the association of routine use of numerical pain rating and adverse treatment effects. It was a retrospective review of records of patients who had experienced an adverse drug effect at the H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute before (~1999) versus after (2002) implementation of a numerical pain treatment algorithm (Figure 3). Following implementation of the algorithm, there was a 2-fold increase in the risk of opioid oversedation (RR 2.22, 95% CI 1.07– 4.60), corresponding to an incidence from 11.0 per 100,000 inpatient hospital days to 24.5 per 100,000 inpatient hospital days post-NPTA ($P < 0.001$).

In the outpatient medical setting, VA has instituted several measures to improve pain management, including routine standardized assessment (or pain as the fifth vital sign), audit and feedback to clinical staff, specialist-level pain consultation services, nurse-level pain services, and palliative care services. A retrospective chart review study³⁵ and a prospective diagnostic test evaluation³⁶ cast doubt on the effectiveness of these interventions and on the accuracy of routine pain assessment, respectively, in the VA outpatient setting.

Figure 2. Inpatient Nursing Acute Pain Algorithm



Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients




Figure 3. Pain Algorithm evaluated in Vila et al. ³⁴

Are there gaps in quality even when pain is assessed routinely?

We did not identify any studies of the timing or frequency of assessment of pain that focused on medical inpatients. However, evaluations conducted in the emergency room are relevant to medical inpatients, because patients headed for nonsurgical, noncancer wards are less likely to get adequate attention in the emergency room.

Surveys conducted in the late 1990's^{37, 38} as well as more recent ones,³⁹ suggest that pain in emergency room patients is underdiagnosed and undertreated. Potential risk factors for delayed or inadequate analgesia include female sex, less severe pain, and daytime admissions. Instituting routine assessment of pain, usually with an educational component, improved rates of assessment and treatment.^{40, 41} In a University-based, single-institution, retrospective chart review study comparing outcomes in 521 medical encounters before and 479 after introduction of routine pain assessment of all patients in an emergency department, the addition of a mandated numeric pain scale increased the proportion of patients who received analgesia from 25% before implementation to 35% after implementation ($p < 0.001$).²⁷ The time from triage to administration of analgesia improved on average from 152 to 113 minutes (but $p > 0.05$). The standard triage form was revised to include a verbal numeric pain scale ranging from 0 to 10 in the vital signs section, and pain was measured at the same time as vital signs. The series included patients who presented with renal colic, extremity trauma, headache, ophthalmologic trauma or soft tissue injury (Appendix E, Summary Table 1).²⁷ A retrospective before-after study at a single hospital had similar results.⁴²

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

Several chart review studies conducted in emergency departments focus on gaps in quality that remain even after institution of system changes. In the Nelson study just described, for example, patients with diagnostic uncertainty were less likely to receive analgesia compared with patients who received no workup (27% v. 34% respectively, $p=0.0220$). In a large, retrospective series from an Australian ED, patients who had a lower-priority triage score were nine times as likely as others to have a delay in treating pain; advanced age (>80 years) and admission to hospital were also associated with delays.⁴³ Documentation and treatment of pain deteriorates when the ED is busy (Appendix E, Summary Table 2).^{44 45}

Specific Condition:

Abdominal Pain

Treating acute abdominal pain has traditionally been delayed until after evaluation by a surgeon, for concern that analgesia may alter the findings of physical examination, leading to misdiagnosis and management errors. A 1996 survey of 131 general surgeons in Iowa determined that 89% preferred to withhold analgesia for patients with acute abdomen until examined by a surgeon.⁴⁶

In fact, there is good evidence that analgesia for acute abdomen is not only safe but beneficial because it facilitates more accurate diagnosis by localizing physical signs and allowing for more detailed examination by reducing patient stress.⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹ More liberal use of analgesia has become common in practice. In a 2003 survey of ED physicians in 60 hospitals, 98.3% responded that it is the practice of their ED to administer narcotic analgesia to patients with acute abdomen prior to surgical consultation. Only 15.3% indicated that it is their practice to always verbally inform the surgeon prior to dosing the patient, and 49.2% reported the belief that analgesics aid in diagnostic accuracy.⁵⁰

In a recent, good-quality systematic review and meta-analysis (Ranji et al), opioid administration had a negligible impact on clinical management and operative decision.⁵¹ The review included 12 placebo-controlled RCTs of opioid analgesia in children and adults, reporting a total of 15 drug/dose comparisons. The combined findings of 11 comparisons from 9 studies in adults revealed a non-significant increase in changes in the physical examination with opioid administration, with a summary RR of 1.51 (95%CI 0.85 - 2.69). There was significant heterogeneity among the studies, and pain relief reported by the opioid group did not significantly differ from placebo in 3 of the comparisons. Most studies did not distinguish between potentially beneficial changes such as improved localization of tenderness and potentially harmful changes such as changes in peritoneal signs. Only 2 studies (including a study in children) specified that loss of peritoneal signs after analgesia occurred in 5.6% to 18.7% of patients with opioids, compared with 2.6% to 7.7% of those in the control group.

In an analysis of diagnostic accuracy in 4 adult studies, there was no significant change in

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

the rate of incorrect management decisions with opioids compared with placebo (+0.3% absolute increase; 95%CI -4.1% to +4.7%). Analgesia was adequately greater than placebo in these studies, and no significant heterogeneity was found. The frequency of possible unnecessary surgeries was similar between opioid and control groups (7.6% v 7.9%). Meta-analysis showed non-significantly fewer unnecessary surgeries among patients with opioids. The reviewers concluded that opioid administration appears to have negligible impact on clinical management, in that 909 patients would need to receive opioids to result in 1 potential management error.⁵¹ A trial intravenous morphine vs. placebo, published too recently to be included in the Ranji review, supported these findings.⁵²

Waiting for a surgical consultant is only one cause of delay in treating abdominal pain. One systematic review⁵¹ and one primary study⁵³ examined the timing of assessment and analgesia for acute abdominal pain. Three studies examined the relation of severity of pain, ED crowding, and other factors to timing of assessment and treatment (Appendix E, Summary Table 2).^{39, 43, 44} Immediate referral to surgery when the patient with acute abdominal pain comes to the ED reduces, but does not eliminate, delay in analgesia. A 2004 study in such a setting examined the factors associated with waiting time from prescription to administration of analgesia among 100 consecutive patients presenting with acute abdomen at a hospital in the UK.⁵³ Despite having direct access to an on-call surgical service, thus eliminating the referral delay and the need to withhold analgesia in the interim, the administration of analgesia to patients in this setting was heterogeneous. Sixty-seven percent of patients received analgesia within 1 hour, and 22% waited 2-14 hours after presentation. The study found that severe pain was more likely to be treated quickly, that females had a longer mean wait time than males (129 min v. 69 min, $p=0.09$), and patients admitted at night waited less time (mean 76 min) than those during the day (mean 114 min). The timing of analgesia was not associated with clinical diagnosis or patient age. Diclofenac was the most commonly prescribed analgesic (37%), followed by pethidine (26%). No patients received analgesia intravenously, and 80% received analgesia through the intramuscular route. Nearly a fourth of patients reported that the analgesia received was inadequate.

Key Question #2. How do the timing and route of administration of pain interventions compare in effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in inpatient care settings?

In general, pain in medical inpatients is managed by the primary team, with involvement from an acute pain team on a consultation basis. There are no programs directed mainly at improving pain management in medical inpatients who do not have cancer and are not suffering from a terminal disease. For clinicians, one of the main clinical management questions is when to use pain and palliative care consultants for such patients, and whether they improve outcomes in this setting. Another important question is whether use of PCA and other modalities improve control of pain and satisfaction of patients and staff.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

Do acute pain management teams and other institutional initiatives improve effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in medical inpatients?

Most institution-wide efforts to improve pain assessment and management aim to influence the timing and route of administration of pain interventions. As mentioned earlier, it is usually not possible to isolate the effect of administration of treatments from other elements of multifaceted programs. However, it is worth examining the overall effects of these programs and their effect on how treatments are administered.

Table 2. Some elements of institution-wide efforts to improve pain assessment and management.

Identify key opinion leaders from relevant disciplines to form a steering committee.
Identify pain assessment problems.
Critically evaluate the applicability of guidelines and other scientific literature on pain assessment to a particular setting.
Form continuous quality improvement team to map, monitor, and evaluate care processes.
Develop and implement pain management standards.
Develop critical pathways, preprinted or prespecified electronic orders, paper or electronic pain assessment and management algorithms.
Staff education “pain management toolbox” (printed materials, videotapes, weekly “pain rounds”, invited lectures)
Form an acute pain management consultation service.
Monitoring to determine whether pain treatments have been effective (Pain as a fifth vital sign.)
Chart audit, surveys of patient satisfaction.

Elements of institution-wide interventions vary, but most incorporate a majority of the elements listed in Table 2.¹⁹ For example, the VHA/Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) Pain Management Collaborative, employed system-wide strategies to modify existing pain assessment and management practices within the VHA.¹⁶ Seventy teams from 22 VISNs throughout the U.S. participated in the 6-month joint Collaborative, with the following measurable objectives: to reduce the prevalence of severe pain by 25%; increase assessment such that 100% of patients will have their pain assessed; increase by 20% the documentation of plan of care among patients with a pain score ≥ 4 ; and to provide appropriate pain management education to at least 50% of patients with a pain score of ≥ 4 . The strategic goals included: 1) provision of a system-wide VHA standard of care for pain management; 2) assurance that pain assessment is performed in a consistent manner and that pain treatment is prompt and appropriate; 3) the inclusion of patients and families as active participants in pain management; 4) continual monitoring and improvement in outcomes of pain treatment; 5) an interdisciplinary, multi-modal approach to pain management; and 6) assurance that clinicians practicing in the VA health care system are adequately prepared to assess and manage pain effectively.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

The VHA/IHI Collaborative used learning sessions, monthly team conference calls, and monitoring of results and sharing of improvement methods via Internet. The learning sessions emphasized reliable and standardized measurement, strategies for interval sampling, and strategies for plotting and analyzing data. Data collection methods were specific to each clinical setting: for inpatients and long-term care settings, at least 2 patients each day were selected randomly; for Emergency Departments, teams could either select time points (e.g. 10AM and 3PM) or to select 2 charts randomly each data for data abstraction; for ambulatory settings, medical records of patients who visited during the month were sampled, excluding patients who were being seen for the first time in primary care. The project did not include a concurrent control group. Three of the 4 objectives were met, and most of the improvements occurred during the first 3 months of the collaboration, and sustained during the next 3 months. The goal of 100% patient assessment was not met, although the frequency of pain assessment increased from 58% to 85% of patients during the collaboration period.

