

1 **Cross-sectional evolution of pain management policies and practices in Portuguese**  
2 **pediatric emergency departments**

3

4 André Garrido<sup>1</sup>

5 Ana Rute Manuel<sup>1</sup>

6 Ricardo Araújo<sup>2</sup>

7 Inês Mascarenhas<sup>1</sup>

8 Helena Almeida<sup>1</sup>

9 Clara Abadesso<sup>1</sup>

10 <sup>1</sup>Departamento da Criança e do Jovem, Hospital Prof. Doutor Fernando Fonseca, E.P.E.,

11 Amadora, Portugal

12 <sup>2</sup>Instituto de Plasmas e Fusão Nuclear, Instituto Superior Técnico, Lisbon, Portugal

13

14 Address correspondence to: André Garrido; Departamento de Pediatria, Hospital Prof.

15 Doutor Fernando Fonseca, E.P.E., IC19, 2720-276 Amadora; +351 927077157;

16 [ajagarrido@gmail.com](mailto:ajagarrido@gmail.com).

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 The prevalence of pediatric pain, either related to the child's hospital visit or as a result of  
19 diagnostic and/or therapeutical interventions, is of primordial importance in pediatric  
20 emergency departments (PEDs).

21 In this study, we evaluate the evolution of pain assessment and management in  
22 Portuguese PEDs through eleven years. To this end, we prepared a questionnaire addressed to  
23 head physicians of 45 the Portuguese PEDs in 2007 and compared the responses to those  
24 provided in 2018, where we also posed these questions to nurse managers.

25 Pain assessment in Portuguese PEDs has significantly improved, namely with  
26 establishment of local protocols and widespread use of pain scales. However, effective adoption  
27 of pain management remains insufficient, as mild to moderate pain is still far from being  
28 universally treated. Nonetheless, there seems to be an adequate treatment of severe pain and  
29 respective common use of opioids, but correct practices were not generally adopted when  
30 specific types of pain were analyzed. Procedural sedation and use of non- pharmacological  
31 techniques has significantly increased, but are not yet universally practiced. These inadequacies  
32 are reflected by the staff's perception that pain management remains suboptimal, and more  
33 training is needed, effectively urging for a nationwide plan and better knowledge translation of  
34 correct pediatric pain management.

## 35 INTRODUCTION

36 In recent decades, the recognition of pain relief as a fundamental right resulted in  
37 significant progress in understanding and assessing pediatric pain. Indeed, children  
38 experience pain distinctively from adults, as they exhibit differences in the  
39 neurobiology of pain(Pancekauskaitė and Jankauskaitė, 2018). Pain is a chief complaint  
40 in the Pediatric Emergency Department (PED), being prevalent in more than 60% of the  
41 cases at admission(Marzona et al., 2019; Taylor et al., 2008). In this context, pain must  
42 be promptly assessed and treated, regardless the underlying condition. Despite ongoing  
43 improvements in pain relief, pediatric pain management is still insufficient  
44 worldwide(Ali et al., 2014; Farhat et al., 2013; Ferrante et al., 2013; Herd et al., 2009;  
45 MacLean et al., 2007; Williams et al., 2019). Ironically, pain induced by health  
46 professionals during various routine procedures is often underestimated, being amongst  
47 the most common sources of acute pain at the PED(Pancekauskaitė and Jankauskaitė,  
48 2018; Senger et al., 2021).

49 Pain treatment must be central to pediatric action as any form of oligoanalgesia  
50 has short- and long-term consequences. In the short-term, acute pain amplifies pain  
51 perception, anxiety and fear, which prevents accurate physical examination and delays  
52 necessary interventions. Consequently, potential needless exacerbation of the child's  
53 condition and the increased length of stay at the PED could be avoided. In the long-  
54 term, untreated pain may affect a child's emotional well-being and increase the  
55 possibility of chronic pain(Anand and Scalzo, 2000; Noel et al., 2017; Taddio et al.,  
56 2009; Williams et al., 2019; Young, 2005). It is, thus, crucial that pain is accurately  
57 assessed and nurse-initiated pain treatment protocols are instituted. Pain treatment must  
58 be prioritized and optimized, using non-pharmacological interventions to reduce distress  
59 and anxiety, combined with pharmacological treatment, proportional to pain

60 severity(Bailey and Trottier, 2016; Bauman and McManus, 2005; Drendel and Ali,  
61 2017; Fein et al., 2012; American Academy of Pediatrics, 2001; Ruest and Anderson,  
62 2016).

63 Allied to this avoidable scenario is the fact that pediatric pain has only started to  
64 receive attention in the 1980s(Schechter, 2008). Portugal established the National Day  
65 Against Pain as early as 1999 and created a National Plan Against Pain in 2001(Diniz et  
66 al., 2001) which has been periodically updated(Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2017). In 2003,  
67 pain was considered the “5<sup>th</sup> vital sign”, which enforced systematic records of pain  
68 intensity(Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2003) and, in 2010, pediatric-specific guidelines were  
69 published by the Ministry of Health(Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2010). Since then, specific  
70 pediatric guidelines were published covering pain management in neonates, children  
71 with cancer, and invasive procedures(Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2012a-c). Despite this  
72 favorable context, no studies demonstrate to what degree these recommendations have  
73 been converted into local protocols at the Portuguese PEDs. Also, there is no national  
74 data regarding the evolution of pain control over the years, and how it compares with  
75 other countries.

76 This study aims to describe the policies and reported practices of pain  
77 management at a national level by comparing the results between two surveys  
78 performed in 2007 and 2018 in a sample of Portuguese PEDs.

