

1 **Title:** Exploring athlete pain assessment experiences and priorities; A two-part qualitative series of
2 athlete and physiotherapist interactions.

3 Part Two. “Forging Our Future” - Athlete and physiotherapists’ priorities for pain assessment and
4 beyond.

5

6 **Authors**

7 Ciarán Purcell^{1,2,3,4,5,6} Caoimhe Barry Walsh³ Garrett Van Oirschot^{1,2} Brona M Fullen¹ Tomás Ward⁶
8 Brian M Caulfield^{1,2}

9 ¹*School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Sports Science, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland*

10 ²*Insight SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics, Dublin, Ireland*

11 ³*School of Allied Health, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

12 ⁴*Physical Activity for Health Research Cluster, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

13 ⁵*Sports and Human Performance Centre, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

14 ⁶*Ageing Research Centre, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37 **Abstract**

38 *Objectives:* To explore the priorities and directions of athlete upper and lower limb pain assessment
39 by facilitating shared understandings of athletes and sports physiotherapists.

40 *Design:* Qualitative Research using a hermeneutic phenomenological approach.

41 *Methods:* We carried out focus groups using a deliberate criterion sample and a constructivist
42 perspective. At the end of each focus group, we used the nominal group technique method to generate
43 a list of consensus-based priorities for future pain assessment. Our paper follows the consolidated
44 criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ) guidelines.

45 *Results:* We completed five focus groups, comprising twelve athletes (female, n=5, male n=7) and
46 four sports physiotherapists (male, n=4) Two final themes (and six subthemes) were developed; (i)
47 Enhanced Communication and Pain Descriptions (describing and representing pain, better
48 communication, the role of technology, providing direction and setting the pace), (ii) Integrating Sport
49 Specific and Multidimensional Assessments (broadening the pain assessment toolkit, the role of
50 technology). We developed a set of thirteen practical priorities for pain assessment that span the
51 subjective, objective, and general aspects of the athlete pain assessment.

52 *Conclusion:* We have presented stakeholder-generated perspectives, directions, and priorities for
53 athlete pain assessment. Athletes and Physiotherapists must continue to work together to achieve a
54 comprehensive sport-specific multidimensional pain assessment experience alongside their wider
55 support networks to ensure optimal representation and communication. We have highlighted some
56 available pain assessment tools and strategies and outlined how novel tools may address certain gaps
57 in the assessment process. Researchers, clinicians, and athletes can consider the practical guidance we
58 have provided to address these priorities.

59

60 **Keywords**

61 'Pain Measurement', 'Musculoskeletal Pain', 'Athletic Injuries' 'Athletic Performance' 'Focus
62 Groups', 'Pain Management'.

63

64 **Introduction**

65

66 In this series, we acknowledge the value of qualitative research in sport, and we are pursuing a
67 comprehensive understanding of athlete pain experience and assessment through qualitative methods.¹
68 The International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) outlines the importance of appreciating
69 and validating each individual's experience, including both the sensory and emotional aspects of pain
70 in their definition of pain.² The contemporary predictive processing model of pain describes how pain
71 is not merely something we experience but something that influences how we act and interact in the
72 world, shaping our behaviours.³ Pain neuroscience has been applied to athlete cohorts with guidelines
73 recommending a multidimensional biopsychosocial approach to facilitate optimal pain assessment.^{4,6}
74 Contextual pain assessment tools (affective, cognitive and socioenvironmental) have been used
75 substantially less frequently than the more traditional tools (neurophysiological and biomechanical
76 pain assessment) in both research and practice settings over the past fifty years and, somewhat
77 concerningly, the gap between the use of these wider aspects and the more commonly used traditional
78 tools is widening.⁷ In Part One of this series, athletes and physiotherapists shared their experiences of
79 the content and qualities of pain assessments. Athletes and physiotherapists discussed the commonly
80 used tools, measures and scales highlighting the strengths and limitations of current practice in the
81 context of best available guidance. The quality of the pain assessment was closely linked with the pain
82 interview, an opportunity for athletes to tell their stories, share information related to the affective,
83 cognitive, and socioenvironmental aspects of pain and develop a strong therapeutic alliance. These
84 findings align with recent literature emphasising the power of narrative methods to express the
85 complexity of feelings, emotions and experiences influenced by sport-specific sociocultural aspects
86 that athletes negotiate daily.⁸⁻¹⁰ In this paper, the second in this two-part series we present the
87 priorities for future practice as part of an integrated overview and culmination of our overall findings.

88

89

90 **Methods**

91 *Focus Groups*

92 We carried out focus groups with a deliberate criterion sample of athletes and sports physiotherapists
93 based in Ireland from diverse sporting backgrounds. We developed a topic guide which guided
94 discussion from broad pain experience-related questions to more focused questions on priorities for
95 pain assessment. A moderator and neutral observer helped to ensure equity of participation and full
96 exploration of the topic guide. We used reflexive thematic analysis and developed codes, candidate
97 themes and final themes in an iterative fashion.¹¹ A critical friend (CBW) independently reviewed the
98 data and added additional perspectives. We have described the methodology for the focus groups
99 component of this paper in detail in Part One of this series.¹² In the current paper, Part Two of the
100 series, we use data from focus group questions that address priorities and directions for athlete pain
101 assessment. The full published data set can be accessed at
102 <https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/t47tw94mzd/2>.).