Most primary studies in this review focused on postoperative or cancer pain, and were uncontrolled (see next section.) We identified one controlled trial, published since this review, which included medical inpatients. It found that a multifaceted intervention improved assessment of pain, but did not affect pain intensity or duration.⁵⁴ The trial enrolled a random sample of 3964 English-speaking, cognitively intact subjects admitted to matched medical/surgical units (3 general medicine, 2 general surgery, 2 specialty surgery, 1 oncology, and 1 mixed oncology/general medicine) at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York. Usual care required that pain be assessed at least once per shift using a 4-point scale. The intervention included, in phases: education, standardized pain assessment using a 1- or 4-item (enhanced) pain scale, audit and feedback of pain scores to nursing staff, and a computerized decision support system to guide analgesic prescribing. The enhanced pain assessment asked patients to rate current pain, worst pain, pain relief, and whether the level of pain was acceptable on 4-pt scales. Patients were interviewed within 48 hrs of admission and then once daily. An enhanced pain assessment that asked inpatients to rate current pain, worst pain, pain relief, and whether the pain level was acceptable on 4-point scales increased the likelihood of pain assessment, improved documentation of pain, and resulted in increased analgesia prescribing.⁵⁴ The percentage of patients who received at least 1 pain assessment per day increased from 32.1% with the standard pain assessment to 79.3% when the enhanced pain scale was combined with the CSS, and to >80% when combined with audit and feedback.

Although the enhanced pain scale and other interventions improved pain assessment and increased analgesic prescribing, the intervention did not alter severity of pain. The percentage of patients who had 72-96 hours of persistent pain following study enrollment and overall mean pain scores remained relatively constant across both blocks and all phases of the study.

Do acute pain management teams and other institutional initiatives improve effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in other settings?

In patients with cancer, most programs include one or more of the following components: professional and patient education, instituting regular pain assessment (pain as a vital sign), audit of pain results and feedback to clinical staff, computerized decisional support systems, and specialist-level pain consultation services.⁵⁵ Techniques for improving assessment and documentation of cancer pain included graphic recording on bedside charts, standardized pain assessment flow sheets, incorporation of both formal education and assessment tools, and institution-wide multidisciplinary programs. A 2007 systematic review identified 10 studies of these interventions; several of them included at least some medical inpatients who did not have cancer. These studies demonstrated that routine pain assessment improved patient and staff satisfaction with pain management and improved documentation, but did not improve overall pain scores or pain severity.⁵⁵

There is much more evidence from the post-operative setting. A 2003 systematic review on institutional approaches to pain assessment and management, conducted in Australia by the Department of Public Health and the National Institute of Clinical Studies (NICS) identified 3 comparative studies and 29 before-and-after studies of the effect of institutional pain management programs on treatment and patient outcomes.¹⁹ Most of these programs implemented routine numerical pain assessment and some form of a pain management team. Overall, interventions improve pain assessment indicators such as use of pain intensity scales, pain flow sheets, a pain plan of care, and documentation of location and quality of pain, and response to treatment. Interventions also increase administration of scheduled (rather than prn) pain medication, reduce use of the IM route, and increase the use of intravenous analgesia and of PCA.

While pain management teams and other system interventions improved the timeliness and frequency of pain assessment, evidence for improvements in pain outcomes was conflicting. The NICS review included 10 studies on dedicated service strategies.¹⁹ These included 9 studies on the introduction of pain management teams, most commonly an Acute Pain Service, and 1 before-and-after study of the introduction of a pain monitoring specialist. Two studies were multi-center studies that compared an intervention group with a control group where standard patient care was maintained (i.e. did not introduce a dedicated pain management service).

The results of the controlled studies suggest that Acute Pain Services in tertiary settings reduce the intensity of pain experienced by patients and improve their functional ability, although these effects were not always determined to be clinically important. The use of a dedicated service strategy increased use of patient-controlled analgesia and IV opioids, while IM administration decreased substantially. Prescribing practices also appeared to be altered in that NSAID and paracetamol use increased significantly. A statistically and clinically important improvement in patient satisfaction with pain management was also observed. Analgesia-related adverse effects, such as nausea, vomiting, sedation, diarrhea, and hypotension, appear to be reduced after the introduction of a dedicated service strategy.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

The review also examined multi-level strategies, in which strategies were developed to modify existing pain assessment and management policies, procedures, and practices at all levels of the institution. Most multi-level strategies included staff education and the use of standardized pain assessment methods. The integration of pain assessment as a “5th vital sign” was included in two studies. The effects of multi-level strategies on pain reduction, functional ability, and patient satisfaction were variable. Only one study of a multi-level strategy used a control group. The body of evidence on institutional approaches to pain assessment and management was of limited quality overall.¹⁹

In summary, institutional interventions improved pain assessment and documentation and staff awareness of pain, and increased use of analgesics. There was only poor-quality evidence that these programs improved safety. Most importantly, the programs’ effect on patient levels of pain was inconsistent; in the relatively higher-quality studies, programs did not improve pain.

How does coordination with the patient’s primary care physician affect outcomes?

We found no evidence about the value of coordinating care with the patient’s primary care physician.

How does the choice of treatment modality affect effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in inpatient care settings?

Treatment options for pain management are listed in Table 3 below.^{1, 17, 20} There is a glaring lack of comparative studies of different agents and methods of administration in the general inpatient setting.

Table 3. Treatments for acute pain

TREATMENTS	COMMENTS
Psychological and physical methods Providing information Relaxation Attentional techniques Hypnosis Cognitive-behavioral interventions TENS Acupuncture Positioning Manual and massage therapies Heat and cold	---

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

TREATMENTS	COMMENTS
Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, acetaminophen, topical therapies, combinations	Bleeding, renal, coagulation problems and fluid retention (NSAIDs)
Nitrous oxide, corticosteroids, ketamine, clonidine	Role in inpatient medical patients unclear.
<p>Opioids</p> <p><u>Delivery methods</u> oral intermittent subcutaneous transdermal IM IV administered by a nurse on request IV administered by a nurse on a schedule Patient-controlled analgesia</p> <p><u>Adjuvant drugs</u> Antiemetics Ketamine Naloxone Clonidine</p>	<p>First-line treatment for severe, acute pain.</p> <p>No clear evidence that any opioid is better in medical inpatients.</p> <p>Requires good staffing levels to minimize delay between need and injection (or between need and setting up PCA)</p> <p>Risks of PCA vs. other methods of administration are similar in surgical patients but have not been studied in medical inpatients.</p> <p>Respiratory depression, diminished level of consciousness, constipation, urinary retention, and other complications are common side effects.</p>
<p>Regional Analgesia</p> <p>Neuraxial blockade Peripheral, n. blockades Paravertebral, intercostal, interpleural, etc</p>	Role in inpatient medical patients unclear.
<p>Epidural Analgesia</p> <p>Thoracic or Lumbar Usually opioid+local anesthetic and sometimes epinephrine Sometimes patient-controlled</p>	<p>Role in inpatient medical patients unclear.</p> <p>The risks are those of an epidural (neurological damage, epidural hematoma, epidural abscess) + those of the drugs (local anesthetic+opioid)</p>
Specialized procedures (eg, joint injection, wound infiltration)	
SYSTEM INTERVENTIONS	
Use of acute pain management team	
Coordination of care with primary care physician	

Effectiveness and safety of patient-controlled analgesia (PCA)

PCA refers to methods of pain relief that allow a patient to self-administer small doses of an analgesic agent as required. The concept of PCA was introduced in 1970, but the method did not become popular until the 1980's, when improvements in infusion pump technology made wider use of PCA in post-operative patients feasible.⁵⁶

The vast majority of studies on the use of PCA pertained to postoperative pain or acute pain due to exacerbation of chronic medical conditions such as sickle cell crisis or cancer. PCA has also been evaluated in patients with fractures or other traumatic injury (see Appendix E, Summary Table 3).⁵⁷⁻⁶⁰

Early trials of PCA compared it with intermittent, intramuscular opioid injections administered by a nurse. More recent trials compare PCA to epidural analgesia. All of these trials were conducted in the setting of post-anesthesia care units or, subsequently, a (postoperative) surgical ward.