## 79    **METHODS**

### 80    **Study Design**

81    In 2007, a structured questionnaire was mailed to all 45 Portuguese hospitals with  
82    PEDs, to be answered by the head physician. A similar questionnaire designed in  
83    Google® Forms was emailed to the same PEDs in 2018 (Supplemental Material), to be  
84    answered by each responsible physician and nurse. Questions included are  
85    discriminated in the results section. Most questions had a Likert scale: never, <50% of  
86    times; > 50% of times, always. Responses to questionnaires were collected along 2007  
87    and between the 1<sup>st</sup> of August of 2018 and the 31<sup>st</sup> of July of 2019, respectively. We  
88    excluded all repeated questionnaires, and we only accepted the original responses when  
89    questionnaires were repeated. Most of the questions required an answer to move  
90    forward in the 2018 questionnaire. Whenever the 2007 questions remained unanswered,  
91    we adjusted the sample accordingly.

### 92    **Statistical Analysis**

93    All statistical analyses were performed using XLSTAT 2018.1.1, using a 95%  
94    confidence interval for all statistics. All P-values were obtained by the asymptotic  
95    method and are two-sided. We assumed for all statistics the independence of answers  
96    between hospitals and equal variances. We have four types of samples (see Fig. 1):  
97    (1) our general sample of Portuguese hospitals (hereafter designated as “general  
98    sample” or “our sample”) is the main focus of our study; we assume to be a  
99    representative sample of the general scenario in the Portuguese PEDs as it compares the  
100    responses from 2007 and 2018 eliminating repeated hospitals for 2018 that also  
101    provided replies to the questionnaires in 2007; we used a Student’s t-test ( $n_{2007}=21$ ;  
102     $n_{2018}=14$ ) for these analyses.

103 (2) the intrahospitalar time series aims to look at the consistency of practices within the  
104 same hospitals in the two sampled time points (2007 and 2018); for these comparisons  
105 we used a paired t-test (n=13).

106 (3) the 2018 only sample analyses responses to questions only present in the 2018  
107 questionnaire; we excluded repeated answers from the same hospital, excluding answers  
108 by nurse managers in these cases (n=27);

109 (4) comparison between head physician and nurse manager responses evaluates if  
110 physicians and nurses responded differently in 2018; we used only the responses from  
111 hospitals that had both responded and we analyzed the data using a paired t-test  
112 ( $n_{\text{nurses}}=n_{\text{physicians}}=13$ ).

113

114 *Figure 1 near here*

115 Figure 1 Rationale for the various analyses performed and corresponding sample  
116 adaptations.

117

118 When answers were originally formatted as “never”, “<50% of times”, “>50% of times”  
119 and “always” we statistically looked at the tendency of the results and, for this reason,  
120 the intermediate answers cannot be quantitatively objectified.

121 **RESULTS**

122 **Sample**

123 In 2007, there were 21 different hospital answers to the questionnaire, all from the head  
 124 physicians. In 2018, there was a total of 40 answers, of which 23 were made by the head  
 125 physician and 17 by the nurse manager. However, 13 of them were provided by both the  
 126 head physician and the nurse manager from the same hospital. This means that 47% of  
 127 the 45 portugueses PEDs responded in 2007 and 60% in 2018. Table 1 shows the  
 128 characterization of the responses as well as the medical specialties operating in different  
 129 PEDs. The annual emergency episodes reported was on average ~31910 cases  
 130 (SD=11286.9) in 2007 and 40943 cases (SD=14737.9) in 2018.

131

Hospital Nature		PED's Responsible				Medical Specialties in PED									
Public (n)		Private (n)		Physician (n)		Nurse (n)		Pediatricians (n)		Pediatric Residents (n)		General practitioners (n)		Others (n)	
2007	2018	2007	2018	2007	2018	2007	2018	2007	2018	2007	2018	2007	2018	2007	2018
21	37	0	3	21	23	0	17	20	39	18	34	20	31	1	12

132 Table 1 Characterization of the responses to questionnaires from Portuguese PEDs

133 responsible staff in 2007 and 2018; PED – Pediatric emergency department.

134 **Pain Protocol**

135 *Prevalence of protocols for pain management*

136 There is a statistically significant increase in the number of hospitals adopting a  
 137 protocol for pain management, from 52% of hospitals in 2007 to 93% in 2018 (P=0.01).

138 However, 15% of hospitals reported differently their existence between nurse managers

139 and head physicians. Among the 25 hospitals in 2018 that reported adopting a protocol,  
140 these were introduced on average 8 years before the questionnaire (SD=5.2 years).

141 Among our sample of 27 hospitals for 2018, 81% affirmed to do analgesia in  
142 triage by protocol (no different responses were observed between nurses and physicians  
143 from the same hospitals).

## 144 **Pain Assessment**

### 145 *Prevalence of pain assessment*

146 Among our general Portuguese hospitals sample, there is a statistically significant  
147 increase in the number of times pain is assessed reported by the responsible staff  
148 (P=0.006). Whereas in 2007 there were 43% of hospitals reporting assessment of pain in  
149 at least 50% of emergency incidents, in 2018 all hospitals did so. However, when we  
150 consider hospitals that assess pain in all PED episodes, there is a non-significant  
151 increase from 38% to 64% (P=0.14).