103 *Nominal Group Technique*

104 Nominal Group Technique (NGT) is a method of problem-solving and idea generation where all
105 participants have an equal opportunity to contribute their priorities, effectively minimising power
106 imbalances and facilitating the ranking of priorities suggested by participants.¹³ We used the NGT at
107 the end of each focus group session to facilitate brainstorming of priorities and generate consensus for
108 items to be included in the next phase of an athlete upper and lower pain assessment framework
109 development. We chose this method to give equal weight to the opinions of all participants and to
110 focus the ideas and topics discussed in the focus groups on priorities for pain assessment practice.
111 NGT is a method of consensus generation where all participants contribute multiple ideas which are
112 then voted on and prioritised equitably.¹⁴ Members rank their top five with their highest priority idea
113 receiving five votes down to their fifth highest priority idea receiving one vote. NGT consists of four
114 stages: Silent generation, round robin, clarification, and voting. We used five sequential steps (state
115 the subject, reflection and writing, polling, discussion, and prioritisation) to operationalise this
116 technique which was first developed in 1975 and has been used across domains and settings including
117 healthcare and sport.^{15 16} We recorded and discussed all ideas generated by participants during the
118 polling stage of the NGT. Participants voted on initial ideas which then became priorities. We

119 discarded all ideas that did not receive a minimum of one vote during this voting stage from our
120 analysis. See Appendix A for a detailed description of how we applied each of the five steps in this
121 study. We carried out the five NGTs independently and pooled the results during the data analysis
122 stage.

123

124 **Data Analysis**

125 During the Focus Group data analysis process, we assigned athletes alphanumeric participant IDs
126 beginning with the letter “A” and physiotherapists alphanumeric IDs beginning with “P”. Athletes
127 and physiotherapists were talking about and experiencing the same concepts so we merged the data
128 for coding and analysis. Participant IDs were known only to CP, the lead researcher. Once participant
129 IDs were allocated and analysis was complete all records of participant information were deleted
130 ensuring anonymity.

131 After we completed the NGTs, we reviewed all priorities that received a minimum of one vote, and I
132 (CP) applied the initial codes. We (CP, BC, TW and GvO) reviewed the initial coding framework. We
133 updated the codes and renamed them where necessary, grouping similar codes to generate candidate
134 themes of assessment items and aspects. CBW reviewed the codes and candidate themes
135 independently in her role as a critical friend and we discussed the additional perspectives. We then
136 updated our candidate themes and developed a set of finalised themes.

137

138 **Figure 1 Themes (Enhanced Communication and Pain Descriptions; Integrating Sport Specific**
139 **and Multidimensional Assessments) and codes inserted here.**

140

141 **Figure 2 The Pain Assessment Priority Pyramid is inserted here.**

142

143

144

145 **Results & Discussion**

146 The results are derived from five focus groups which gathered the experiences and interactions of
147 sixteen participants (athletes, n=12, physiotherapists, n=4) from a broad range of sports and
148 competition levels, a full description of which is provided in Part One of this series.¹² Athletes and
149 physiotherapists voiced their opinions on what the future of an athlete pain assessment could and
150 should look like. From the focus group codes, we developed two clear themes highlighting priority
151 areas for pain assessment.

152 In Figure 1 we present these two themes and their associated codes. The first theme centres around
153 better strategies to describe and represent pain, including tools that go beyond the current methods for
154 capturing pain intensity and enhanced pain communication strategies. Participants highlighted aspects
155 such as the context, timing and frequency of pain assessments and proposed technology-based
156 solutions as one option to address current shortcomings. The challenge and opportunity of providing
157 athletes with clear direction in the next steps of their pain assessment and management process are
158 highlighted. The second theme explores prioritising assessment strategies for the different aspects of
159 pain experience. Future pain assessments should be multimodal, considering a wide range of
160 biopsychosocial and sports-specific factors to get a more comprehensive picture of the pain the athlete
161 is experiencing. Both strategies promise to enhance current assessments offering a deeper and more
162 nuanced understanding to better guide decision-making and management.

163 In Figure 2 we present the finalised thematic map of the athlete pain assessment priority pyramid
164 which demonstrates how the themes and subthemes explored in this paper build on Part One of the
165 series.

166

167

168 **Theme 1 Enhanced communication and pain descriptions.**

169 Theme 1 includes three sub themes; 1.1 – describing and representing pain, 1.2 – better
170 communication and 1.3 – the role of technology.

171 **1.1 Describing and representing pain**

172
173 Participants discussed the struggle to describe and represent pain, and how it may be improved by
174 using more comprehensive descriptions. This reflects the contemporary drive for valuing the patient’s
175 language and selecting appropriate metaphors to help represent and explain the pain experience.¹⁷
176 Additionally athletes felt providing contextual information such as their pain and rehabilitation history
177 helped explain their current pain experience. Athletes and physiotherapists highlighted the
178 development of criteria and categories for the classification of pain intensity that go beyond the
179 traditional numerical pain rating scale (NPRS) to include more detailed descriptions of pain and the
180 impact of pain on aspects of daily life as a priority for pain assessment.

181 *“I think more kinds of adjectives describing pain it definitely would be beneficial.” - A09*

182 *“Your rehab experience. Because I think they all play into how you experience pain and*
183 *maybe your history of pain or your even perception of pain because everyone is an individual*
184 *and they experience lots of things differently.” - A02*

185 *“It would be great to see something where it was like how does this pain influence and then*
186 *there’s like several categories so maybe one would be sleep for me anyway, one would be like*
187 *work you know or your sport...” – A10*

188 There may be value in revisiting long-established measures such as the Brief Pain Inventory Scale
189 (which includes intensity, location, body chart, interference with everyday life and pain within a
190 certain timeframe) and the McGill Pain Questionnaire (which includes a comprehensive list to
191 describe pain sensation, physical and emotional aspects, interaction with treatment options and wider
192 lifestyle factors and measures of intensity that provide context to this pain experience) and developing
193 contemporary multidimensional tools tailored to an athlete population.^{18 19}

194 **1.2 Better communication**

195 The timing, setting and communication of pain were earmarked by participants as areas to improve
196 athlete pain assessments and enable some of the proposed enhanced descriptions and categorisation.
197 Athletes and physiotherapists felt including more time for reflection, both before and after the athlete-
198 physiotherapist assessment session, would facilitate athletes to recall their pain experiences in greater
199 detail. Additionally, varying the time of assessments to capture pain during competition and activities
200 of daily living that provoke pain was suggested as an opportunity to enhance pain assessment practice,
201 particularly when athlete-physiotherapist interactions are infrequent, and athletes may struggle to
202 accurately recall the entirety of their pain experience since their previous assessment.