In post-operative patients, regional and epidural analgesia have been compared with intravenous opioids, administered intermittently or by patient-controlled analgesia (PCA). Recent systematic reviews identified surgical conditions in which regional analgesia provides superior pain relief compared with opioids, but could not confirm or deny a relationship between the choice of postoperative analgesic techniques on major mortality or morbidity.^{61, 62} Other systematic reviews have found that, after surgery, patients using PCA consumed higher amounts of opioids and had better pain control and higher satisfaction than patients treated with prn or scheduled opioid treatments, with no higher incidence of most side effects⁶³⁻⁶⁵ Comparative evidence is generally favorable to regional analgesia for certain surgeries, but overall evidence comparing continuous epidural analgesia and PCA is not conclusive.⁶⁶⁻⁷⁰

The evidence summarized in these reviews has low applicability to medical inpatients, where the course of pain as well as staffing and monitoring procedures differ from those of the post-anesthesia unit. There is almost no information on the use or safety of PCA in a medical ward setting. A fair-quality, non-blinded RCT compared the effectiveness of morphine delivered by nurses as needed versus by IV-PCA in 86 patients who presented to the ED with a pain score of 7+ due to traumatic injury, most commonly fracture (74% in the PCA group, 53.4% of controls), and found that pain relief and patient satisfaction were similar between the treatment modalities.⁵⁸ Pain scores and physiological measurements were collected at 0, 5, 15, 30, 45, 60, 90, and 120 minutes. Although the PCA group used more than twice as much morphine than controls (mean total 18.83 mg vs. 7.65; mean usage rate 7.26 mg/h v. 4.03 mg/h), the mean VAS pain scores were the same (4.8) in treatment both groups, and there were no significant differences between groups in the satisfaction questionnaires. An area-under-the-curve analysis of VAS scores confirmed no significant difference between groups. The investigators noted the limitation that nurse behavior might have been influenced by the presence of researchers to optimize delivery of pain relief, given the non-blinded design of the study.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

Most of the evidence on the adverse effects of PCA was derived from the experience of patients with postoperative pain or chronic conditions.^{17, 71-73} The opioid-related side effects from IV PCA are the same as those for intermittent opioid analgesic regimens, and include respiratory depression, sedation, constipation, pruritis, nausea, and vomiting. Patient factors and misuse of the PCA device by family members, however, may lead to the inappropriate use of PCA,⁷¹ and cases of oversedation caused by equipment programming mishaps have been reported.⁷³

In patients with acute thoracic pain from traumatic injury, analgesia with IV-morphine PCA was equivalent to morphine administered PRN in one study⁵⁸ and to nebulized morphine in another study,⁵⁷ but inferior to epidural analgesia in 2 studies.^{59, 60} Most patients in these studies had suffered fractures, though the populations varied in the type and severity of the injuries.

The lack of data on the use and safety of PCA in medical patients is concerning, for there are protocols for post-op management but not for medical patients. Pain improves predictably in the post-operative period, making weaning protocols easier to implement. Also, use of PCA is integrated into staff routines and monitoring protocols. None of these characteristics apply to medical inpatients.

Specific Conditions

Renal colic and biliary stone pain

Most evidence about treating renal colic is old and addresses whether to use IM, SC, or IV analgesics. The main findings, discussed in more detail below, are (1) NSAIDs provide effective analgesia for acute renal colic, and act more quickly through the IV route than by IM or PR 2) Opioids provide analgesia that is equivalent to NSAIDs but result in a higher incidence of vomiting and other adverse events, particularly pethidine 3) Hydromorphone provided superior pain relief and led to fewer hospital admissions compared with meperidine in one study. 4) Intramuscular injection of opioids should not be used because it causes more discomfort and complications than subcutaneous injection and relieves pain no faster. Many studies excluded patients who had negative followup investigations for biliary stone or renal calculi, which may limit the applicability of findings to all patients presenting with pain from these suspected causes (see Appendix E, Summary Table 4).

A 1998 systematic review of NSAIDs included 3 trials in renal colic in which the same drug was compared by different routes.⁷⁴ Two trials compared 50 mg intravenous vs. 100 mg rectal indomethacin.^{75, 76} The 3rd trial compared IV with IM administration of dipyron and diclofenac in 6 comparisons: dipyron 1g or 2g IM + placebo IV; dipyron 1g or 2g IV + placebo IM; diclofenac 75 mg IM + placebo IV; diclofenac 75 mg IV + placebo IM.⁷⁷ In all 3 trials, the NSAID acted more quickly through the intravenous route than rectal or intramuscular. The difference was significant, but evident only during the first 10 to 20 minutes.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

A 2007 Cochrane review of NSAIDs vs. opioids for acute renal colic found that both NSAIDs and opioids provide effective analgesia in acute renal colic, but opioids, particularly pethidine, result in a higher incidence of vomiting and other adverse events.⁷⁸ Five different NSAIDs (diclofenac, indomethacin, indoprofen, ketorolac, tenoxicam) and 7 opioids were studied in 20 trials from 9 countries with a total of 1613 participants.⁷⁸ The intramuscular route was most commonly used for each drug type (10 trials), followed by the intravenous route (7 trials). Patients receiving NSAIDs reported lower pain scores than patients receiving opioids in 10 of 13 studies, though the differences were small. Pooled results on efficacy were not available due to heterogeneity between studies. Patients treated with NSAIDs were significantly less likely to require rescue analgesia (RR 0.75, 95%CI 0.61-0.93). A higher incidence of adverse events occurred with opioids than with NSAIDs in the majority of trials, and pethidine in particular was associated with a higher rate of vomiting. Most studies included only participants with renal calculi confirmed on subsequent testing and excluded patients with negative results on followup tests. These exclusions may limit the applicability of findings to all patients who present with the clinical picture of renal colic.

A 2007 Cochrane review of hydromorphone in acute and chronic pain⁷⁹ identified one trial in patients with renal colic,⁸⁰ and one trial in patients with biliary stone pain.⁸¹ In a fair-quality double-blind RCT, patients with renal colic were randomized to receive either 50 mg meperidine or 1 mg hydromorphone IV, and their pain scores were measured on a 10-cm VAS were recorded at t=0, 15, 30, 60, and 120 minutes.⁸⁰ Patients who received hydromorphone achieved more pain relief, required less rescue medication, underwent fewer IV pyelograms, and avoided hospital admission more frequently than did patients who received meperidine. A poor-quality unblinded trial in 42 patients with biliary stone pain compared subcutaneous injection of 1mL dihydromorphinone with 50 mg indomethacin IV.⁸¹ Eight initially enrolled patients were excluded from analysis because follow-up X-ray or ultrasonogram investigations were negative for these patients. Pain was evaluated by VAS at baseline and at 10 and 30 minutes after drug injection. Indomethacin and dihydromorphinone were equally effective at reducing pain in patients with acute attacks of biliary stone pain. VAS scores at 0, 10, and 30 minutes were 71.8, 44.1, and 14.2 in the dihydromorphinone group, compared with 68.5, 32.4, 15.8 in the indomethacin group, and the differences between groups were not statistically significant. No serious side effects were observed with either drug. The lack of patient blinding was a limitation in this study, and the exclusion of patients who were later found to be negative for biliary stone may limit applicability of findings to all patients who present with biliary stone pain.

Phantom Limb Pain

Phantom limb pain is a form of neuropathic pain perceived in the missing limb after amputation that is distinct from pain in the residual portion of the limb or stump, and other non-painful sensation of the missing limb. In trials of perioperative interventions, the prevalence of phantom limb pain after amputation among control subjects ranged from 56-82% at day 7, 39-73% at 6 months, and 27-78% at 12 months.⁸² A survey in 1980 identified more than 50 different therapies in use for the treatment of phantom limb pain⁸³, suggesting limited consensus on the effectiveness of treatment.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

A good-quality systematic review sought to determine the optimal management of acute and chronic phantom limb pain, and identified 12 controlled trials that reported phantom pain as an outcome (see Appendix E, Summary Table 5).⁸² The included studies were published between 1985-1997, and the 12 trials included a combined total of 375 male and female patients, ages 47-75. Trials were included if they involved a control group and examined any intervention for PLP, regardless of methodology. Interventions involving treatments before and during the amputation were included, as well as treatments for chronic pain.

Trials were divided into 2 groups based on the timing of intervention (early vs. late): 8 trials of preoperative, intraoperative, and early postoperative interventions at <2 weeks, and 4 trials of late (>2 weeks) postoperative interventions. Among the 8 early intervention trials, 3 used epidural anesthesia, 3 used regional nerve blocks, 1 used intravenous calcitonin, and 1 used transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS). Controls in these studies received a placebo consisting of a saline infusion or epidural anesthesia consisting of on-demand opioid analgesia. The 4 trials of late postoperative interventions studied the use of TENS, a crossover study comparing the use of a metal threaded sock (Farabloc) vs. no treatment, vibratory stimulation vs. placebo stimulation, and intravenously infused ketamine vs. saline. Subjects served as their own controls in these studies, and in most of the early treatment studies the control group received active treatment with opioid analgesics. No trials examined commonly recommended oral drugs, such as membrane stabilizers or tricyclic antidepressants.

Among the 8 early intervention trials, 3 trials of preoperative epidural pain relief reported mixed results. Three other trials assessed sciatic or posterior tibial nerve blocks with perineural and intraneural bupivacaine blocks during or immediately after surgery, and found no differences in pain between the intervention and control groups in the postacute period, measured at various timepoints up to 12 months after surgery. In a trial of calcium calcitonin (200 IU) and a trial of early TENS, reduced phantom limb pain was observed in the early postoperative period but not in longer-term followup. In trials of the late postoperative phase, Farabloc, low-frequency TENS applied to the ear, and ketamine provided a modest short-term reduction in phantom limb pain and paresthesia. Another late-treatment trial examined TENS at the site of pain but findings were inconclusive. Several studies were limited by small sample sizes, and high loss rates from dropouts, re-amputations, and mortality.

The review⁸² concluded that there is little evidence from randomized trials to support any particular treatment of phantom limb pain either in the acute perioperative period or later. Evidence on preemptive epidurals, early regional nerve blocks, and mechanical vibratory stimulation provides inconsistent support for these treatments.