### 152 *Pain assessment: who, method, pain scales, and locus*

153 In our sample, when comparing 2007 to 2018, there was a statistically significant  
154 increase of nurses providing pain assessment, from 52% to 100% (P=0.001). However,  
155 the contribution that physicians provide for pain assessment was maintained between  
156 the years studied, 57% in 2007 and 50% in 2018 (P=0.69). Notably, no hospitals  
157 considered parent's assessment of pain in 2018, while in 2007 nearly 50% percent of the  
158 hospitals did (P<0.001).

159 In our sample, hospitals started adopting significantly more pain scales from  
160 2007 to 2018, 62% versus 100% (P=0.01). The pain scales used the most, by decreasing  
161 order reported in 2018, were: Numeric (n=30); Faces (n=23); Face, Legs, Activity, Cry,  
162 Consolability (FLACC) (n=20), Analogic (n=11), Neonatal Infant Pain Scale (NIPS)

163 (n=9), Portuguese Triage Group Scale (4), Faces Pain Scale – Revised (FPS-R) (n=3),  
 164 Face, Legs, Activity, Cry, Consolability – Revised (FLACC-R) (n=2), Hétero  
 165 Evaluation Douleur Enfant (HEDEN) and Échelle Douleur Inconfort Nouveau-Né  
 166 (EDIN) scales (both n=1).

167 **Analgesia for Different Types and Presentations of Pain**

168 The characterization of how pain is treated for different types of pains can be found in  
 169 Table 2.

170

		General Sample			Intrahospitalar Sample		
		2007	2018	p	2007	2018	p
Mild to moderate pain	Overall evolution	2.0	2.0	1.00	1.8	2.1	0.29
	Always	43%	7%	0.02	31%	31%	1.00
	Strong NSAIDs	0%	36%	0.002	0%	38%	0.018
	Weak opioids	5%	14%	0.34	0%	7%	0.34
Severe pain	Overall evolution	2.9	2.9	0.86	2.85	2.85	1.00
	Always	95%	93%	0.77	92%	85%	0.34
	Opioids	86%	93%	0.53	77%	92%	0.16
Abdominal pain	Overall evolution	1.4	1.6	0.44	1.1	1.9	0.01
	Always	14%	7%	0.53	7%	23%	0.34
	Opioids	14%	36%	0.15	23%	31%	0.72
Articular pain	Overall evolution	2.2	2.2	0.93	2.0	2.2	0.49
	Always	57%	29%	0.10	46%	31%	0.44
	NSAIDs	90%	93%	0.81	85%	92%	0.58
Fracture pain	Overall evolution	2.8	2.6	0.23	2.7	2.6	0.75
	Always	86%	64%	0.15	77%	62%	0.44
	Opioids	62%	79%	0.31	46%	77%	0.10
Burn pain	Overall evolution	2.9	2.6	0.05	2.9	2.5	0.05
	Always	90%	64%	0.06	92%	61%	0.04
	Opioids	81%	79%	0.87	69%	100%	0.04
Politrauma pain	Overall evolution	2.6	2.4	0.65	2.5	2.6	0.50
	Always	81%	57%	0.13	77%	61%	0.16
	Opioids	76%	100%	0.05	69%	77%	0.67

171 Table 2 Characterization of pain's treatment for different types of pains concerning the

172 general and the interhospitalar samples; overall evolution - the mean of a scale from 0 to

173 3, in which 0 means never treated, 1 means <50% of times, 2 means >50% of times and

174 3 means always treated; always – concerns to the percentage of hospitals in which pain

175 is always treated; strong NSAIDs / weak opioids / opioids – concerns to the percentage  
176 of hospitals in which these types of analgesics are used for pain's treatment.

#### 177 *Analgesia of mild-moderate and severe pain*

178 Concerning the use of analgesia for mild to moderate pain results were similar in 2007  
179 and 2018. Always using analgesia in this situation had a significant decrease from 43%  
180 to 7% in our sample ( $P=0.02$ ). There is a very significant increase of use of strong  
181 nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAIDs) like diclofenac, ketorolac and  
182 metamizole from 2007 to 2018 for this type of pain across our sample ( $P=0.002$ ) and  
183 intrahospitally ( $P=0.018$ ). None of the hospitals used strong NSAIDs in 2007, whereas  
184 in 2018, 36% were already using them.

185         There is a widespread use of analgesia for severe pain both in 2007 and 2018, as  
186 also the use of opioids in these situations.

#### 187 *Analgesia for abdominal, articular, fracture, burn, and politrauma pains*

188 For abdominal pain there was a non-statistically significant increase for analgesics use  
189 in our sample but a significant increase intrahospitally. For the use of analgesics for  
190 articular pain treatment, there was no evolution between the sampled years. There was a  
191 non-statistically significant reduction of use of analgesics for fracture pain. We  
192 registered one hospital that only used paracetamol for the treatment of fracture pain,  
193 both in 2007 and 2018. There was a statistically significant decrease in use of analgesics  
194 for burn treatment in our sample and a near non-statistically significant in the  
195 intrahospital sample. There was no statistically significant variation of analgesics use  
196 in our sample of Portuguese hospitals for politrauma treatment.