203 *“I like the idea of writing stuff down before you go in and see someone because you get a*
204 *chance to actually think of it.” – P04*

205 *“I know that helped for me, because.. before I go into a physio, I do write down what I’m*
206 *going to say, because more often than not I’d leave forgetting to mention things and you’re*
207 *like, oh god, well it’s gone now and I’m never going to say anything.” - A11*

208 Ecological momentary assessment (EMA) involves the repeated sampling of behaviours and
209 experiences in real-time and is carried out in the person’s natural environment.²⁰ EMA has been
210 applied in chronic pain and sports psychology research and our results suggest it is something which
211 may provide value when considering improved communication in future pain assessments for athletes.
212 ^{21 22} Participants felt applying enhanced communication methods would help with difficult decision-
213 making when it comes to athlete pain. Athletes described the challenge of not knowing when to play
214 or compete through pain and how to effectively gauge progress whilst physiotherapists noted the
215 opportunity for additional communication to enhance this process.

216 *“I think as an athlete .. we want to know .. when is that pain too much to keep doing what I’m*
217 *doing, when should I stop? That type of thing like what’s the recovery process?” – A06*

218 *“Sometimes as physios that’s where we could maybe have that missing link..., not necessarily*
219 *to be so individualised and so 24/7 care but there has to be some level of a way of you know*

220 *being able to kind of link in with them I think a bit more that I think would help sometimes.” -*

221 P02

222 ***1.3 The role of technology***

223 The effective use of technology to facilitate enhanced communication and contextual assessment was
224 proposed as a future opportunity. Technology could be used to integrate novel assessment methods
225 such as EMA. Athletes based in high-performance environments discussed how they used
226 smartphones to facilitate more frequent communication about pain with their sports medicine teams
227 which they found helpful. The value of insights gleaned from regular subjective wellness reporting
228 with athletes has been established and has been proposed to provide more value than objective
229 measures for certain training load, health, and well-being markers.²² However, further consideration is
230 needed to smoothly integrate technology into the contemporary pain assessment process and wider
231 athlete ecosystem. Aspects such as validity, data protection and integration into current workflows
232 and health system records all warrant consideration. The clinical utility of a single self-report item has
233 been challenged in line with the need for interpretation and reasoning when it comes to
234 musculoskeletal clinical practice standards.^{23 24} Furthermore, the future integration of technology must
235 meet the needs of both athletes and physiotherapists, enhancing rather than complicating the pain
236 assessment clinical encounter.

237 *“An app we use for training, and she (coach) would put in each day like how many hours did*
238 *you sleep last night? What’s your perceived rate of recovery from the previous day's training?*
239 *Perceived rate of like pain that day.” – A08*

240 *“Could you fill in maybe an assessment after each training session, describing your pain and*
241 *send that back to the physio or have regular updates throughout that process as well?” – A05*

242 *“A pain app where every morning it was what’s your pain and then a journaling section and*
243 *it's like how did you sleep last night? Did you take painkillers? How was your training? All*

244 *these different sections so and then say next time you see your physio potentially they would*
245 *have access to your app and it's like okay here's with your rating over the last week" – A10*

246

247 **1.4 Providing direction and setting the pace**

248 An effective assessment sets the pace and expectations for the management process. Athletes found
249 that receiving an accurate prognosis and timeline to build goals as a pivotal part of pain management.
250 Athletes and Physiotherapists highlighted that the role of the physiotherapist is to provide an objective
251 perspective to aid in the decision-making process. The optimal level of objectivity and guidance
252 varied amongst athletes and sports environments. Regarding priorities for pain assessment practice,
253 physiotherapists acknowledged the importance of providing clear direction at the end of the
254 assessment.

255

256 *"I think clarity is probably the most important thing, just having a timeline said to you that*
257 *you can believe and actually see is realistic, I think that's very important in terms of progressing" –*

258

A05

259 *"As much as you're a fan of the sport and a runner as well you kind of have to then be able to*
260 *stand aside and go hold on what's the best for the athlete" – P01*

261

262 *"You're having issues with these three areas, this is what we're going to work on.." – P04*

263

264 However, both athletes and physiotherapists emphasised how diagnoses, timelines and decision-
265 making are not always straightforward. Physiotherapists found making a definitive diagnosis and
266 providing direction was particularly challenging in persistent pain presentations, where the signs and
267 symptoms that frequently accompany acute pain and injury presentations were not present and
268 recovery and improvement were often protracted requiring a greater level of pain knowledge and

269 clinical reasoning skills. These challenges align with gaps and future priorities in athlete pain
270 assessment and management identified by the International Olympic Committee (IOC).²⁵

271 *“I agree completely with what P03 was saying as regards how cloudy things become over*
272 *time and I think that that’s a difficulty like for ... with a patient... I would always say to them .. look*
273 *the longer we go away from your injury to where we are now, the more likely is we won’t be able to*
274 *give you a definite diagnosis of what’s going on” – P02*

275

276 Acknowledging these challenges in an area that does not always have a clear answer, physiotherapists
277 prioritised understanding their limitations as an important aspect of the role of the sports
278 physiotherapist. Additionally, they highlighted the importance of honesty and focusing on aspects
279 within their remit to facilitate the development of the trust required for an effective athlete-
280 physiotherapist assessment and relationship.²⁶

281

282 *“Lads come in with pain and ask what is it?..I don’t know exactly what it is, it could be this,*
283 *this and this, but all I know is that you’re having issues with these three areas, this is what we’re*
284 *going to work on..we’ll see what it’s like.” – P04*

285 *“It’s okay to not know and I think sometimes it’s better to tell someone you don’t know but*
286 *definitely have a direction you feel like they need to go in” – P04*

287

288 **Theme 2 Integrating sport-specific and multidimensional assessments.**

289 Theme 2 includes two subthemes: 2.1 – broadening the pain assessment toolkit and 2.2 – the role of
290 technology. In parallel to enhanced communication and descriptions, athletes felt multimodal and
291 sport-specific pain assessment tools would give a more comprehensive assessment and understanding
292 of the athlete's pain experience. This theme was developed from codes gleaned from athlete
293 perspectives only and so it is a truly athlete-focused theme.