Studies of the effectiveness of other treatments for phantom limb pain were identified in the ANZCA report.¹⁷ Early postoperative infusion salmon calcitonin was effective at reducing phantom limb pain compared with placebo, in a double-blind crossover trial (n=21). One week after the first treatment, 90% of patients had pain relief of more than

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

50%, 76% were completely pain free, and 71% never experienced phantom limb pain again. One year later, 8 (62%) of the 13 surviving patients still had more than 75% phantom limb pain relief.⁸⁴ In single studies, ketamine,⁸⁵ oral slow-release morphine,⁸⁶ IV infusion of morphine,⁸⁷ and gabapentin⁸⁸ were also effective in reducing phantom limb pain. Lidocaine had no effect on phantom limb pain, but significantly reduced stump pain in one study.⁸⁷

The ANZCA report also identified three studies of interventions to prevent phantom limb pain.¹⁷ A small observational study found that in 14 patients given a bolus dose of ketamine followed by an infusion, begun preoperatively and continued for 72 hours postoperatively, the incidence of severe phantom limb pain was reduced, compared with no ketamine in 14 historical controls.⁸⁹ An RCT that compared perioperative intravenous ketamine infusion to saline infusion in 45 patients found the incidence of phantom limb pain at 6 months post-amputation was lower in the ketamine group than the control group (47% v. 71%) but the difference was not statistically significant.⁹⁰ A review of the efficacy of perioperative epidural analgesia determined that the incidence of severe phantom limb pain was reduced though not completely abolished 12 months after amputation (NNT = 5.8, 95% CI 3.2-28.6).⁹¹ A non-pharmacological treatment for phantom limb pain was effective in a study of sensory discrimination training.⁹²

Overall there is a paucity of evidence to guide specific treatment of phantom limb pain. Single studies showed evidence of the effectiveness of various therapies (calcitonin, morphine, ketamine, gabapentin, and sensory discrimination training), and perioperative studies of ketamine and epidural analgesia showed reduced incidence of phantom limb pain, but these studies were limited by small sample size.

Key Question #3. For inpatients with impaired self-report due to any of several factors, including delirium or confusion, pre-existing severe dementia, closed head injury, stroke, and psychosis, how do differences in assessment and management of acute pain affect clinical outcomes or safety?

Cognitive impairment complicates assessment and treatment of pain. Several studies have reported underestimation by providers of pain in cognitively impaired patients.⁹³ Most studies of pain in cognitively impaired individuals were conducted in nursing homes,⁹⁴ where chronic dementia is the most prevalent cause of cognitive impairment. A large bibliography of articles, guidelines, and quality indicators for pain management in nursing homes is available at <http://medqic.org/>

Briefly, most guidelines for the management of pain in patients with cognitive impairment emphasize principles set forth in a 1993 article by Parmelee⁹⁵ and modified by others⁹⁶⁻⁹⁸:

1. Assess all patients for cognitive impairment using a Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE).

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

2. Mildly impaired individuals are almost as able as cognitively intact individuals to accurately report their pain.
3. Impaired patients with communication skills will not neglect reporting of pain when queried specifically.
4. In moderately and severely impaired individuals, try several different scales. Most moderately and severely impaired individuals can understand at least one pain assessment scale (verbal, horizontal visual, or faces)^{99,100}
5. Self-report can also be improved by other strategies, such as asking the patient to describe painful events that have been experienced that correspond to different pain intensities. Patients can be prompted by asking about common events that occur in a clinical setting such as needle sticks.⁹⁸
6. Markedly impaired patients report less intense pain and a smaller number of pain complaints than the mildly impaired.
7. For patients who are impaired and deny pain or do not respond to questions about pain, use an observational assessment tool to screen for pain.

This guidance, intended for use in nursing homes, has limited applicability to the medical inpatient setting, where delirium is a much more common cause of cognitive impairment. Buffum reviewed the sparse literature on assessing and managing pain in delirious patients and identified a long list of research gaps and priorities.⁹⁷ Except for some surveys of the prevalence of delirium among inpatients (cited in Buffum), we identified no relevant studies of pain assessment or management in patients with delirium.

Most studies of pain and cognitive impairment focus on assessment. There is fair evidence from one prospective cohort study⁹⁹ that most cognitively impaired individuals can understand at least one self-assessment measure. This study was conducted in a series of 160 consecutive inpatients, recruited from 2 Swiss hospitals and referred for dementia consultation. The investigators administered 4 self-assessment scales (horizontal VAS, vertical VAS, faces pain scale, verbal rating scale) and one observational rating scale (the Doloplus scale, developed to assess pain in older people with communicative disorders).⁹⁹ Patients were considered to have understood a scale if on both self-assessments the patient was able to explain its use and could correctly indicate which position on the scale corresponded to no pain at all, and which position corresponded to the most severe pain. Comprehension of at least 1 scale was demonstrated by 40% of patients with severe dementia, 90% of patients with moderate dementia, and 97% of patients with mild dementia. The correlation between the self-assessment scales was high (Spearman's $r_s = 0.81-0.95$, $p < 0.001$). The Doloplus observational rating scale correlated only moderately with self-assessment by the patient (Spearman's $r_s = 0.31-0.40$, $p < 0.05$), and the strength of the correlations did not increase in patients with moderate to severe pain. The investigators in this study concluded that the majority of hospitalized patients with dementia can reliably use self-assessment pain scales, and that observational scales tend to underestimate pain intensity and should be reserved for patients who have demonstrated that they cannot complete a self-assessment. One limitation of this study is that none of the severely demented patients who could demonstrate appropriate use of the self-assessment scales reported experiencing any pain. This means that, at best, the authors' conclusions about the usefulness of the self-

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

assessment scales may apply only to distinguishing between some pain and none—that is, the study provides no evidence about the scaling properties of self-assessment scales in severely demented patients.

Another study compared the psychometric properties of 4 established pain scales between moderately impaired (MMSE 13-21, n=42) and cognitively unimpaired (MMSE 22-30, n=33) hospitalized older adults (mean age 76 yrs) with pain at admission.¹⁰¹ Patients participated in the study for 14 days. On days 1-7, participants were visited 3 times per day and asked to rate their current pain on each of 4 scales: 1) a 5-pt verbal rating scale; 2) a 7-pt faces scale; 3) a horizontal 21-point box scale; 4) 2 vertical 21-point box scales. Patients were also asked to make retrospective ratings at the end of the day and at weekly time points, with reference to usual, worst, and least pain levels, using each of the 4 scales for each rating. The study sought to determine the effect of mental status on pain rating; scale redundancy, scale reliability, validity/current pain bias (whether a retrospective pain rating represents the actual pain experienced over a given period of time); and whether retrospective pain ratings (memory of pain) were biased by current pain to indicate greater than the average pain experienced by the patient. The horizontal 21-pt box scale emerged as the best scale with respect to psychometrics and validity, regardless of mental status. Little evidence of response perseveration was found on any of the tests. Pain intensity did not vary with mental status. The cognitively impaired group had difficulty with the ratings of least pain, showing a high level of bias in the extent to which memory of pain was influenced by current pain. The investigators concluded that older, cognitively impaired patients are able to rate pain reliably and validly.

Three recent systematic reviews¹⁰²⁻¹⁰⁴ and part of a broader guideline for assessing pain in the elderly²³ examined studies of observational methods to assess pain in cognitively impaired adults (Table 4). These instruments rely on examiners to observe facial features and behavior in order to guess how much pain a patient has.

All three reviews concluded that among the numerous scales of nonverbal behavioral pain indicators that currently exist, none are more reliable or valid than others, and none are convincingly appropriate for use in this population. A total of 13 scales were identified in these reviews. Taking all 3 reviews together, the PACSLAC and PAINAD appeared to have the best psychometric properties. Unfortunately, as van Herk and colleagues note, the value of these measures in decision-making is unclear because cutoff values for these scales have not been established.

It is important to note that there is no gold standard for judging the validity of these measures. Most evaluations reported the psychometric properties of these measures rather than their validity.³⁰ Validity was assessed as agreement with self-report or report of relatives to assess validity; these comparisons are of limited value (if self-report were known to be reliable, there would be little need for using an observational measure.)

Table 4. Pain observation scales. From van Herk et al.¹⁰³

Pain Observation Scale	Target Population	No. of Items	Categories*	Response Category	Score Range
Facial Activity Coding System (FACS)	Cognitively impaired (older) adults	46	1	Frequency and intensity	—
Pain Behavior Method (PBM)	Cognitively impaired (older) adults	5	1, 2, 4	Presence or absence	0–5
Discomfort Scale—Dementia of Alzheimer Type (DS-DAT)	Alzheimer patients	9	1, 2, 4, 6	4-point scale	0–27
DOLOPLUS2	Nonverbal or cognitively impaired older adults	10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	4-point scale	0–30
Behavior Checklist	Cognitively impaired older adults	20	2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Presence or absence	—
Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators (CNPI)	Cognitively impaired older adults	6	1, 2, 3, 4	Presence or absence	0–6
Assessment for Discomfort in Dementia (ADD)	Patients with moderate to severe dementia	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Presence or absence	—
Pain Assessment in Advanced Dementia (PAINAD)	Patients with (severe) dementia	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 6	3-point scale	0–10
Pain Assessment Tool in Confused Older Adults (PATCOA)	Confused older adults	9	1, 2, 4, 6	Presence or absence	0–9
Pain Assessment for the Dementing Elderly (PADE)	Patients with dementia	24	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	4-point scale and multiple choice	24–96
Pain Assessment Checklist for Seniors with Limited Ability to Communicate (PACSLAC)	Seniors with a limited ability to communicate	60	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Presence or absence	0–60
Non-Communicative Patient's Pain Assessment Instrument (NOPPAIN)	Noncommunicative patients	17	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	6-point scale	0–30
Abbey Pain Scale	Patients with end-stage dementia	6	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	4-point scale	0–18

Note. *1 = facial expression; 2 = motor behavior; 3 = social behavior or mood; 4 = vocalization; 5 = eat or sleep pattern; 6 = physiological indicators.

Key Question #4. For inpatients with dependencies on tobacco, alcohol, stimulant, marijuana, or opioids, how do differences in assessment and management of acute pain affect clinical outcomes or safety?

Addiction, physical dependence and tolerance are common among inpatients. The ANZCA 2005 report¹⁷ suggested the following for managing acute pain in opioid-tolerant patients:

- 1) Withdrawal from opioids should be prevented by maintenance of normal preadmission opioid regimens, or appropriate substitutions with another opioid, or the same opioid via another route. Opioid-tolerant patients are at risk of withdrawal if non-opioid analgesic regimens or tramadol alone are used.
- 2) Opioid-tolerant patients report higher pain scores and have a lower incidence of opioid-induced nausea and vomiting.
- 3) Ketamine may reduce opioid requirements in opioid-tolerant patients.
- 4) Intravenous PCA is a useful modality in opioid-tolerant patients, and larger bolus doses ad a background infusion to replace the usual opioid dose may be needed.
- 5) Neuraxial opioids can be used although higher doses may be required, and these doses may be inadequate to prevent withdrawal.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

- 6) Patient education regarding prescribed opioids and communication with the primary physician are advisable upon discharge.