#### 197 **Procedural Analgesia and Sedation**

198 Characterization of different procedures sedoanalgesia can be found in Table 3.

		General Sample			Intrahospitalar Sample		
		2007	2018	p	2007	2018	p
Venoanalgesia	Overall evolution	0.9	1.2	0.37	0.9	1.1	0.66
	Never	43%	13%	0.06	46%	23%	0.19
	Always	14%	14%	1.00	15%	8%	0.58
Local analgesia for intramuscular injections	Overall evolution	62%	50%	0.50	75%	50%	0.22
Analgesia for lumbar puncture	Overall evolution	1.0	1.1	0.52	0.9	1.1	0.08
	Never	24%	7%	0.21	23%	8%	0.16
Sedation for lumbar puncture	Overall evolution	0.3	0.9	0.006	0.4	0.7	0.16
	Never	67%	21%	0.008	61%	46%	0.34
Analgesia for fracture reduction	Overall evolution	1.1	1.6	0.14	1.0	1.5	0.05
	Never	33%	7%	0.07	38%	8%	0.04
	Opioids	10%	43%	0.02	7%	7%	1.00
Sedation for fracture reduction	Overall evolution	0.5	1.4	0.001	0.3	1.1	0.009
	Never	61%	0%	<0.001	69%	15%	0.012
Analgesia for wound disinfection and suture	Overall evolution	1.5	1.4	0.85	1.4	1.2	0.58
	Never	19%	0%	0.09	23%	0%	0.08
Sedation for wound disinfection and suture	Overall evolution	0.3	0.8	0.02	0.3	1.0	0.02
	Never	71%	21%	0.003	69%	23%	0.03

200 Table 3 Characterization of pain's treatment of different procedures concerning the  
 201 general and the interhospitalar samples; overall evolution - the mean of a scale from 0 to  
 202 3, in which 0 means never treated, 1 means <50% of times, 2 means >50% of times and  
 203 3 means always treated (except for local analgesia for intramuscular injections which  
 204 was closed question, answering yes/no); never / always – concerns to the percentage of  
 205 hospitals in which pain is never and always treated, respectively.

206 *Analgesia for venopuncture and use of lidocaine for intramuscular injections*

207 For venopuncture, there was an increase in use of topic analgesia from 2007 to 2018 in  
 208 both samples, but such results were not statistically significant.

209 There was no statistically significant change in the use of local lidocaine before  
 210 intramuscular injections in our sample, 62% in 2007 and 50% in 2018 (P=0.50).

211 However, in 2018, there is a statistically significant difference between the answers  
212 within the same hospital provided by physicians and nurses with 46% physicians  
213 confirming the use of lidocaine, whereas 85% nurses reported the use of this technique  
214 (P=0.02).

215 *Analgesia and sedation for lumbar puncture*

216 Although there was an increase in our sample and intrahospitally for the use of  
217 analgesics for lumbar punctures, namely topic analgesia, it was not statistically  
218 significant. Concerning the use of sedation for the lumbar puncture procedure, there was  
219 a statistically significant increase for our sample.

220 *Analgesia and sedation for fracture reduction*

221 The increase of analgesics use for fracture reduction was not statistically significant  
222 within our sample, but near-significant intrahospitally. There was a significant increase  
223 in use of sedation for this procedure in the general panorama and intrahospitally.  
224 Fracture reduction procedures were performed within PEDs in 48% of the 27 hospitals  
225 interviewed in 2018.

226 *Analgesia and sedation for wound suture*

227 Concerning the use of analgesia for wound disinfection and suture, is similar in both  
228 periods. However, there is a statistically significant increase in use of sedation for this  
229 procedure. Among 27 hospitals interviewed in 2018, 67% performed the wound  
230 suturing and disinfection procedure in the PED.

231 *Use of sucrose, lidocaine/prilocaine patches (EMLA®), and equimolar mixture of*  
232 *oxygen and nitrous oxide (EMONO)*

233 There was a statistically significant increase in terms of the use of sucrose for infants <6  
234 months years old for painful procedures in our sample from 52% of hospitals in 2007 to  
235 100% in 2018 (P=0.001).

236 Among 27 hospitals interviewed in 2018, 85% use EMLA® and 37% had  
237 EMONO.

238 *Medical responsibility for IV procedural sedoanalgesia and pre-procedural risk*  
239 *evaluation*

240 In 2018, intensivists or anesthesiologists supported the sedation prescription in 85% of  
241 hospitals and this prescription was performed exclusively by these physicians in still 7%  
242 of hospitals. The pre-sedation risk evaluation is performed in 93% of hospitals and 89%  
243 of hospitals registered this risk and the sedation procedure.

#### 244 **Pain reassessment after analgesia**

245 Concerning if efficacy of pain treatment is assessed, the results were already high in  
246 2007, but there was a slight increase across the general sample, 81% in 2007 to 93% in  
247 2018, but not statistically significant (P=0.34).

#### 248 **Non-Pharmacological Interventions**

249 The increase in the use of non-pharmacological interventions in our sample from 52%  
250 in 2007 to 79% in 2018 was not statistically significant (P=0.12). However, it is  
251 statistically significant when such practices are compared intrahospitally, from 50% in  
252 2007 to 92% in 2018 (P=0.02). In 2018, there is no statistically significant difference  
253 between the answers within the same hospital provided by physicians and nurses  
254 concerning the use of these techniques (P=0.58).

255 Among 27 hospitals interviewed in 2018, the parents are always or most of the  
256 times present during procedures in 93% of hospitals (Table 4). However, only 51% of

257 hospitals confirmed using the parent's lap always or most of the times. In 2018, 26% of  
258 hospitals reported using forced immobilization most of the times. Interestingly, there is  
259 a statistically significant difference between the answers within the same hospital  
260 provided by physicians and nurses, with physicians reporting the use of force more  
261 often than nurses (P=0.04).  
262

	Always	>50% of the times	<50% of the times	Never
Parental presence	37%	56%	7%	0%
Parent's lap	7%	44%	30%	18%
Forced immobilization	0%	26%	70%	4%

263 Table 4 Characterization of the percentage of hospitals in which parental presence,  
264 parent's lap and forced immobilization are used in 2018.