294 **2.1 Broadening the pain assessment toolkit.**

295 Psychosocial, lifestyle and environmental pain assessment tools were recommended by athletes to
296 give a more encompassing and holistic overview of athlete pain. Athletes highlighted sport-specific
297 pain assessment tools such as assessing movement, strength and motor control patterns relevant to
298 their sport, asking about training load and the impact of pain on sports activities and measuring pain
299 during, before or after sports activities to represent the unique athlete pain experience and provide
300 enhanced contextual information in line with the best available athlete pain guidance.^{4 27} Athletes
301 discussed how clinic-based pain assessments could be enhanced by completing more assessments in
302 the athlete's sports environment such as on the pitch, court or track, a finding that could facilitate the
303 practical implementation of contemporary IOC guidance.^{4 27}

304 *“ The other environmental or the psychological factors that could have led to it because*
305 *sometimes it's a very obvious thing, that reason it happened. But asking about how you feel*
306 *around it and a little bit of support...getting a good grasp of someone's life and all the other*
307 *stressors and factors I think definitely would help in diagnosing the thing rather than you*
308 *know just going for more scans and what have you to try to pinpoint it.” – A09*

309 *“The questions that they use for pain, there's no differentiation between some guy who hurt*
310 *his leg working on a building site versus somebody who's like an amateur athlete who's you*
311 *know playing sport five nights a week and the questions need to be more specific to that*
312 *person, that kind of activity maybe.” - A02*

313 *“More assessments directed at for the readiness to play in terms of I think even out on a pitch*
314 *is completely different in the physio room .. when you're out on the pitch afterwards and you*
315 *feel different types of pain .. could the physio be out and involved more?” - A05*

316 **2.2 The role of technology**

317 Technology was once again suggested by athletes as a potential method to add multimodal and sport-
318 specific measures into an integrative pain assessment. Additionally, the role of the physiotherapist and
319 their expertise in pain assessment and management was stressed, and future pain assessment strategies
320 should augment rather than replace this vital relationship. Additionally, a recent systematic review

321 found that there is moderate to high certainty evidence supporting the integration of technology into a
322 physiotherapy assessment for musculoskeletal disorders in the general population.²⁸ The study found
323 substantial to excellent validity and excellent inter and intra-rater reliability for pain (97-98%
324 agreement) and patient-reported outcome measures (ICC 0.99-1.00, 95% CI 0.97 to 1.00). However,
325 patients reported a superior user experience and confidence in the examination from a face-to-face
326 assessment, supporting our findings. Additionally conducting and interpreting pain assessments with
327 athletes requires sports and context-specific information (such as sport-specific physical demands, and
328 coach and team expectations for return to play) that may be understood better if conducted in the
329 athlete's sporting environment.

330 *“So, if I could see changes in the industry its App based for sure it's probably interactive ..but*
331 *there's some clear definitive I want him (the physiotherapist) to have a relationship with me,*
332 *know what I'm doing and know when I can get back to my sport so there's something in that.*
333 *I don't know what but...” – A06*

334

335 **From theory to practice: practical priorities for pain assessment.**

336 In Table 1 we present the pooled results of the nominal group techniques we carried out. Each theme
337 is a practical example of an aspect of assessment that can be used to operationalise the pain
338 assessment priorities we identified through the focus group findings above. We present the codes that
339 comprise each theme alongside a qualitative description of how clinicians can apply the assessment
340 item in practice. We have indicated whether each item can be incorporated as part of the subjective
341 assessment (initial interview), objective assessment (physical testing) or should be considered as a
342 general aspect of the wider assessment process. The proportion of total votes each theme received
343 when codes were pooled is also presented. The majority of the practical pain assessment priorities we
344 present align closely with the published literature including 1) subjective components such as;
345 establishing the history, context, characteristics, severity and impact of the athlete's pain and
346 exploring the athlete's stressors, psychological aspects and lifestyle factors as well as their training

347 load and 2) objective components such as; assessing and identifying pain through movement,
348 completing sports specific objective measures both at the site of pain and throughout the kinetic chain.
349 ^{2 4 25} Developing a specific, clear, and time-appropriate assessment is a novel finding. Although the
350 IOC guidelines recommend tailoring the pain assessment based on the presentation of the athlete and
351 the stage in the pain management process our findings add that the assessment should align closely
352 with the athlete's goals and the plan should be articulated clearly to the athlete so that they understand
353 each aspect of the pain assessment and why it is being completed. Another novel finding is the need
354 for alternative pain severity scales that go beyond the traditional numerical pain rating scale. Scales
355 such as the traffic light pain scale which offers athletes guidance on decision-making regarding
356 playing through pain have clinical utility and are used widely in practice.²⁹ Additionally there is scope
357 for the inclusion of a pain severity scale that helps to overcome the limitations of a numerical scale to
358 describe and represent the pain experience more appropriately although what that might look like is
359 yet unclear. The International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) identifies how a verbal
360 description is just one method of representing pain.² Additional options include athletes using a body
361 chart to indicate their pain or the demonstration of their pain through a specific movement or action to
362 have their experience of pain understood and validated which is another novel finding.