The ANZCA 2005 report¹⁷ makes the following suggestions for the management of acute pain in patients with substance abuse disorder:

- 1) Management of pain in these patients should focus on prevention of withdrawal, effective analgesia, and symptomatic treatment of affective disorders and behavioral alterations.
- 2) Naltrexone should be stopped at least 24 hours prior to elective surgery, and be replaced by multimodal analgesic regimens.
- 3) Patients who have completed naltrexone therapy should be regarded as opioid naïve; in the immediate post-treatment phase they may be opioid-sensitive.
- 4) Maintenance methadone regimens should be continued where possible
- 5) Buprenorphine maintenance may be continued; if buprenorphine is ceased prior to surgery, conversion to an alternative opioid is required.
- 6) There is no cross-tolerance between CNS stimulants and opioids.

The evidence on which these recommendations are based is weak, being derived from case reports, retrospective studies and expert opinion.¹⁷

How do the assessment and management of acute pain differ between patients on pre-existing opioid therapy and patients with opiate addiction?

In 2001, the American Academy of Pain Medicine, the American Pain Society, and the American Society of Addiction Medicine issued a statement¹⁰⁵ agreeing upon the following definitions:

Tolerance: “Tolerance is a state of adaptation in which exposure to a drug induces changes that result in a diminution of one or more of the drug’s effects over time.”

Physical Dependence: “Physical dependence is a state of adaptation that often includes tolerance and is manifested by a drug class specific withdrawal syndrome that can be produced by abrupt cessation, rapid dose reduction, decreasing blood level of the drug, and/or administration of an antagonist.”

Addiction: “Addiction is a primary, chronic, neurobiological disease, with genetic, psychosocial, and environmental factors influencing its development and manifestations. It is characterized by behaviors that include one or more of the following: impaired control over drug use, compulsive use, continued use despite harm, and craving.”

The statement also defined “pseudoaddiction” as “patient behaviors that may occur when pain is undertreated,” including a focus on obtaining medications, illicit drug use and deception and other behaviors that may lead clinicians to label them as being “drug seeking.” It also said “a patient who is physically dependent on opioids may sometimes

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

continue to use them despite resolution of pain only to avoid withdrawal. Such use does not necessarily reflect addiction.”

These definitions are not universally agreed upon, and work to harmonize terminology continues.¹⁰⁶ However, these definitions are consistent with the basic concepts that 1) tolerance and physical dependence are normal responses to opioid therapy, but addiction is not; 2) addictive use of medications is associated with aberrant, destructive behaviors such as “persistent sedation or intoxication due to overuse; increasing functional impairment and other medical complications; psychological manifestations such as irritability, apathy, anxiety, or depression; or adverse legal, economic or social consequences 3) addiction is a multidimensional disease with neurobiological and psychological dimensions. Many guidelines say that a history of addiction to opioids or to alcohol is a relative contraindication for prescribing *chronic* opioids for nonmalignant pain. Guidance on how a history of addiction should influence inpatient management of acute pain is unclear.

The prevalence of addiction among chronic opioid users was unknown.¹⁰⁵ Most studies of the prevalence of addiction among patients with *chronic* pain have used simplistic or outdated criteria for diagnosing addiction, or did not describe their criteria at all.¹⁰⁷ Not surprisingly, estimates of the prevalence of addiction varied wildly, from 0.2% to 50%, depending on the investigators’ definition. The apparent prevalence was much lower in studies that used stricter criteria for addiction based on behaviors that are thought to distinguish it from tolerance and physical dependence, and higher in studies that classified patients as addicted if they exhibited “drug-seeking” behavior. While, as a group, the prevalence studies are weak, they do suggest strongly that when a patient on chronic opioid therapy presents with pain, clinicians should not presume that the patient is addicted, and should never diagnose addiction unless there is reason to believe pain control is adequate.

In the literature, there are several lists of signs and symptoms that may be indicators of addiction (as opposed to tolerance and physical dependence.) We found no studies of whether, in acute care settings, clinicians can distinguish addiction from physical dependence or pseudoaddiction. We also found no studies of the discriminant ability of the individual signs and symptoms of addiction, that is, their ability to identify distinct groups of patients for whom different assessment and treatment strategies are most effective.

On the other hand, several instruments intended to screen chronic opioid users for addiction may be helpful in assessing whether relevant signs, symptoms, and behaviors are present. The Pain Medicine Questionnaire and the SOAPP questionnaire have good psychometric properties.¹⁰⁷ The CAGE-AID is a modified CAGE which adapts questions about alcohol to drug use (eg “Have you felt you ought to cut down your drinking *or drug use*?” “Have you felt bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use?” etc.) It has not been tested extensively. None of these instruments has been shown to improve long-term outcomes of chronic nonmalignant pain management, and none has been evaluated in the setting of acute pain in inpatients.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

Guidelines for managing post-operative pain specify that initial dosing should be adjusted for patients who take opioids for chronic nonmalignant pain. For the most part, these guidelines for initial dosing have been generalized to patients who have acute pain from other causes, but we did not find any evidence about effectiveness or safety in the target population for this report.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the systematic evidence review, including the type and quality of evidence for each key question, are summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Summary of Systematic Evidence Review, Key Question 1. How do differences in timing and frequency of assessment, severity of pain, and follow-up of pain affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?

KQ#	Key question	Type of Evidence	Grade of Evidence	Comments
1a	In medical inpatients with acute pain, does routine assessment of pain affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?	None	GRADE Very Low = Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.	We found no evidence that directly linked the timing, frequency, or choice of measure for assessment with the timeliness, choice, or safety of treatment specifically in medical inpatients. Older studies demonstrated that observational assessment of pain by a nurse or physician is inaccurate.
1b	Does the choice of assessment measure affect choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, and safety?	1 descriptive study in cancer patients	GRADE Low = Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.	Within a program of routine assessment of pain, we found no studies of how the choice of assessment measure affects the choice of treatment, clinical outcomes, or safety. Most studies focus on the psychometric qualities and ease of administration of each method. In cancer patients, there is fair evidence from one observational study that opioid-related oversedation and other adverse effects increased substantially after implementation of pain assessment on a numerical scale routinely with other vital signs.
1c	Do protocols for assessing pain improve outcomes?	None	Very Low	In most cases, these protocols are part of larger, institution-wide strategies to improve pain management. We found no evaluations that could isolate the effect of algorithms, preprinted orders, clinical pathways, or other protocols for assessing pain in the target population.
1d	Are there gaps in quality even when pain is assessed routinely?	5 descriptive studies in the ED	GRADE Moderate = Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.	<i>3 chart review studies in the ED setting found that gaps in quality that remain after institution of system changes. Having a lower-priority triage score, older age, and diagnostic uncertainty were factors associated with delay or lower likelihood of receiving analgesia. In a study of patients with acute abdomen in an ED with direct access to on-call surgical service, females, less severe pain, and daytime admissions predicted delays in analgesia, despite the elimination of referral delay.</i>
1e	<i>Specific condition: nonsurgical abdominal pain</i>	<i>1 systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials and 1 additional trial</i>	GRADE High = Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence on the estimate of effect.	<i>Opioid administration has a negligible impact on clinical management of acute abdominal pain.</i>

Summary of Key Question 2. How do the timing and route of administration of pain interventions compare in effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in inpatient care settings?

KQ#	Key question	Type of Evidence	Grade of Evidence	Comments
2a	Do acute pain management teams and other institutional initiatives improve effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in medical inpatients?	1 uncontrolled systemwide intervention and 1 controlled trial	Moderate	1 uncontrolled collaborative VHA/IHI study of institution-wide strategies showed measurable improvements in the prevalence of severe pain, frequency of assessment and documentation of plan of care, and provision of patient education on pain management. A controlled trial of a multifaceted intervention achieved increased assessment of pain but did not alter pain intensity or duration.
2b	Do acute pain management teams and other institutional initiatives improve effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in other settings?	2 systematic reviews of before-after or uncontrolled studies	Low	Most primary studies in these reviews were in postoperative or cancer pain, and were uncontrolled. While pain management teams and other system-wide interventions improved the timeliness and frequency of pain assessment, the findings were mixed for improvement in pain outcomes. In controlled studies, Acute Pain Services reduced pain intensity and improved functional ability, although the magnitude of these effects was not always clinically important.
2c	How does coordination with the patient’s primary care physician affect outcomes?	None	Very Low	<i>We found no evidence about the value of coordinating care with the patient’s primary care physician.</i>
2d	How does the choice of treatment modality affect effectiveness, adverse effects, and safety in inpatient care settings?	None	Very Low	<i>We found no evidence on the comparative effectiveness of different agents and methods of administration in general inpatients.</i>
2e	Effectiveness and safety of patient-controlled analgesia (PCA)	3 controlled trials and 1 cohort study	Low	<i>There is almost no information on the use or safety of PCA in a medical ward setting. Most of the evidence on the adverse effects of PCA was derived from the experience of patients with postoperative or chronic conditions.</i>

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

	Specific conditions: renal colic and biliary stone pain	Renal colic studies: 3 RCTs comparing route of NSAID administration; 1 systematic review of NSAIDS vs. opioids; 1 RCT of hydromorphone; 1 study of hydromorphone in biliary pain	Moderate	(1) NSAIDs provide effective analgesia for acute renal colic, and act more quickly through the IV route than by IM or PR 2) Opioids provide analgesia that is equivalent to NSAIDs but result in a higher incidence of vomiting and other adverse events, particularly pethidine 3) Hydromorphone provided superior pain relief and led to fewer hospital admissions compared with meperidine in one study. Many studies excluded patients who had negative followup investigations for biliary stone or renal calculi, which may limit the applicability of findings to all patients presenting with pain from these suspected causes.
2g	<i>Specific conditions: phantom limb pain</i>	<i>1 systematic review of controlled trials</i>	Low	<i>Overall there is a paucity of evidence to guide specific treatment of phantom limb pain. The evidence on preemptive epidurals, early regional nerve blocks, and mechanical vibratory stimulation provides inconsistent support for these treatments. Single studies showed evidence of the effectiveness of various therapies (calcitonin, morphine, ketamine, gabapentin, and sensory discrimination training), and perioperative studies of ketamine and epidural analgesia showed reduced incidence of phantom limb pain, but these studies were limited by small sample size.</i>

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

Summary of Key Questions 3 and 4.