### 265 **General Use of Opioids**

266 The general use of opioids did not change significantly both across the general and the  
267 intrahospital samples (P=0.76 and P=0.67, respectively). Similarly, no significant  
268 variations were observed when weak and strong opioids were compared alone. Weak  
269 opioids use decreased from 48% in 2007 to 36% of hospitals in 2018 (P=0.50). Strong  
270 opioids had a marginal increase from 61% to 64% of hospitals (P=0.59). In 2018,  
271 opioids were prescribed exclusively by intensivists or anesthesiologists in still 7% of  
272 hospitals.

### 273 **Training and Adequacy of Pain Treatment**

#### 274 *Staff's perception of pain treatment adequacy and need for training*

275 Concerning the perception of adequacy of pain treatment practiced in the sampled  
276 Portuguese hospitals, there seems to be a slight decrease in our general sample from  
277 67% in 2007 to 57% in 2018 (P=0.58), but a slight increase intrahospitally from 58% in

278 2007 to 67% in 2018 ( $P=0.67$ ). However, none of these results are statistically  
279 significant ( $P=0.58$  and  $P=0.67$ , respectively). At the same time, there seems to be an  
280 increased will for additional training when our sample is considered, from 86% in 2007  
281 to 100% in 2018 but this result was not statistically significant too ( $P=0.15$ ).

282 *Staff's perception for main reasons of pain treatment inadequacy*

283 The main reasons appointed for an inadequacy of pain treatment in 2007 were, from the  
284 most to the less chosen, fear of hiding symptoms or signs (38% of hospitals), difficulty  
285 of a correct pain assessment (33%) and fear of opioid side effects (24%). In 2018, the  
286 most chosen reasons were fear of hiding symptoms or signs (50% of hospitals), lack of  
287 time (33%), fear of opioid side effects (29%) and medical inexperience in prescribing  
288 analgesics (29%).

289 **DISCUSSION**

290 From 2007 to 2018, despite significant improvements in pain assessment in Portuguese  
291 PEDs, the routine practice of pain treatment protocols had not ensued. Mild to moderate  
292 pain remains infrequently treated, although severe pain treatment and corresponding use  
293 of opioids is prevalent. Similarly, although the use of sedation increased significantly  
294 for many painful procedures, analgesia during these procedures persists being scarce. In  
295 line with these results, there is still a considerable proportion of hospitals that  
296 acknowledge inadequate treatment of pain. Fear of children hiding symptoms/signs and  
297 hesitancy concerning opioid use account for the most prevailing reasons for  
298 unsatisfactory treatment, mirroring previously reported results(Craig et al., 1996;  
299 Czarnecki et al., 2019; McGrath and Frager, 1996; American Academy of Pediatrics,  
300 2001). In the other direction, the use of non-pharmacological techniques for pain control  
301 has improved, with multiple hospitals reporting the child sitting on the caregiver's lap  
302 during painful procedures, but others, however, still frequently use forced  
303 immobilization, a practice that is against ethical and legal considerations in health  
304 care(Bailey and Trottier, 2016; Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2012a; Ruest and Anderson,  
305 2016; Trottier et al., 2019; Wente, 2013). Nevertheless, the widespread desire of further  
306 training on the treatment of pain by health practitioners offers a sign of hope for the  
307 future.

308 The implementation of local protocols for pain management and use of  
309 recommended pain scales is now a highly prevalent practice in Portugal (93% and  
310 100%, respectively), reflecting the Portuguese and international guidelines and  
311 practices(Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2010; Fein et al., 2012; Krug et al., 2009; Marzona et  
312 al., 2019; Schug et al., 2020; Williams et al., 2019; Young, 2017). With the universal  
313 use of pain scales, nurses settled as the main pain assessors and parent's contribution

314 has significantly fallen. In line with the evolution in Italy(Benini et al., 2020), there was  
315 a significant increment in pain assessment in Portugal from 2007 to 2018, but not yet  
316 universally adopted as suggested(Fein et al., 2012; Marzona et al., 2019). North-  
317 American PEDs have universally implemented the use of pain assessment protocols  
318 (Haupt et al., 2021), which should have downstream effects leading to more adequate  
319 and personalized treatments, such as subsequent administration of analgesia.

320 In fact, analgesia in triage by protocol was not yet a generalized practice by 2018  
321 in Portuguese PEDs (81%), performing between Italian (68%) and Australian (92%)  
322 PEDs(Benini et al., 2020; Herd et al., 2009). Similarly, mild to moderate pain analgesia  
323 is not administered during a significant proportion of episodes in Portuguese PEDs and  
324 the 11-year evolution was significantly unfavorable when considering the PEDs that  
325 always do it. This is a worrying scenario as children often receive non-adequate pain  
326 relief treatment(Brudvik et al., 2017). However, there was a significant improvement in  
327 administration of strong NSAIDs for this type of pain (36%). Opioids are practically  
328 unused in this setting, despite the broad consensus for its use for moderate pain in lower  
329 doses(Bailey and Trottier, 2016; Bauman and McManus, 2005; Fein et al., 2012; Ruest  
330 and Anderson, 2016; Young, 2017).

331 Unlike previous studies(Brudvik et al., 2017; Senger et al., 2021), there was high  
332 percentage of treatment of severe pain for the years studied, as well as widespread use  
333 of opioids in this context.