363

364

365 **Conclusion**

366 In this paper we have presented themes focused on future pain assessment priorities and directions
367 that build on our “athlete pain assessment” findings presented in Part One of this series. Moving
368 beyond unidimensional, point-in-time clinical pain measures to encompass better communication and
369 direction for pain management will involve the use of more comprehensive and descriptive pain
370 scales and tools that athletes and physiotherapists can relate to. We have outlined examples of pain
371 assessment tools that are currently available and should be considered by clinicians. Conversely, we
372 have highlighted how novel tools may encompass capturing pain at critical time points in sports
373 environments to help tell the full story of athlete pain. Whilst Physiotherapists may be justifiably
374 reticent to introduce additional measures to avoid complicating the assessment process for athletes,

375 athletes are embracing existing and emerging technology as part of evolving sports science. Applying
376 a carefully developed and well-implemented solution that incorporates available technology and keeps
377 the athlete-physiotherapist interaction and relationship at its core is one potential future solution that
378 must be considered.

379 Although we collected experiences from a diverse range of athletes and physiotherapists and variety
380 was achieved in sport, competition level and practice setting the experiences and priorities gathered
381 from these focus groups and nominal group techniques may not apply to all athlete pain assessment
382 settings. Notably, participants were all recruited from Ireland and whilst some of the female athletes
383 also had a physiotherapy background, no female sports physiotherapists were available to participate.
384 The focus of our research was to highlight the athlete and physiotherapist voices and explore their
385 experiences of pain assessment through open discussion. In addition, to augment these findings, we
386 selected the Nominal Group Technique to complement the exploratory nature of the focus group
387 methodology. We have presented a comprehensive series of pain assessment priorities for
388 physiotherapists to consider. There is scope for future research to consider these findings in light of
389 contemporary research and practice and develop an expert sports physiotherapist consensus-based
390 athlete pain assessment framework that can be implemented in research and practice settings.

391

392

393 **Practical Implications**

- 394 - The pain assessment must include assessment tools and measures that allow athletes to,
395 represent and therefore validate their specific pain experience.
- 396 - Physiotherapists should use pain assessment tools that capture the context of an athlete's pain
397 as well as the intensity and impact on sports and activities of everyday life at key points in an
398 athlete's day.
- 399 - Physiotherapists must consider a variety of pain assessment tools that address the
400 multidimensional nature of pain and integrate psychological, social, environmental and sport-
401 specific aspects of the athlete's pain experience in the pursuit of providing direction for
402 athletes to manage their pain.

403 - Physiotherapists should consider the careful and effective use of technology to augment the
404 athlete-physiotherapist pain assessment interaction.

405

406

407 **References**

408

- 409 1. Bekker S, Bolling C, H Ahmed O, et al. Athlete health protection: Why qualitative research
410 matters. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport* 2020;23(10):898-901. doi:
411 10.1016/j.jsams.2020.06.020
- 412 2. Raja SN, Carr DB, Cohen M, et al. The revised International Association for the Study of Pain
413 definition of pain: concepts, challenges, and compromises. *Pain* 2020;161(9):1976-82. doi:
414 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001939 [published Online First: 2020/07/23]
- 415 3. Kiverstein J, Kirchhoff MD, Thacker M. An Embodied Predictive Processing Theory of Pain
416 Experience. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 2022 doi: 10.1007/s13164-022-00616-2
- 417 4. Hainline B, Derman W, Vernec A, et al. International Olympic Committee consensus statement on
418 pain management in elite athletes. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(17):1245-58. doi:
419 10.1136/bjsports-2017-097884 [published Online First: 2017/08/23]
- 420 5. Caneiro JP, Alaiti RK, Fukusawa L, et al. There is more to pain than tissue damage: eight principles
421 to guide care of acute non-traumatic pain in sport. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*
422 2021;55(2):75-77. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-101705
- 423 6. Hoegh M, Stanton T, George S, et al. Infographic. Pain or injury? Why differentiation matters in
424 exercise and sports medicine. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2022;56(5):299-300. doi:
425 10.1136/bjsports-2021-104633
- 426 7. Purcell C, Duignan C, Fullen BM, et al. Comprehensive assessment and classification of upper and
427 lower limb pain in athletes: a scoping review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*
428 2023;bjsports-2022-106380. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2022-106380

- 429 8. Everard C, Wadey R, Howells K. Storying sports injury experiences of elite track athletes: A
430 narrative analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 2021;56:102007. doi:
431 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.102007>
- 432 9. Tabben M, Verhagen E, Warsen M, et al. Obstacles and opportunities for injury prevention in
433 professional football in Qatar: exploring the implementation reality. *BMJ Open Sport &
434 Exercise Medicine* 2023;9(1):e001370. doi: 10.1136/bmjsem-2022-001370
- 435 10. Costa N, Butler P, Dillon M, et al. “I felt uncertain about my whole future”—a qualitative
436 investigation of people's experiences of navigating uncertainty when seeking care for their
437 low back pain. *PAIN* 2023
- 438 11. Braun V, Clarke V. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in
439 Sport, Exercise and Health* 2019;11(4):589-97. doi:
440 10.1080/2159676x.2019.1628806
- 441 12. Purcell C, Barry Walsh C, Van Oirschot G, et al. Exploring athlete pain assessment experiences
442 and priorities; A two-part qualitative series of athlete and physiotherapist interactions.
443 Part One. “Gauging and discerning” - Athlete & physiotherapist pain assessment experiences
444 and interactions. *medRxiv* 2023:2023.12.28.23300487. doi: 10.1101/2023.12.28.23300487
- 445 13. McMillan SS, King M, Tully MP. How to use the nominal group and Delphi techniques.
446 *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy* 2016 doi: 10.1007/s11096-016-0257-x
- 447 14. Delbecq ALG, David H & Van de Ven, Andrew H. Group techniques for program planning : a
448 guide to nominal group and Delphi processes / Andre L. Delbecq, Andrew H. Van de Ven,
449 David H. Gustafson. III ed. Foresman Glenview: Scott 1975.
- 450 15. US Dept of Health & Human Services, . Gaining Consensus Among Stakeholders Through the
451 Nominal Group Technique. In: Prevention DoHHSCfDCa, ed. Evaluation Briefs Centre for
452 Disease Control & Prevention 2018.
- 453 16. Dallinga J, Janssen M, van der Werf J, et al. Analysis of the Features Important for the
454 Effectiveness of Physical Activity–Related Apps for Recreational Sports: Expert Panel
455 Approach. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 2018;6:e143. doi: 10.2196/mhealth.9459

- 456 17. Louw A, Puentedura EJ, Diener I, et al. Pain neuroscience education: Which pain neuroscience
457 education metaphor worked best? *South African Journal of Physiotherapy* 2019;75(1) doi:
458 10.4102/sajp.v75i1.1329
- 459 18. Melzack R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: major properties and scoring methods. *Pain*
460 1975;1(3):277-99. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(75)90044-5 [published Online First: 1975/09/01]
- 461 19. Cleeland CS, Ryan KM. Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. *Ann Acad Med*
462 *Singap* 1994;23(2):129-38. [published Online First: 1994/03/01]
- 463 20. Pagé MG, Gauvin L, Sylvestre M-P, et al. An Ecological Momentary Assessment Study of Pain
464 Intensity Variability: Ascertainig Extent, Predictors, and Associations With Quality of Life,
465 Interference and Health Care Utilization Among Individuals Living With Chronic Low Back
466 Pain. *The Journal of Pain* 2022;23(7):1151-66. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2022.01.001
- 467 21. Reifsteck EJ, Anderson SN, Newton JD, et al. A practical guide and empirical example for
468 implementing ecological momentary assessment in sport psychology research with athletes.
469 *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology* 2021;10(3):408-22. doi: 10.1037/spy0000252
- 470 22. Saw AE, Main LC, Gastin PB. Monitoring the athlete training response: subjective self-reported
471 measures trump commonly used objective measures: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med*
472 2016;50(5):281-91. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-094758 [published Online First: 2015/10/02]
- 473 23. Duignan C, Doherty C, Caulfield B, et al. Single-Item Self-Report Measures of Team-Sport
474 Athlete Wellbeing and Their Relationship With Training Load: A Systematic Review. *J Athl*
475 *Train* 2020;55(9):944-53. doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-0528.19 [published Online First:
476 2020/09/30]
- 477 24. Bishop A, Blackburn, J., Hallam, F., McComiskie, E., Rankin, G. Musculoskeletal physiotherapy
478 service standards; The delivery of musculoskeletal (MSK) physiotherapy services in the UK
479 for adults of 16 years and over. In: *Physiotherapy TCSO*, ed. London 2021.
- 480 25. Zideman DA, Derman W, Hainline B, et al. Management of Pain in Elite Athletes: Identified Gaps
481 in Knowledge and Future Research Directions. *Clin J Sport Med* 2018;28(5):485-89. doi:
482 10.1097/JSM.0000000000000618 [published Online First: 2018/06/29]

483 26. David S, Hitchcock J. Understanding Patient Trust in the Athletic Setting through Interviews.
484 *Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice* 2018 doi: 10.46743/1540-
485 580x/2018.1683

486 27. Hainline B, Turner JA, Caneiro JP, et al. Pain in elite athletes-neurophysiological, biomechanical
487 and psychosocial considerations: a narrative review. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(17):1259-64.
488 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-097890 [published Online First: 2017/08/23]

489 28. Bernhardsson S, Larsson A, Bergenheim A, et al. Digital physiotherapy assessment vs
490 conventional face-to-face physiotherapy assessment of patients with musculoskeletal
491 disorders: A systematic review. *PLoS One* 2023;18(3):e0283013. doi:
492 10.1371/journal.pone.0283013 [published Online First: 2023/03/22]

493 29. Silbernagel KG, Thomeé R, Eriksson BI, et al. Continued sports activity, using a pain-
494 monitoring model, during rehabilitation in patients with Achilles tendinopathy: a
495 randomized controlled study. *Am J Sports Med* 2007;35(6):897-906. doi:
496 10.1177/0363546506298279 [published Online First: 2007/02/20]

497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

Theme	Codes	Description of Theme	Subjective, Objective or General Aspect	Votes Nr	Votes %
Pain History & Context	Pain History: 'What does this pain mean to you?', Pain context: subjective questions Pre-Assessment Model - Written (Is pain threatening or not?); Pain medication	Ask the athlete about the history of this pain presentation and prior pain experiences. Previous pain related to injuries or trauma will help establish the context. Questions around the time of the season and current home and sports environment will help to establish the "full picture". Gauge the athlete's understanding (intra-rater context) by asking "what does this pain mean to you?" or "Do you feel this pain is threatening or not?". A pre-assessment survey could help gather this information.	Subjective	44	18.53%
Movement & Pain ID	Active ROM & pain/deficits; Assessing Functional ADLs; Pain provocation- movement; Palpation.	Identify the athlete's specific pain through a movement assessment which may include a full range of motion tests (noting how the athlete describes any pain to help establish the nature of the pain presentation), and assessing functional movements of daily living that provoke pain. Palpation can also be considered.	Objective	27	11.25%
Objective Assessments (Sport Specific)	Objective Sport Specific Measures; Sport Specific Functional Assessment	Measure movement, functional patterns, and strength assessments specific to the athlete's sport. This may include movement patterns such as running, jumping, stretching and throwing as well as bilateral/unilateral strength measures.	Objective	22	9.17%
Specific clear and time appropriate assessment	Structured, tailored assessment; Prompt diagnostic imaging; Daily Monitoring/Check-ins Explanation of assessment process & timeline	Carry out a well-structured, goal-oriented pain assessment that is specific to the phase of the athlete's pain assessment and management process. The plan should be explained clearly to the athlete. Diagnostic imaging should be used judiciously but promptly when it is required; daily monitoring or check-ins may help to establish an athlete's pain recovery and wellness overtime.	General Aspect of Assessment	19	7.92%
Stressors & Lifestyle Factors	Sleep, Nutrition & Lifestyle Factors; Work & Family related stress	Fully explore the athlete's lifestyle factors. Ask the athlete about their diet, hydration and nutritional status. Ask about sleep duration, quality and the relationship between the athlete's sleep and pain. Factors such as smoking and alcohol and work/family life stressors should be explored as appropriate. Use the assessment to educate athletes regarding the impact of lifestyle factors on pain perception and experience.	Subjective	19	7.92%
Pain Severity Scales & Measures	Pain Severity & Irritability Measures & Scales; Physical & Functional Pain Scale	Measure the severity and irritability of the athlete's pain. Consider the use of traditional scales such as the Numerical Pain Rating Scale, alongside more practical and descriptive scales incorporating the athlete's pain context and previous pain experiences.	Subjective/Objective	17	7.08%
Pain Characteristics	Aggravating & Easing Factors; Pain Onset/Mechanism & Duration; Nature/Type of Pain	Comprehensively explore the factors that aggravate and ease the athlete's pain experience. Document the pain timeline from initial onset (including mechanism of onset where available) to the current pain presentation. Encourage athletes to describe the nature or quality of the pain with different adjectives to help determine the underlying pain mechanism.	Subjective	16	6.67%
Knowing & Understanding the athlete	Sports priorities/goals; Clinician openness re pain; Understanding individual & background; Personality Assessment	Get to know and understand the athlete as an individual, their unique background and circumstances and their sporting priorities and goals. Take an open-minded approach to pain assessment, acknowledging individual differences and communication preferences.	General aspect of assessment	15	6.25%
Athlete identifying their pain	Body Chart for ID of painful areas; Show, demonstrate or describe your pain	Prioritise the accurate representation of the athlete's pain. Consider various measures to facilitate athletes to identify their pain including body charts, demonstrating and describing their pain. An athlete's ability to pinpoint their pain may indicate whether pain is localised or diffuse which can aid in establishing underlying pain mechanisms.	Objective	15	6.25%
Objective Measures (General)	Objective strength tests and measures; Kinetic Chain & Fitness Assessments; Balance/Proprioception	Use a comprehensive set of objective measures to establish positive goals and identify areas of improvement to develop the athlete's robustness and performance alongside addressing their pain. These include strength (handheld dynamometry, upper and lower limb repetitions max) fitness, and balance/proprioception throughout the kinetic chain (and not just the site of pain/injury).	Objective	15	6.25%
Pain Impact	Effect of pain on QoL, ADLs & Sports performance	Explore the impact of pain on an athlete's performance within their sport as well as the influence of pain on their everyday activities. Over time the experience of pain can have an effect on an athlete's quality of life which should be discussed.	Subjective	15	6.25%
Current Training & Rehab load	Current Rehab; Training schedule & load	Determine the athlete's rehabilitation history, what worked well previously and what did not, particularly for recurrent pain episodes. Document current rehabilitation or prehabilitation activities. Establish the (acute) training load leading up to the athlete's pain presentation alongside the chronic training load preceding this episode. Record the impact of this pain episode on training load capacity.	Subjective	9	3.75%
Psychological/Emotional aspects	Post-Session Psych Assessment; Discussion & support; Fear or concern	Explore the emotional and psychological aspects of pain. Ask the athlete about the fears, worries or concerns surrounding their pain. Take some time to explain the psychological impact of pain and injury and offer the athlete appropriate support.	Subjective	7	2.92%

521 **Table 1 – Nominal Group Technique Results inserted here**

522 *Votes Nr – is the number of votes each theme received. Each participant received a total of 15 votes which they*
523 *used to rank their top five priorities/codes (5 votes, 4 votes, 3 votes, 2 votes and 1 vote.) Votes % displays the*
524 *overall percentage of votes each theme received. Pain ID - Pain identification, ROM - range of motion, ADLs –*
525 *activities of daily living, QoL – Quality of life.*

526

527

528

529

530

531 **Figure Captions**

532 **Figure 1. Themes (Enhanced Communication and Pain Descriptions; Integrating Sport-specific**
533 **and Multidimensional Assessments) and codes.** Dark shading – indicates codes that were present in
534 athletes and physiotherapists. Light shading – indicates codes that were present in athletes only. No
535 shading – indicates codes that were present in physiotherapists only

536

537

538 **Figure 2. Athlete pain assessment priorities themes and subthemes.** The themes for each part of
539 this series represent a row in the priorities for pain assessment pyramid, this paper presents the top
540 row of the pyramid, the themes and subthemes that address the priorities for athlete pain assessment.
541 These themes build on the bottom row or foundation of the pyramid presented in Part One. Source:
542 The cartoon element at the top of this image was designed by Freepik www.freepik.com

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553


554

555


556 **Appendix A – The Five Steps of the Nominal Group Technique**

- 557 1) **State the subject.** The lead researcher wrote the title of the subject at the top of a whiteboard
558 (virtual whiteboard for Zoom session) “List all the items you think should be
559 included/prioritised in an athlete pain assessment framework.”
- 560 2) **Reflection & writing.** Ten minutes were given for silent reflection and consideration and
561 participants were asked to write down all of their ideas on separate sticky note pages to keep
562 their ideas private until the polling stage.
- 563 3) **Polling.** Each group member revealed one idea at a time, taking turns until every idea was
564 recorded by placing the sticky notes on the whiteboard. Minimal discussion took place at this
565 stage with equal contribution from each member.
- 566 4) **Discussion.** Each idea was then clarified and explained by the participant who proposed it,
567 followed by discussion and queries by the group. The specific wording of ideas was changed
568 in some circumstances following discussion upon approval from the person who came up
569 with the idea. Similar ideas were merged or grouped together at this stage.
- 570 5) **Prioritisation** Following discussion each participant ranked their top five assessment priority
571 ideas from all of the ideas generated and approved in earlier stages. A score of five was
572 allocated to the idea the participant ranked highest, a score of 4 was allocated to the idea the
573 participant ranked next highest and so on continuing to one. The ideas were then ranked based
574 on the highest to lowest scoring. Participants were then invited to share any element they felt
575 was missing or needed to be adjusted before the final ranking was approved. All ideas that
576 received a minimum score of one vote were kept.

Enhanced Communication & Pain Descriptions



Integrating Sport Specific & Multidimensional Assessments





Describing and representing pain

Better communication

Providing direction and setting the pace

Enhanced Communication & Pain Descriptions

Integrating Sport Specific & Multidimensional Assessments

Broadening the pain assessment toolkit

The role of technology

Measures, Scales & Dimensions

Connect, Listen & Learn

Lighthouse in the storm

Theme	Codes	Description of Theme	Subjective, Objective or General Aspect	Votes Nr	Votes %
Pain History & Context	Pain History; What does this pain mean to you?; Pain context subjective questions; Pre Assessment Model - Written; Is pain Threatening or not?; Pain medication	Ask the athlete about the history of this pain presentation and prior pain experiences. Previous pain related to injuries or trauma will help establish the context. Questions around the time of the season and current home and sports environment will help to establish the "full picture". Gauge the athlete's understanding (internal context) by asking "What does this pain mean to you?" or "Do you feel this pain is threatening or not?" A pre-assessment survey could help gather this information.	Subjective	44	18.33%
Movement & Pain ID	Active ROM & pain/deficits; Assessing Functional ADLs; Pain provocation - movement; Palpation.	Identify the athlete's specific pain through a movement assessment which may include a full range of motion test (noting how the athlete describes any pain to help establish the nature of the pain presentation) and assessing functional movements of daily living that provoke pain. Palpation can also be considered.	Objective	27	11.25%
Objective Assessments (Sport Specific)	Objective Sport Specific Measures; Sport Specific Functional Assessment	Measure movement, functional patterns, and strength assessments specific to the athlete's sport. This may include movement patterns such as running, jumping, squatting and throwing as well as bilateral/unilateral strength measures.	Objective	22	9.17%
Specific clear and time appropriate assessment	Structured tailored assessment; Prompt diagnostic imaging; Daily Monitoring/check ins; Explanation of assessment process & timeline	Carry out a well-structured, goal-oriented pain assessment that is specific to the phase of the athlete's pain assessment and management process. The plan should be explained clearly to the athlete. Diagnostic imaging should be used judiciously but promptly when it is required, daily monitoring or check-ins may help to establish an athlete's pain, recovery and wellness over time.	General Aspect of Assessment	19	7.92%
Stressors & Lifestyle Factors	Sleep, Nutrition & Lifestyle Factors; Work & Family related stress	Fully explore the athlete's lifestyle factors. Ask the athlete about their diet, hydration and nutritional status. Ask about sleep duration, quality and the relationship between the athlete's sleep and pain. Factors such as smoking and alcohol and work/family life stressors should be explored as appropriate. Use the assessment to educate athletes regarding the impact of lifestyle factors on pain perception and experience.	Subjective	19	7.92%
Pain Severity Scales & Measures	Pain Severity & Irritability Measures & Scales; Practical & Functional Pain Scale	Measure the severity and irritability of the athlete's pain. Consider the use of traditional scales such as the Numerical Pain Rating Scale, alongside more practical and descriptive scales incorporating the athlete's pain context and previous pain experiences.	Subjective/Objective	17	7.08%
Pain Characteristics	Aggravating & Easing Factors; Pain Onset/Mechanism & Duration; Nature/ Type of Pain	Comprehensively explore the factors that aggravate and ease the athlete's pain experience. Document the pain timeline from initial onset (including mechanism of onset where available) to the current pain presentation. Encourage athletes to describe the nature or quality of the pain with different adjectives to help determine the underlying pain mechanism.	Subjective	16	6.67%
Knowing & Understanding the athlete	Sports priorities/goals; Clinician openness re pain; Understanding individual & background; Personality Assessment	Get to know and understand the athlete as an individual, their unique background and circumstances and their sporting priorities and goals. Take an open-minded approach to pain assessment acknowledging individual differences and communication preferences.	General aspect of assessment	15	6.25%
Athlete identifying their pain	Body Chart for I.D of painful areas; Show, demonstrate or describe your pain	Prioritise the accurate representation of the athlete's pain. Consider various measures to facilitate athletes to identify their pain including body charts, demonstrating and describing their pain. An athlete's ability to pinpoint their pain may indicate whether pain is localised or diffuse which can aid in establishing underlying pain mechanisms.	Objective	15	6.25%
Objective Measures (General)	Objective strength tests and measures; Kinetic Chain & Fitness Assessments; Balance/Proprioception	Use a comprehensive set of objective measures to establish positive goals and identify areas of improvement to develop the athlete's robustness and performance alongside addressing their pain. These include strength (handheld dynamometry, upper and lower limb repetitions max) fitness, and balance/proprioception throughout the kinetic chain (and not just the site of pain/injury).	Objective	15	6.25%
Pain Impact	Effect of pain on QoL, ADLs & Sports performance	Explore the impact of pain on an athlete's performance within their sport as well as the influence of pain on their everyday activities. Overtime the experience of pain can have an effect on an athlete's quality of life which should be discussed.	Subjective	15	6.25%
Current Training & Rehab Load	Current Rehab; Training schedule & load	Determine the athlete's rehabilitation history, what worked well previously and what did not, particularly for recurrent pain episodes. Document current rehabilitation or prehabilitation activities. Establish the (acute) training load leading up to the athlete's pain presentation alongside the chronic training load preceding this episode. Record the impact of this pain episode on training load capacity	Subjective	9	3.75%
Psychological/Emotional aspects	Post Session Psych Assessment, Discussion & supports; Fear or concern	Explore the emotional and psychological aspects of pain. Ask the athlete about their fear, worries or concerns surrounding their pain. Take some time to explain the psychological impact of pain and injury and offer the athlete appropriate support.	Subjective	7	2.92%