KQ#	Key question	Type of Evidence	Grade of Evidence	Comments
3	For inpatients with impaired self-report due to any of several factors, including delirium or confusion, pre-existing severe dementia, closed head injury, stroke, and psychosis, how do differences in assessment and management of acute pain affect clinical outcomes or safety?	3 systematic reviews of descriptive and cross-sectional evaluations of assessment instruments; no study designs were excluded	Low	Most studies were conducted in nursing homes in patients with dementia, and focused on assessment. Delirium is a more common cause of cognitive impairment in the medical inpatient setting, and we identified no studies of pain assessment or management in patients with delirium. All 3 reviews concluded that among the numerous scales of nonverbal behavioral pain indicators in use, none are more reliable or valid than others, and none are convincingly appropriate for use in this population. The reviews included a total of 13 scales, and the PACSLAC and PAINAD appear to have the best psychometric properties. The value of these measures in decision-making is unclear, however, because cutoff values for these scales have not been established. We found no studies that directly linked differences in assessment and management with clinical outcomes or safety in this subgroup of patients.
4a	For inpatients with dependencies on tobacco, alcohol, stimulant, marijuana, or opioids, how do differences in assessment and management of acute pain affect clinical outcomes or safety?	Case reports, retrospective studies, and expert opinions identified by a systematic search	Low	<i>Guidelines for managing acute pain in opioid-tolerant patients and patients with substance abuse disorder are based on case reports, retrospective studies, and expert opinion were compiled in a good-quality systematic review. The evidence on which these recommendations are based is weak, however, being derived from case reports, retrospective studies and expert opinion</i>
4b	<i>How do the assessment and management of acute pain differ between patients on pre-existing opioid therapy and patients with opiate addiction?</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Very Low</i>	<i>Definitions for tolerance, physical dependence, and addiction, and pseudoaddiction are not universally agreed upon, and estimates of the prevalence of addiction in patients with chronic pain varied widely, from 0.2% to 50%. We found no studies of whether in acute care settings, clinicians can distinguish addiction from physical dependence or pseudoaddiction. We also found no studies of the discriminant ability of individual signs and symptoms of addiction to identify distinct groups of patients for whom different assessment and treatment strategies are most effective. Guidelines for managing post-operative pain specify that initial dosing should be adjusted for patients who take opioids for chronic nonmalignant pain, and while these guidelines for initial dosing have been generalized to patients who have acute pain from other causes, we did not find any evidence about effectiveness or safety in the target population.</i>

Recommendations for future research

Pain is a prevalent problem for medical inpatients, and research has not addressed this setting effectively. The lack of evidence suggests that the VA should characterize current practice, avoid overly prescriptive standards, and emphasize a robust research agenda. Given that pain intensity is used widely, and that outpatient research raises some questions about the accuracy and relevance of single item screening for pain to improved patient outcomes, veterans might benefit from clinical research that:

- 1) Tests use of pain intensity along with other approaches (automated nurse / physician alerts, expanded screening items / paradigms, patient direct-triggered nurse / physician alerts) to better link screening to intervention. Psychometric evaluation is needed as one aspect of this research.
- 2) Draws upon quality improvement research to evaluate the efficacy of key intervention components.
- 3) Evaluates different initial treatment intensities including the clinical effectiveness and safety of PCA, but not excluding high intensity oral regimes (which are used in lieu of PCA in places such as Australia). These studies should stress the evaluation of alternative follow-up strategies and ascertain the risk / benefit and ceiling effects of alternative approaches to medical pain management.
- 4) Specifically addresses basic clinical science of pain in delirium, severe mental illness (such as schizophrenia which you highlight) and dementia (such as identifying a ‘gold standard’ for validity – e.g., fMRI vs. observation), and clinical studies that address 1-3 should not exclude veterans with substance abuse disorder. Furthermore, studies that examine treatment in those populations and that include outcomes relevant to prior abuse such as triggering of recurrent abuse, dysphoria, etc., are needed.
- 5) Evaluates performance measures that go beyond assessment to include prompt treatment and successful alleviation of pain in the medical inpatient setting (see Table 6).

Additional recommendations pertinent to VA care can be found in Buffum et al.⁹⁷

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

Table 6. Examples of indicators for measuring aspects of pain management

Performance measure	Developed for population/setting	Numerator	Denominator
<i>Assessment and diagnosis</i>			
Percentage of patients with documented assessment for pain using standardized tool on admission ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number with documented admission assessment for pain using standardized tool	All patients
Percentage of patients with documented care plan for acute or chronic pain ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number with documented care plan for acute or chronic pain	All patients with reported pain
Percentage of patients receiving physical exam to assess for causes of pain ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number receiving physical exam to assess for causes of pain	All patients with reported pain
Percentage with cognitive and language problems receiving targeted pain assessment ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number with cognitive and language problems receiving targeted pain assessment	Patients with diagnosed cognitive and/or language deficit
Percentage with periodic documented assessment by nursing staff of effectiveness of pain management ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number with periodic documented assessment by nursing staff of effectiveness of pain management	Patients with reported pain
Percentage with periodic documented assessment of effectiveness of pain management by medical doctor (MD) ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number with periodic documented assessment of effectiveness of pain management by medical doctor (MD)	Patients with reported pain
Percentage with documented complete assessment of pain covering all pertinent components of pain ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number with documented complete assessment of pain covering all pertinent components of pain	All patients with reported pain
Screening for pain ¹⁰⁹	Vulnerable elders (aged 65+)	Number of patients screened for chronic pain in initial evaluation	All vulnerable elders
Screening for depression ¹⁰⁹	Vulnerable elders (aged 65+)	Number of patients screened for depression	Vulnerable elders with presenting with chronic pain
<i>Treatment/ management</i>			
Percentage with documented absence of pain symptoms after treatment ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number with documented absence of pain symptoms after treatment	All patients with reported pain who received treatment
Percentage with documented reduction of pain symptoms ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number of patients with documented reduction of pain symptoms	All patients with reported pains
Percentage of patients	Long-term care	Number of patients with	All patients receiving

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

with orders for not recommended drugs ¹⁰⁸	setting	orders for not recommended drugs	medications to treat pain
Percentage of patients with appropriate treatment for pain ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number of patients with appropriate treatment for pain	All patients with reported pain
Percentage of patients prescribed narcotics for pain with appropriate bowel management program in place ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number of patients prescribed narcotics with appropriate bowel management in place	All patients receiving narcotics to treat pain
Percentage with adverse drug reactions (ADRs) to pain medications ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number of patients with adverse drug reactions (ADRs) related to pain medications	All patients receiving pain medication
Percentage with controlled adverse drug reactions (ADRs) to pain medications ¹⁰⁸	Long-term care setting	Number with controlled adverse drug reactions (ADRs) to pain medications	All patients with reported pain receiving pain medication who had an adverse drug reaction (ADR)
Addressing risks of NSAIDs ¹⁰⁹	Vulnerable elders (aged 65+)	Number of patients whose medical record indicates whether s/he has a history of peptic ulcer disease, and if a history is present, documentation of justification of NSAID use	All vulnerable elders who have been prescribed a cyclooxygenase nonselective NSAID for the treatment of chronic pain
Constipation with opioid use ¹⁰⁹	Vulnerable elders (aged 65+)	Number of vulnerable elders offered a bowel regimen, or whose medical record documents the potential for constipation or explains why bowel treatment is not needed.	All vulnerable elders treated with opioids for chronic pain
Meperidine not used ¹⁰⁹	Vulnerable elders (aged 65+)	Number of patients requiring analgesia who were not given meperidine	All vulnerable elders who require analgesia
Percentage who reported how often their pain was controlled ¹¹⁰	Adult inpatients	The number of respondents from the denominator who indicated "Always," "Usually," "Sometimes," or "Never" on the two questions regarding their experiences with control of their pain	Hospital inpatients with an admission during the reporting period who answered the "Pain Management" questions on the CAHPS Hospital Survey