334 Concerning some specific pain treatments, the 11-year evolution has not been  
335 generally satisfactory. For instance, abdominal and articular pains remain infrequently  
336 treated with few hospitals reporting treatment in all instances (22% on average), similar  
337 to results for other countries(Farhat et al., 2013; Kleiber et al., 2011). Fracture-, burn-  
338 and politrauma-associated pains are reported to always be treated on average in 62% of

339 hospitals. If we consider that these situations are usually associated with moderate-  
340 severe pain, this percentage is not consistent with the general answer about treatment of  
341 severe pain. Alongside, the generalized use of opioids has been reported for politrauma  
342 associated pain (100%), but less so for fracture- and burn-associated pains (79% for  
343 both).

344 Beyond sparse adherence to specific pain treatment with analgesics, the  
345 frequency of analgesia for various medical procedures remains uncommon, and  
346 incorrect practices continue. Notably, however, there is a slight reduction of hospitals  
347 that never use analgesics for these procedures, but analgesia remains rarely used for  
348 venipuncture, below the average in Europe and Canada(Ali et al., 2014; Sahyoun et al.,  
349 2021), but in line with other international reports(Ali et al., 2014; Kleiber et al., 2011).  
350 National and international recommendations, however, clearly suggest the  
351 implementation of analgesia when performing venipuncture(Bailey and Trottier, 2016;  
352 Bauman and McManus, 2005; Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2012a; Fein et al., 2012; Ruest  
353 and Anderson, 2016; Trottier et al., 2019). On the other hand, sucrose is now widely  
354 used in Portuguese PEDs, contrasting with other nations where this practice is less  
355 frequently used(Kleiber et al., 2011). Fortunately, sedation for painful procedures  
356 incremented considerably and, in fact, few hospitals never used sedation during these  
357 practices, in spite of EMONO unavailability in most Portuguese PEDs. Indeed, the  
358 availability of EMONO is below the European mean(Sahyoun et al., 2021). In a few  
359 Portuguese PEDs the wrong practice of limiting opioid and sedation prescription to  
360 intensivists/anesthetists persists (7% for both)(Coté and Wilson, 2019; Cravero, 2009;  
361 Cravero et al., 2006; Fein et al., 2012). This reflects the reduced specific training of  
362 general pediatricians on procedural analgesia and sedation.

363 Our study has several limitations including (1) the absence of control for non-  
364 response biases, i.e., the hospitals that responded to questionnaires probably had more  
365 interest in this subject; (2) the responses of the head physicians and nurse managers can  
366 be biased by different emphasis in the course of their education; (3) the sample size  
367 despite representing 60% of Portuguese PEDs is still statistically small, some results  
368 would have improved statistical power given larger samples; (4) non-pharmacological  
369 techniques were explored less objectively than pharmacological techniques, limiting the  
370 evaluation of the desired multimodal approach to pediatric pain(American Academy of  
371 Pediatrics, 2001). Despite these limitations, our cross-sectional study offers an  
372 insightful view over a decade of pain treatment and assessment at a countrywide level,  
373 allowing the definition of a clear roadmap to improve the quality of treatment in  
374 Portuguese PEDs.

375 In conclusion, Portugal is in line with other countries concerning the assessment  
376 and treatment of pain, but erroneous and inadequate procedures are still common.  
377 Fortunately, the creation of local pain protocols has significantly expanded, which  
378 contributed to a significant increment in pain assessment and to the widespread  
379 adoption of pain scales. Also, the treatment of severe pain remained satisfactory and  
380 corresponding use of opioids, but there is room for improvement as this is not a  
381 universal practice yet. Sedation use has also significantly increased in many painful  
382 procedures, but analgesia continues relatively uncommon. Though, the treatment of  
383 mild to moderate pain is far from being a generalized practice. A nationwide, articulated  
384 action is urgent. There are several educational resources available in Portugal released  
385 by the Directorate-General of Health(Direção-Geral da Saúde, 2010; Direção-Geral da  
386 Saúde, 2012a-c) and the Portuguese Association for the Study of Pain (available at  
387 <https://www.aped-dor.org/>). Knowledge translation is of utmost importance. The

388 widespread of the already existing resources, as well as promoting local training  
389 specific for pain management and procedural analgesia and sedation in PED is crucial.  
390 Additionally, further scientific research including: (1) evaluation of efficacy of newly  
391 adopted strategies, (2) objective periodic evaluations of the healthcare system and, also  
392 (3) transnational collaborations at an Iberian or pan-European scale to promote pain  
393 research and allowing studies with large sample sizes are crucially necessary.

394

### 395 **Acknowledgements**

396 We are grateful to all nurses and physicians that kindly answered our questionnaire.

### 397 **Funding Acknowledgements**

398 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,  
399 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

### 400 **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

401 The other authors have indicated they have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

402 REFERENCES

- 403 Ali S, Chambers AL, Johnson DW, et al. (2014) Paediatric pain management practice and  
404 policies across Alberta emergency departments. *Paediatrics & Child Health* 19(4): 190–194.  
405 DOI: 10.1093/pch/19.4.190.
- 406 American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family  
407 Health; Task Force on Pain in Infants, Children, and Adolescents (2001) The Assessment and  
408 Management of Acute Pain in Infants, Children, and Adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 1 September.  
409 DOI: 10.1542/peds.108.3.793.
- 410 Anand KJS and Scalzo FM (2000) Can Adverse Neonatal Experiences Alter Brain  
411 Development and Subsequent Behavior? *Neonatology* 77(2): 69–82. DOI: 10.1159/000014197.
- 412 Bailey B and Trottier ED (2016) Managing Pediatric Pain in the Emergency Department.  
413 *Pediatric Drugs* 18(4): 287–301. DOI: 10.1007/s40272-016-0181-5.
- 414 Bauman BH and McManus JG (2005) Pediatric Pain Management in the Emergency  
415 Department. *Emergency Medicine Clinics of North America* 23(2): 393–414. DOI:  
416 10.1016/j.emc.2004.12.008.
- 417 Benini F, Castagno E, Urbino AF, et al. (2020) Pain management in children has significantly  
418 improved in the Italian emergency departments. *Acta Paediatrica* 109(7): 1445–1449. DOI:  
419 10.1111/apa.15137.
- 420 Brudvik C, Moutte S-D, Baste V, et al. (2017) A comparison of pain assessment by physicians,  
421 parents and children in an outpatient setting. *Emergency Medicine Journal* 34(3): 138–144.  
422 DOI: 10.1136/emermed-2016-205825.
- 423 Coté CJ and Wilson S (2019) Guidelines for Monitoring and Management of Pediatric Patients  
424 Before, During, and After Sedation for Diagnostic and Therapeutic Procedures. *Pediatrics*  
425 143(6): e20191000. American Academy of Pediatrics. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2019-1000.
- 426 Craig KD, Lilley CM and Gilbert CA (1996) Barriers to Optimal Pain Management in Infants,  
427 Children, and Adolescents Social Barriers to Optimal Pain Management in Infants and Children.  
428 *The Clinical Journal of Pain* 12(3): 232–242. DOI: 10.1097/00002508-199609000-00011.
- 429 Cravero JP (2009) Risk and safety of pediatric sedation/anesthesia for procedures outside the  
430 operating room. *Current Opinion in Anaesthesiology* 22(4): 509–513. DOI:  
431 10.1097/ACO.0b013e32832dba6e.
- 432 Cravero JP, Blike GT, Beach M, et al. (2006) Incidence and Nature of Adverse Events During  
433 Pediatric Sedation/Anesthesia for Procedures Outside the Operating Room: Report From the  
434 Pediatric Sedation Research Consortium. *Pediatrics* 118(3): 1087–1096. DOI:  
435 10.1542/peds.2006-0313.
- 436 Czarnecki ML, Guastello A, Turner HN, et al. (2019) Barriers to Pediatric Pain Management: A  
437 Brief Report of Results from a Multisite Study. *Pain Management Nursing* 20(4): 305–308.  
438 DOI: 10.1016/j.pmn.2019.01.008.
- 439 Diniz A, Calado B, Almeida M, et al. (2001) *Plano Nacional de Luta Contra a Dor*. Direcção-  
440 Geral da Saúde. Available at: [www.dgs.pt](http://www.dgs.pt).
- 441 Direcção-Geral da Saúde (2003) *A Dor Como 5º Sinal Vital. Registo Sistemático Da Intensidade*  
442 *Da Dor*. Report no. 09/DGCG. Available at: [www.dgs.pt](http://www.dgs.pt).
- 443 Direcção-Geral da Saúde (2010) *Orientações Técnicas Sobre a Avaliação Da Dor Nas Crianças*.  
444 Report no. 14/2010. Available at: [www.dgs.pt](http://www.dgs.pt).
- 445 Direcção-Geral da Saúde (2012a) *Orientações Técnicas Sobre o Controlo Da Dor Em*  
446 *Procedimento Invasivos Nas Crianças*. Report no. 022/2012. Available at: [www.dgs.pt](http://www.dgs.pt).
- 447 Direcção-Geral da Saúde (2012b) *Orientações Técnicas Sobre o Controlo Da Dor Nas Crianças*  
448 *Com Doença Oncológica*. Report no. 023/2012. Available at: [www.dgs.pt](http://www.dgs.pt).

- 449 Direção-Geral da Saúde (2012c) *Orientações Técnicas Sobre o Controlo Da Dor Nos Recém-*  
450 *Nascidos*. Report no. 024/2012. Available at: [www.dgs.pt](http://www.dgs.pt).
- 451 Direção-Geral da Saúde (2017) *Programa Nacional Para a Prevenção e Controlo Da Dor*.  
452 Available at: [www.dgs.pt](http://www.dgs.pt).
- 453 Drendel AL and Ali S (2017) Ten Practical Ways to Make Your ED Practice Less Painful and  
454 More Child-Friendly. *Clinical Pediatric Emergency Medicine* 18(4): 242–255. DOI:  
455 10.1016/j.cpem.2017.09.001.
- 456 Farhat A, Kouzegaran S, Sabertanha A, et al. (2013) Assessment of Pain Management in  
457 Pediatric Emergency Department in Mashhad-Iran. *International Journal of Pediatrics* 1(2):  
458 25–29. DOI: 10.22038/IJP.2013.2257.
- 459 Fein JA, Zempsky WT, Cravero JP, et al. (2012) Relief of Pain and Anxiety in Pediatric  
460 Patients in Emergency Medical Systems. *Pediatrics* 130(5): e1391–e1405. DOI:  
461 10.1542/peds.2012-2536.
- 462 Ferrante P, Cuttini M, Zangardi T, et al. (2013) Pain management policies and practices in  
463 pediatric emergency care: a nationwide survey of Italian hospitals. *BMC Pediatrics* 13(1): 139.  
464 DOI: 10.1186/1471-2431-13-139.
- 465 Haupt J, Shah N, Fifolt M, et al. (2021) Pain Assessment in Pediatric Emergency Departments.  
466 *Pediatric Emergency Care* 37(12): e1145–e1149. DOI: 10.1097/PEC.0000000000001930.
- 467 Herd DW, Babl FE, Gilhotra Y, et al. (2009) Pain management practices in paediatric  
468 emergency departments in Australia and New Zealand: A clinical and organizational audit by  
469 National Health and Medical Research Council’s National Institute of Clinical Studies and  
470 Paediatric Research in Emergency Departments International Collaborative. *Emergency*  
471 *Medicine Australasia* 21(3): 210–221. DOI: 10.1111/j.1742-6723.2009.01184.x.
- 472 Kleiber C, Jennissen C, McCarthy AM, et al. (2011) Evidence-Based Pediatric Pain  
473 Management in Emergency Departments of a Rural State. *The Journal of Pain* 12(8): 900–910.  
474 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpain.2011.02.349.
- 475 Krug SE, Bojko T, Fein JA, et al. (2009) Joint Policy Statement—Guidelines for Care of  
476 Children in the Emergency Department. *Pediatrics* 124(4): 1233–1243. DOI:  
477 10.1542/peds.2009-1807.
- 478 MacLean S, Obispo J and Young KD (2007) The Gap Between Pediatric Emergency  
479 Department Procedural Pain Management Treatments Available and Actual Practice. *Pediatric*  
480 *Emergency Care* 23(2): 87–93. DOI: 10.1097/PEC.0b013e31803.
- 481 Marzona F, Pedicini S, Passone E, et al. (2019) Mandatory Pain Assessment in a Pediatric  
482 Emergency Department: Failure or Success? *The Clinical Journal of Pain* 35(10): 826–830.  
483 DOI: 10.1097/AJP.0000000000000743.
- 484 McGrath PJ and Frager G (1996) Psychological Barriers to Optimal Pain Management in  
485 Infants and Children. *The Clinical Journal of Pain* 12(2): 135–141. DOI: 10.1097/00002508-  
486 199606000-00009.
- 487 Noel M, Rabbitts JA, Fales J, et al. (2017) The influence of pain memories on children’s and  
488 adolescents’ post-surgical pain experience: A longitudinal dyadic analysis. *Health Psychology*  
489 36(10): 987–995. DOI: 10.1037/hea0000530.
- 490 Pancekauskaitė G and Jankauskaitė L (2018) Paediatric Pain Medicine: Pain Differences,  
491 Recognition and Coping Acute Procedural Pain in Paediatric Emergency Room. *Medicina*  
492 54(6): 94. DOI: 10.3390/medicina54060094.
- 493 Ruest S and Anderson A (2016) Management of acute pediatric pain in the emergency  
494 department. *Current Opinion in Pediatrics* 28(3): 298–304. DOI:  
495 10.1097/MOP.0000000000000347.

- 496 Sahyoun C, Cantais A, Gervais A, et al. (2021) Pediatric procedural sedation and analgesia in  
497 the emergency department: surveying the current European practice. *European Journal of*  
498 *Pediatrics* 180(6): 1799–1813. DOI: 10.1007/s00431-021-03930-6.
- 499 Schechter NL (2008) From the Ouchless Place to Comfort Central: The Evolution of a Concept.  
500 *Pediatrics* 122(Supplement\_3): S154–S160. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2008-1055h.
- 501 Schug SA, Palmer GM, Scott DA, et al. (2020) *Acute Pain Management: Scientific Evidence*.  
502 5th ed. ANZCA & FPM. Available at: <https://www.anzca.edu.au/>.
- 503 Senger A, Bryce R, McMahon C, et al. (2021) Cross-sectional study of pediatric pain  
504 prevalence, assessment, and treatment at a Canadian tertiary hospital. *Canadian Journal of Pain*  
505 5(1): 172–182. DOI: 10.1080/24740527.2021.1961081.
- 506 Taddio A, Chambers CT, Halperin SA, et al. (2009) Inadequate pain management during  
507 routine childhood immunizations: The nerve of it. *Clinical Therapeutics* 31(SUPPL. 2): S152–  
508 S167. DOI: 10.1016/j.clinthera.2009.07.022.
- 509 Taylor EM, Boyer K and Campbell FA (2008) Pain in Hospitalized Children: A Prospective  
510 Cross-Sectional Survey of Pain Prevalence, Intensity, Assessment and Management in a  
511 Canadian Pediatric Teaching Hospital. *Pain Research and Management* 13(1): 25–32. DOI:  
512 10.1155/2008/478102.
- 513 Trottier ED, Doré-Bergeron M-J, Chauvin-Kimoff L, et al. (2019) Managing pain and distress  
514 in children undergoing brief diagnostic and therapeutic procedures. *Paediatrics & Child Health*  
515 24(8): 509–521. DOI: 10.1093/pch/pxz026.
- 516 Wente SJK (2013) Nonpharmacologic Pediatric Pain Management in Emergency Departments:  
517 A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Journal of Emergency Nursing* 39(2): 140–150. DOI:  
518 10.1016/j.jen.2012.09.011.
- 519 Williams S, Keogh S and Douglas C (2019) Improving paediatric pain management in the  
520 emergency department: An integrative literature review. *International Journal of Nursing*  
521 *Studies* 94: 9–20. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2019.02.017.
- 522 Young KD (2005) Pediatric procedural pain. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 45(2): 160–171.  
523 DOI: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2004.09.019.
- 524 Young VB (2017) Effective Management of Pain and Anxiety for the Pediatric Patient in the  
525 Emergency Department. *Critical Care Nursing Clinics of North America* 29(2): 205–216. W.B.  
526 Saunders. DOI: 10.1016/j.cnc.2017.01.007.