REFERENCES

1. Ngo AL, Guiang R. Acute pain management. In: Boswell MV, Cole BE, eds. *Weiner's pain management: A practical guide for clinicians, 7th edition*. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2006.
2. Dix P, Sandhar B, Murdoch J, MacIntyre PA. Pain on medical wards in a district general hospital. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*. 2004;92(2):235-237.
3. Johnson L, Regaard A, Herrington N. Pain in general medical patients: an audit. In: Dostrovsky JO CD, Koltzenburg, eds. , ed. *Proceedings of the 10th World Congress of Pain. Progress in Pain Research and Management*. . Vol 24. Seattle: : IASP Press; 2003.
4. Melotti RM, Samolsky-Dekel BG, Ricchi E, et al. Pain prevalence and predictors among inpatients in a major Italian teaching hospital. A baseline survey towards a pain free hospital. *European Journal of Pain: Ejp*. Oct 2005;9(5):485-495.
5. Vallano A, Malouf J, Payrulet P, Banos JE. Prevalence of pain in adults admitted to Catalonian hospitals: a cross-sectional study. *Eur J Pain*. Nov 2006;10(8):721-731.
6. Visentin M, Zanolin E, Trentin L, Sartori S, de Marco R. Prevalence and treatment of pain in adults admitted to Italian hospitals. *European Journal of Pain: Ejp*. Feb 2005;9(1):61-67.
7. *The Integrated Approach to the Management of Pain. NIH Consensus Statement*: National Institutes of Health; 1986.
8. Warfield CA, Kahn CH. Acute pain management. Programs in U.S. hospitals and experiences and attitudes among U.S. adults. *Anesthesiology*. Nov 1995;83(5):1090-1094.
9. Morrison RS, Magaziner J, McLaughlin MA, et al. The impact of post-operative pain on outcomes following hip fracture. *Pain*. Jun 2003;103(3):303-311.
10. Anonymous. *Acute Pain Management: Operative or Medical Procedures and Trauma*: Agency for Health Care Policy and Research; February 1992 1992. AHCPR Publication No. 92-0032.
11. *Management of cancer pain*: Agency for Health Care Policy and Research; February 1992 1994. AHCPR Publication No. 92-0032.
12. Shojanian KG, Duncan BW, McDonald KM. *Making Health Care Safer: A Critical Analysis of Patient Safety Practices*.: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2001. AHRQ Publication No. 01-E058.
13. Cleeland CS, Reyes-Gibby CC, Schall M, et al. Rapid improvement in pain management: the Veterans Health Administration and the institute for healthcare improvement collaborative. *Clin J Pain*. Sep-Oct 2003;19(5):298-305.
14. Craine M, Kerns RD. Pain Management Improvement Strategies in the Veteran's Health Administration. *APS Bulletin*. 2003;13(5).
15. McMillan SC, Tittle M, Hagan S, Laughlin J. Management of Pain and Pain-Related Symptoms in Hospitalized Veterans With Cancer. *Cancer Nursing*. 2000;23(5):327-336.
16. Kerns RD, Booss J, Bryan M, et al. Veterans Health Administration National Pain Management Strategy: Update and Future Directions. *APS Bulletin*. 2006;16(1).

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

17. Australian and New Zealand College of Anaesthetists and Faculty of Pain Medicine. *Acute Pain Management: Scientific Evidence*, 2nd edition. Melbourne: Australian and New Zealand College of Anaesthetists. 2005.
18. Macintyre PE, Schug SA, Scott DA. Acute pain management: the evidence grows. An Australian document now has an important role in acute pain management worldwide. *Medical Journal of Australia* 2006;184(3):101-2.
19. Merlin T, Hodgkinson B, Macintyre PE, Ludbrook G, Hiller JE. Institutional approaches to pain assessment and management (008PAI). A systematic literature review. *Health Technology Assessment Database*. 2003(1).
20. *ICSI Health Care Guideline: Assessment and Management of Acute Pain, 5th Edition* 2006.
21. *Pain: Current Understanding of Assessment, Management, and Treatments* Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations; 2001.
22. *Improving the quality of pain management through measurement and action:* Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations; 2003.
23. Hadjistavropoulos T, Herr K, Turk DC, et al. An Interdisciplinary Expert Consensus Statement on Assessment of Pain in Older Persons. *Clinical Journal of Pain*. 2007;23 Supplement 1:S1-S43.
24. Harris RP, Helfand M, Woolf SH, et al. Current methods of the US Preventive Services Task Force: a review of the process. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. Apr 2001;20(3 Suppl):21-35.
25. Mora B, Giorni E, Dobrovits M, Barker R, Lang T, Gore C, Kober A. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation: an effective treatment for pain caused by renal colic in emergency care. *Journal of Urology*. 175(5):1737-41; discussion 1741, 2006 May.
26. Frasco PE, Sprung J, Trentman TL. The Impact of the Joint Commission for Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations Pain Initiative on Perioperative Opiate Consumption and Recovery Room Length of Stay. *Anesth Analg*. January 1, 2005 2005;100(1):162-168.
27. Nelson BP, Cohen D, Lander O, Crawford N, Viccellio AW, Singer AJ. Mandated pain scales improve frequency of ED analgesic administration. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. Nov 2004;22(7):582-585.
28. Luger TJ, Lederer W, Gassner M, Lockinger A, Ulmer H, Lorenz IH. Acute pain is underassessed in out-of-hospital emergencies. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. Jun 2003;10(6):627-632.
29. Carey SJ, Turpin C, Smith J, Whatley J, Haddox D. Improving pain management in an acute care setting. The Crawford Long Hospital of Emory University experience. *Orthopaedic Nursing*. Jul-Aug 1997;16(4):29-36.
30. Peters ML, Patijn J, Lame I. Pain Assessment in Younger and Older Pain Patients: Psychometric Properties and Patient Preference of Five Commonly Used Measures of Pain Intensity. *Pain Medicine*. 2007;8(7):601-610.
31. Morrison RS, Ahronheim JC, Morrison GR, et al. Pain and discomfort associated with common hospital procedures and experiences. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 1998;15(2):91-101.
32. Jaeschke R, Singer J, Guyatt GH. Measurement of health status. Ascertaining the minimal clinically important difference. *Control Clin Trials*. 1989;10(4):407-415.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

33. Grant MD, Samson D. Special Report: Measuring and Reporting Pain Outcomes in Randomized Controlled Trials. *TEC Assessment Program*. 2006;21(11).
34. Vila H, Jr., Smith RA, Augustyniak MJ, et al. The Efficacy and Safety of Pain Management Before and After Implementation of Hospital-Wide Pain Management Standards: Is Patient Safety Compromised by Treatment Based Solely on Numerical Pain Ratings? *Anesth. Analg.* August 1, 2005 2005;101(2):474-480.
35. Mularski RA, White-Chu F, Overbay D, Miller L, Asch SM, Ganzini L. Measuring Pain as the 5th Vital Sign Does Not Improve Quality of Pain Management. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2006;21(6):607-612.
36. Krebs EE, Carey TS, Weinberger M. Accuracy of the Pain Numeric Rating Scale as a Screening Test in Primary Care. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2007;21(10):1453-1458.
37. Tanabe P, Buschmann M. A prospective study of ED pain management practices and the patient's perspective. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. Jun 1999;25(3):171-177.
38. Blank FS, Mader TJ, Wolfe J, Keyes M, Kirschner R, Provost D. Adequacy of pain assessment and pain relief and correlation of patient satisfaction in 68 ED fast-track patients. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. Aug 2001;27(4):327-334.
39. Grant PS. Analgesia delivery in the ED. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. Nov 2006;24(7):806-809.
40. Jones JB. Assessment of pain management skills in emergency medicine residents: the role of a pain education program. *Journal of Emergency Medicine*. Mar-Apr 1999;17(2):349-354.
41. Kelly AM. A process approach to improving pain management in the emergency department: development and evaluation. *Journal of Accident & Emergency Medicine*. May 2000;17(3):185-187.
42. Fosnocht DE, Swanson ER. Use of a triage pain protocol in the ED. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. Sep 2007;25(7):791-793.
43. Arendts G, Fry M. Factors associated with delay to opiate analgesia in emergency departments. *Journal of Pain*. Sep 2006;7(9):682-686.
44. Hwang U, Richardson LD, Sonuyi TO, Morrison RS. The effect of emergency department crowding on the management of pain in older adults with hip fracture. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. Feb 2006;54(2):270-275.
45. Pines JM, Hollander JE. Emergency department crowding is associated with poor care for patients with severe pain. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*. Jan 2008;51(1):1-5; discussion 6-7.
46. Graber MA, Ely JW, Clarke S, Kurtz S, Weir R. Informed consent and general surgeons' attitudes toward the use of pain medication in the acute abdomen. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. Mar 1999;17(2):113-116.
47. Attard AR, Corlett MJ, Kidner NJ, Leslie AP, Fraser IA. Safety of early pain relief for acute abdominal pain. *BMJ*. 1992;305:554-556.
48. Pace S, Burke T. Intravenous morphine for early pain relief in patients with acute abdominal pain. *Academic emergency medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine*. 1996;3(12):1086-1092.
49. McHale PM, LoVecchio F. Narcotic analgesia in the acute abdomen--a review of prospective trials. *Eur J Emerg Med*. Jun 2001;8(2):131-136.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

50. Nissman SA, Kaplan LJ, Mann BD. Critically reappraising the literature-driven practice of analgesia administration for acute abdominal pain in the emergency room prior to surgical evaluation. *American Journal of Surgery*. Apr 2003;185(4):291-296.
51. Ranji SR, Goldman LE, Simel DL, Shojania KG. Do opiates affect the clinical evaluation of patients with acute abdominal pain? *JAMA*. Oct 11 2006;296(14):1764-1774.
52. Bijur PE, Berard A, Esses D, Nestor J, Schechter C, Gallagher EJ. Lack of influence of patient self-report of pain intensity on administration of opioids for suspected long-bone fractures. *Journal of Pain*. Jun 2006;7(6):438-444.
53. Shabbir J, Ridgway PF, Lynch K, et al. Administration of analgesia for acute abdominal pain sufferers in the accident and emergency setting. *European Journal of Emergency Medicine*. Dec 2004;11(6):309-312.
54. Morrison RS, Meier DE, Fischberg D, et al. Improving the management of pain in hospitalized adults. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. May 8 2006;166(9):1033-1039.
55. Goldberg GR, Morrison RS. Pain management in hospitalized cancer patients: a systematic review. *J Clin Oncology*. 2007;25(13):1792-1801.
56. White PF. Use of patient-controlled analgesia for management of acute pain. *JAMA*. Jan 8 1988;259(2):243-247.
57. Fulda GJ, Giberson F, Fagraeus L. A prospective randomized trial of nebulized morphine compared with patient-controlled analgesia morphine in the management of acute thoracic pain. *Journal of Trauma-Injury Infection & Critical Care*. Aug 2005;59(2):383-388; discussion 389-390.
58. Evans E, Turley N, Robinson N, Clancy M. Randomised controlled trial of patient controlled analgesia compared with nurse delivered analgesia in an emergency department. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. Jan 2005;22(1):25-29.
59. Moon MR, Luchette FA, Gibson SW, et al. Prospective, randomized comparison of epidural versus parenteral opioid analgesia in thoracic trauma. *Annals of Surgery*. May 1999;229(5):684-691; discussion 691-682.
60. Wu CL, Jani ND, Perkins FM, Barquist E. Thoracic epidural analgesia versus intravenous patient-controlled analgesia for the treatment of rib fracture pain after motor vehicle crash. *Journal of Trauma-Injury Infection & Critical Care*. Sep 1999;47(3):564-567.
61. Liu SS, Wu CL. The Effect of Analgesic Technique on Postoperative Patient-Reported Outcomes Including Analgesia: A Systematic Review. *Anesth Analg*. September 1, 2007 2007;105(3):789-808.
62. Liu SS, Wu CL. Effect of Postoperative Analgesia on Major Postoperative Complications: A Systematic Update of the Evidence. *Anesth Analg*. March 1, 2007 2007;104(3):689-702.
63. Bainbridge D, Martin JE, Cheng DC. Patient-controlled versus nurse-controlled analgesia after cardiac surgery--a meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia*. May 2006;53(5):492-499.
64. Block BM, Liu SS, Rowlingson AJ, Cowan AR, Cowan JA, Jr., Wu CL. Efficacy of Postoperative Epidural Analgesia: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA*. November 12, 2003 2003;290(18):2455-2463.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

65. Walder B, Schafer M, Henzi I, Tramer MR. Efficacy and safety of patient-controlled opioid analgesia for acute postoperative pain. A quantitative systematic review. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. Aug 2001;45(7):795-804.
66. Hudcova J, McNicol E, Quah C, Lau J, Carr DB. Patient controlled opioid analgesia versus conventional opioid analgesia for postoperative pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2007(2).
67. Hudcova J, McNicol E, Quah C, Lau J, Carr DB. Patient controlled opioid analgesia versus conventional opioid analgesia for postoperative pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2006(4):CD003348.
68. Tziavrangos E, Schug SA. Regional anaesthesia and perioperative outcome. *Current Opinion in Anaesthesiology*. Oct 2006;19(5):521-525.
69. Werawatganon T, Charuluxanun S. Patient controlled intravenous opioid analgesia versus continuous epidural analgesia for pain after intra-abdominal surgery. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2007(2).
70. Werawatganon T, Charuluxanun S. Patient controlled intravenous opioid analgesia versus continuous epidural analgesia for pain after intra-abdominal surgery. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2005(1):CD004088.
71. Macintyre PE. Safety and efficacy of patient-controlled analgesia. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*. Jul 2001;87(1):36-46.
72. Hagle ME, Lehr VT, Brubakken K, Shippee A. Respiratory depression in adult patients with intravenous patient-controlled analgesia. *Orthopaedic Nursing*. Jan-Feb 2004;23(1):18-27; quiz 28-19.
73. Ashburn MA, Love G, Pace NL. Respiratory-related critical events with intravenous patient-controlled analgesia. *Clinical Journal of Pain*. Mar 1994;10(1):52-56.
74. Tramer MR, Williams JE, Carroll D, Wiffen PJ, Moore RA, McQuay HJ. Comparing analgesic efficacy of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs given by different routes in acute and chronic pain: a qualitative systematic review. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. Jan 1998;42(1):71-79.
75. Nelson CE, Nylander C, Olsson AM, Olsson R, Pettersson BA, Wallstrom I. Rectal v. intravenous administration of indomethacin in the treatment of renal colic. *Acta Chirurgica Scandinavica*. Apr 1988;154(4):253-255.
76. Nissen I, Birke H, Olsen JB, et al. Treatment of ureteric colic. Intravenous versus rectal administration of indomethacin. *British Journal of Urology*. Jun 1990;65(6):576-579.
77. Muriel-Villoria C, Zungri-Telo E, Diaz-Curiel M, et al. Comparison of the onset and duration of the analgesic effect of dipyron, 1 or 2 g, by the intramuscular or intravenous route, in acute renal colic. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*. 1995;48(2):103-107.
78. Holdgate A, Pollock T. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) versus opioids for acute renal colic. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2007(2).
79. Quigley C. Hydromorphone for acute and chronic pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2007(2).
80. Jasani NB, O'Conner RE, Bouzoukis JK. Comparison of hydromorphone and meperidine for ureteral colic. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. Nov-Dec 1994;1(6):539-543.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

81. Uden P, Starck CJ, Berger T. Comparison of indomethacin and dihydromorphinone in acute, biliary stone pain. *Current Ther Res.* 1984;36(6):1228-1234.
82. Halbert J, Crotty M. Evidence for the optimal management of acute and chronic phantom pain: a systematic review. *Clin J Pain* 2002;18(2):84-92.
83. Sherman RA, Sherman CJ, Gall NG. A survey of current phantom limb pain treatment in the United States. *Pain.* 1980;8:85-99.
84. Jaeger H, Maier C. Calcitonin in phantom limb pain: a double-blind study. *Pain.* Jan 1992;48(1):21-27.
85. Nikolajsen L, Hansen CL, Nielsen J, Keller J, Arendt-Nielsen L, Jensen TS. The effect of ketamine on phantom pain: a central neuropathic disorder maintained by peripheral input. *Pain.* Sep 1996;67(1):69-77.
86. Huse E, Larbig W, Flor H, Birbaumer N. The effect of opioids on phantom limb pain and cortical reorganization. *Pain.* Feb 1 2001;90(1-2):47-55.
87. Wu CL, Tella P, Staats PS, et al. Analgesic effects of intravenous lidocaine and morphine on postamputation pain: a randomized double-blind, active placebo-controlled, crossover trial. *Anesthesiology.* Apr 2002;96(4):841-848.
88. Bone M, Critchley P, Buggy DJ. Gabapentin in postamputation phantom limb pain: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, cross-over study. *Regional Anesthesia & Pain Medicine.* Sep-Oct 2002;27(5):481-486.
89. Dertwinkel R, Henrichs C, Senne I, et al. Prevention of severe phantom limb pain by perioperative administration of ketamine - an observational study. *Acute Pain.* 2002;4:9-13.
90. Hayes C, Armstrong-Brown A, Burstal R. Perioperative intravenous ketamine infusion for the prevention of persistent post-amputation pain: a randomized, controlled trial. *Anaesthesia & Intensive Care.* Jun 2004;32(3):330-338.
91. Gehling M, Tryba M. [Prophylaxis of phantom pain: is regional analgesia ineffective?]. *Schmerz.* Jan 2003;17(1):11-19.
92. Flor H, Denke C, Schaefer M, Grusser S. Effect of sensory discrimination training on cortical reorganisation and phantom limb pain. *Lancet.* Jun 2 2001;357(9270):1763-1764.
93. Cook AK, Niven CA, Downs MG. Assessing the pain of people with cognitive impairment. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry.* Jun 1999;14(6):421-425.
94. Weiner D, Peterson B, Ladd K, McConnell E, Keefe F. Pain in nursing home residents: An exploration of prevalence, staff perspectives, and practical aspects of measurement. *Clin J Pain.* 1999;15(2):92-101.
95. Parmelee P. Pain complaints and cognitive status among elderly institution residents. . *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society.* 1993;41(5):517-522.
96. Pautex S, Michon A, Guedira M, et al. Pain in severe dementia: self-assessment or observational scales?. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society.* 2006;54(7):1040-1045.
97. Buffum MD, Hutt E, Chang VT, Craine MH, Snow AL. Cognitive impairment and pain management: Review of issues and challenges. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development.* 2007;44(2):315-330.

Assessment and Management of Pain in Inpatients

98. Assessing Pain in the Patient with Impaired Communication: A Consensus Statement from the VHA National Pain Management Strategy Coordinating Committee. In: Affairs V, ed; 2004.
99. Pautex S, Herrmann F, Le Lous P, Fabjan M, Michel JP, Gold G. Feasibility and reliability of four pain self-assessment scales and correlation with an observational rating scale in hospitalized elderly demented patients. . *Journals of Gerontology Series A-Biological Sciences & Medical Sciences*. Apr 2005;60(4):524-529.
100. Defrin R, Lotan M, Pick CG. The evaluation of acute pain in individuals with cognitive impairment: a differential effect of the level of impairment. *Pain*. Oct 2006;124(3):312-320.
101. Chibnall JT, Tait RC. Pain assessment in cognitively impaired and unimpaired older adults: a comparison of four scales. *Pain*. May 2001;92(1-2):173-186.
102. Herr K, Bjoro K, Decker S. Tools for assessment of pain in nonverbal older adults with dementia: a state-of-the-science review. *Journal of Pain & Symptom Management*. Feb 2006;31(2):170-192.
103. van Herk R, van Dijk M, Baar FP, Tibboel D, de Wit R. Observation scales for pain assessment in older adults with cognitive impairments or communication difficulties. *Nurs Res*. 2007;56(1):34-43.
104. Zwakhalen SMG, Hamers JPH, Abu-Saad HH, Berger MPF. Pain in elderly people with severe dementia: a systematic review of behavioural pain assessment tools. *BMC Geriatrics*. 2006;6:3.
105. Definitions Related to the Use of Opioids for the Treatment of Pain. <http://www.ampainsoc.org/advocacy/opioids2.htm>. Accessed December 10, 2007, 2007.
106. Savage SR, Joranson DE, Covington EC, Schnoll SH, Heit HA, Gilson AM. Definitions related to the medical use of opioids: evolution towards universal agreement. . *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2003;26:655–667.
107. Hojsted J, Sjogren P. Addiction to opioids in chronic pain patients: A literature review. *European Journal of Pain*. 2007;11(5):490-518.
108. American Medical Directors Association. We care: tool kit for implementation of the clinical practice guideline for pain management. Columbia (MD): American Medical Directors Association (AMDA); 2004.
109. ACOVE quality indicators. Assessing the Care of Vulnerable Elders Project. Rand Health, Santa Monica, California. Chodosh J, Ferrell BA, Shekelle PG, et al. Quality indicators for pain management in vulnerable elders. *Ann Intern Med*. 2001; 135 (8pt2):641-758, 731-738.
110. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). CAHPS hospital survey. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2006 Feb 1. 4 p. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). HCAHPS survey [<http://www.hcahpsonline.org>]. Baltimore (MD): Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS)