Title: Exploring athlete pain and pain assessment experiences and priorities; A three-part qualitative series of athlete and physiotherapist interactions.

Part Three. "Forging Our Future" - Athlete and physiotherapists' priorities for pain assessment.

Authors

Ciarán Purcell[1,2,3,4,5,6] Caoimhe Barry Walsh[3] Garett Van Oirschot[1,2] Brona M Fullen[1] Tomás Ward[2] Brian M Caulfield[1,2]

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

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

[3]*School of Allied Health, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

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

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

[6]*Ageing Research Centre, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

Corresponding Author: Ciaran Purcell **– ciaran.purcell.1@ucdconnect.ie**

Abstract

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

Design; Qualitative Research using a hermeneutic phenomenological approach.

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

Results: We completed five focus groups, comprising twelve athletes (female, n=5, male n=7) and four sports physiotherapists (male, n=4) Two final themes (and five subthemes) were developed; I Enhanced Communication and Pain Descriptions (describing and representing pain, better communication, the role of technology), II Integrating Sport Specific and Multidimensional Assessments (broadening the pain assessment toolkit, the role of technology). We developed a set of thirteen practical priorities for future pain assessment that span the subjective, objective, and general aspects of the athlete pain assessment.

Conclusion: We have presented stakeholder-generated perspectives and priorities for athlete pain assessment. Athletes and Physiotherapists must continue to work together to achieve a comprehensive sport-specific multidimensional pain assessment experience alongside their wider support networks to ensure optimal representation and communication. We have highlighted some available pain assessment tools and strategies and outlined how novel tools may help adress certain elements. Researchers, clinicians and athletes can consider the practical guidance we have provided to address these future priorities.

Keywords

‘Pain Measurement’, ‘Musculoskeletal Pain’, ‘Athletic Injuries’ ‘Athletic Performance’ ‘Focus Groups’, ‘Pain Management’.

Introduction

In this series, we acknowledge the value of qualitative research in sport and we are pursuing a comprehensive multidimensional biopsychosocial understanding of athlete pain experience and assessment through qualitative methods.[1] The International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) outlines the importance of appreciating and validating each individual's experience including both the sensory and emotional aspects of pain in their definition.[2] The contemporary predictive processing model of pain describes how pain is not merely something we experience but something that influences how we act and interact in the world, shaping our behaviours. [3] Current guidance for the assessment of pain in athletes recommends a comprehensive approach to the assessment of athlete pain that includes more contextual measures of pain such as; affective (emotional), cognitive (understandings and appraisals) and socioenvironmental (sport, home, work/school, social, cultural and environmental aspects) as well as the more frequently used neurophysiological (pain characteristics and qualities) and biomechanical (both local and wider biomechanical considerations).[4-6] Affective, cognitive and socioenvironmental pain assessment tools have been used substantially less in both research and practice settings over the past fifty years and, somewhat concerningly, the gap between the use of these wider aspects and the more commonly used neurophysiological and biomechanical tools is widening.[7] In Part One of this series we presented findings from our focus groups of a diverse cohort of athletes and physiotherapists across a range of sports and competition levels. We discussed the unique experience of athlete pain that is influenced by an array of physical and emotional factors and shapes their performance and life outside of sport aligning closely with contemporary models.[2 3] In Part Two of this series, athletes and physiotherapists shared their experiences of the content and qualities of pain assessments. We discussed the commonly used tools, measures and scales highlighting the strengths and limitations of current practice in the context of best available guidance. The quality of the pain assessment was closely linked with the pain interview, an opportunity for athletes to tell their story, share information related to the affective, cognitive, and socioenvironmental aspects of pain and develop a strong therapeutic alliance. These findings align with recent literature emphasising the power of narrative

methods to express the complexity of feelings, emotions and experiences influenced by sport-specific sociocultural aspects that athletes negotiate daily. [8-10] In this paper, the third and final part of the series we present the priorities for future practice as part of an integrated overview and culmination of our overall findings.

Methods

Focus Groups

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

Nominal Group Technique

Nominal Group Technique (NGT) is a method of problem-solving and idea generation where all participants have an equal opportunity to contribute their priorities, effectively minimising power imbalances and facilitating the ranking of priorities suggested by participants.[12] We used the nominal group technique (NGT) at the end of each focus group session to facilitate brainstorming of priorities

and generate consensus for items to be included in the next phase of an athlete upper and lower pain assessment framework development. We chose this method to give equal weight to the opinions of all participants and to focus the ideas and topics discussed in the focus groups on future priorities. NGT is a method of consensus generation where all participants contribute multiple ideas which are then voted on and prioritised equitably.[13] Members rank there top five with their highest priority idea receiving five votes down to their fifth highest priority idea receiving one vote. NGT consists of four stages: Silent generation, round robin, clarification, and voting. We used five sequential steps (state the subject, reflection and writing, polling, discussion and prioritisation) to operationalise this technique which was first developed in 1975 and has been used across domains and settings including healthcare and sport.[14 15] We recorded and discussed all ideas generated by participants during the polling stage of the NGT. Participants voted on initial ideas which then became priorities. We discarded all ideas that did not receive a minimum of one vote during this voting stage from our analysis. See Appendix A for a detailed description of how we applied each of the five steps in this study. We carried out the five NGTs independently and pooled the results during the data analysis stage.

Data Analysis

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

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

Figure 2 The Pain Assessment Priority Pyramid is inserted here.

Source: The cartoon element at the top of this image was designed by Freepik www.freepik.com

Results & Discussion

The results are derived from five focus groups which gathered the experiences and interactions of sixteen participants (athletes, n=12, physiotherapists, n=4) from a broad range of sports and competition levels, a full description is provided in Part One of this series.[11] Athletes and physiotherapists voiced their opinions on what the future of athlete pain assessment could and should look like. From the focus group codes, we developed two clear themes highlighting future priority areas. In Figure 1 we present these two themes and their associated codes. The first theme centres around better strategies to describe and represent pain, including tools that go beyond the current methods for capturing pain intensity and enhanced pain communication methods. Participants highlighted aspects such as the context, timing and frequency of pain assessments and proposed technology-based solutions as one option to address current shortcomings. The second theme explores prioritising assessment strategies for the different aspects of pain experience. Future pain assessments should be multimodal, considering a wide range of biopsychosocial and sports-specific factors to get a more comprehensive picture of the pain the athlete is experiencing. Both strategies promise to enhance current assessments offering a deeper and more nuanced understanding to better guide decision-making and management. In Figure 2 we present the finalised thematic map of the athlete pain assessment priority pyramid which demonstrates how the themes and subthemes explored in this paper are built upon Part One and Two of this series

Theme 1 Enhanced communication and pain descriptions.

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

1.1 Describing and representing pain

Participants discussed the struggle to describe and represent pain and how it may be improved by using more comprehensive descriptions, which reflects the contemporary drive for valuing the patient's language and selecting appropriate metaphors to help represent and explain the pain experience.[16] Athletes and physiotherapists highlighted the development of criteria and categories for the classification of pain intensity that go beyond the traditional numerical pain rating scale (NPRS) to include more detailed descriptions of pain and the impact of pain on aspects of daily life as a priority for future pain assessment. Contextual information such as the athlete's pain and rehabilitation history helped explain their current pain experience.

> *"I think more kinds of adjectives describing pain it definitely would be beneficial."* - A09

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

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

There may be value in revisiting long-established measures such as the Brief Pain Inventory Scale (which includes intensity, location, body chart, interference with everyday life and pain within a certain timeframe) and the McGill Pain Questionnaire (which includes a comprehensive list to describe pain sensation, physical and emotional aspects, interaction with treatment options and wider lifestyle factors and measures of intensity that provide context to this pain experience) and developing contemporary multidimensional tools tailored to an athlete population.[17 18]

1.2 Better communication

The timing, setting and communication of pain were earmarked by participants as areas to improve future athlete pain assessment and enable some of the proposed enhanced descriptions and

categorisation. Athletes and physiotherapists felt including more time for reflection, both before and after the athlete-physiotherapist assessment session, would facilitate athletes to recall their pain experiences in greater detail. Additionally, varying the time of assessments to capture pain during competition and activities of daily living that provoke pain was suggested as an opportunity for the future, particularly when athlete-physiotherapist interactions are infrequent, and athletes may struggle to accurately recall their entire pain experience since the previous assessment.

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

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

Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) involves the repeated sampling of behaviours and experiences in real time and is carried out in the person's natural environment.[19] EMA has been applied in chronic pain and sports psychology research and our results suggest it is something which may provide value when considering improved communication in future pain assessments for athletes.[20 21] Participants felt applying enhanced assessment communication methods would help with difficult decision-making when it comes to athlete pain. Athletes described the challenge of not knowing when to play or compete through pain and how to effectively gauge progress whilst physiotherapists noted the opportunity for additional communication to enhance this process.

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

> *"Sometimes as physios that's where we could maybe have that missing link..., not necessarily to be so individualised and so 24/7 care but there has to be some level of a way of you know being able to kind of link in with them I think a bit more that I think would help sometimes."* - P02

1.3 The role of technology

The effective use of technology to facilitate enhanced communication and contextual assessment was proposed as a future opportunity. Technology could be used to integrate novel assessment methods such as EMA. Athletes based in high-performance environments discussed how they used smartphones to facilitate more frequent communication about pain with their sports medicine teams which they found helpful. The value of insights gleaned from regular subjective wellness reporting with athletes has been established and has been proposed to provide more value than objective measures for certain training load, health and well-being markers.[21] However, further consideration is needed to smoothly integrate technology into the contemporary pain assessment process and wider athlete ecosystem. The clinical utility of a single self-report item has been challenged in line with the need for interpretation and reasoning when it comes to musculoskeletal clinical practice standards.[22 23] Furthermore, the future integration of technology must meet the needs of both athletes and physiotherapists, enhancing rather than complicating the pain assessment clinical encounter.

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

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

> *"A pain app where every morning it was what's your pain and then a journaling section and it's like how did you sleep last night? Did you take painkillers? How was your training? All these different sections so and then say next time you see your physio potentially they would have access to your app and it's like okay here's with your rating over the last week"* – A10

Theme 2 Integrating sport-specific and multidimensional assessments.

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

2.1 Broadening the pain assessment toolkit.

Psychosocial, lifestyle and environmental pain assessment tools were recommended by athletes to give a more encompassing and holistic overview of athlete pain. Athletes highlighted sport-specific pain assessment tools such as assessing movement, strength and motor control patterns relevant to their sport, asking about training load and the impact of pain on sports activities and measuring pain during, before or after sports activities to represent the unique athlete pain experience and provide enhanced contextual information in line with the best available athlete pain guidance. [4 23] Athletes discussed how clinic-based pain assessments could be enhanced by completing more assessments in the athlete's sports environment such as on the pitch, court or track, a finding that could facilitate the practical implementation of contemporary IOC guidance. [4 24]

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

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

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

2.2 The role of technology

Technology was once again suggested by athletes as a potential method to add multimodal and sport-specific measures into an integrative pain assessment. Additionally, the role of the physiotherapist and their expertise in pain assessment and management was stressed and future pain assessment strategies should augment rather than replace this vital relationship. Additionally, a recent systematic review found that whilst there is moderate to high certainty evidence supporting the integration of technology into a physiotherapy assessment for musculoskeletal disorders in the general population, with substantial to excellent validity and excellent inter and intra-rater reliability for pain (97-98% agreement) and patient-reported outcome measures (ICC 0.99-1.00, 95% CI 0.97 to 1.00), patients reported a superior user experience and confidence in the examination from a face to face assessment supporting our findings.[25] Additionally conducting and interpreting pain assessments with athletes requires sports and context-specific information (such as sport-specific physical demands, and coach and team expectations for return to play) that may be understood better if conducted in the athlete's sporting environment.

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

From theory to practice: practical priorities for pain assessment.

In Table 1 below we present the pooled results of the nominal group techniques we carried out. Each theme is a practical example of an aspect of assessment that can be used to operationalise the pain assessment priorities we identified through the focus group findings above. We present the codes that comprise each theme alongside a qualitative description of how clinicians can apply the assessment item in practice. We have indicated whether each item can be incorporated as part of the subjective assessment (initial interview), objective assessment (physical testing) or should be considered as a general aspect of the wider assessment process. The proportion of total votes each theme received when codes were pooled is also presented.

The majority of the practical pain assessment priorities we present align closely with the published literature including 1) subjective components such as; establishing the history, context, characteristics, severity and impact of the athlete's pain and exploring the athlete's stressors, psychological aspects and lifestyle factors as well as their training load and 2) objective components such as; assessing and identifying pain through movement, completing sports specific objective measures both at the site of pain and throughout the kinetic chain. [2 4 24] Developing a specific, clear and time-appropriate assessment is a novel finding. Although the IOC guidelines recommend tailoring the pain assessment based on the presentation of the athlete and the stage in the pain management process our findings add that the assessment should align closely with the athlete's goals and the plan should be articulated clearly to the athlete so that they understand each aspect of the pain assessment and why it is being completed. Another novel finding is the need for alternative pain severity scales that go beyond the traditional numerical pain rating scale. Scales such as the traffic light pain scale which offers athletes guidance on decision-making regarding playing through pain have clinical utility and are used widely in practice. (Silbernagel reference) Additionally there is scope for the inclusion of a pain severity scale that helps to overcome the limitations of a numerical scale to describe and represent the pain experience more appropriately although what that might look like is yet unclear. The International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) identifies how a verbal description is just one method of representing pain. [2] We provide a practical example of how athletes might use a body chart to indicate their pain or demonstrate their pain through a specific movement or action for example to have their experience of pain understood and validated another novel finding.

Conclusion

In this paper, the third and final part of the series, we have presented themes focused on future pain assessment priorities that build on our “athlete pain” (presented in Part One) and “athlete pain assessment” (presented in Part Two) findings.

Moving beyond unidimensional, clinical point-in-time pain measures to encompass better communication will involve the use of more comprehensive and descriptive pain scales and tools that athletes and physiotherapists can relate to. We have outlined examples of pain assessment tools that are currently available and should be considered by clinicians. Conversely, we have highlighted how novel tools may encompass capturing pain at critical time points in sports environments to help tell the full story of athlete pain. Whilst Physiotherapists may be justifiably reticent to introduce additional measures to avoid complicating the assessment process for athletes, it is clear that athletes are embracing existing and emerging technology as part of evolving sports science. Applying a carefully developed and well-implemented solution that incorporates available technology and keeps the athlete-physiotherapist interaction and relationship at its core is one potential future solution that must be considered.

Although we collected experiences from a diverse range of athletes and physiotherapists and variety was achieved in sport, competition level and practice setting the experiences and priorities gathered from these focus groups and nominal group techniques may not apply to all athlete pain assessment settings. Notably, participants were all recruited from Ireland and whilst some of the female athletes

also had a physiotherapy background no female sports physiotherapists were available to participate. The focus of our research was to highlight the athlete and physiotherapist voice and explore their experiences around pain and pain assessment through open discussion. This open qualitative method enables a deep exploration of the different perspectives of athlete pain and pain assessment.. In addition,to augment these findings, we selected Nominal Group technique to complement the exploratory nature of focus group methodology. We have presented a comprehensive series of pain assessment priorities for physiotherapists to consider. There is scope for future research to consider these findings in light of contemporary research and practice and develop an expert sports physiotherapist consensus-based athlete pain assessment framework that can be implemented in research and practice settings.

Practical Implications

- The pain assessment must include assessment tools and measures that allow athletes to express, represent and therefore validate their specific pain experience.
- Physiotherapists should use pain assessment tools that capture the context of an athlete's pain as well as the intensity and impact on sports and activities of everyday life at key points in an athlete's day.
- Physiotherapists must consider a variety of pain assessment tools that address the multidimensional nature of pain and integrate psychological, social, environmental and sport-specific aspects of the athlete's pain experience.
- Physiotherapists should consider the careful and effective use of technology to augment the athlete-physiotherapist pain assessment interaction.

References

1. Bekker S, Bolling C, H Ahmed O, et al. Athlete health protection: Why qualitative research matters. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport* 2020;23(10):898-901. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2020.06.020

2. Raja SN, Carr DB, Cohen M, et al. The revised International Association for the Study of Pain definition of pain: concepts, challenges, and compromises. *Pain* 2020;161(9):1976-82. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001939 [published Online First: 2020/07/23]

3. Kiverstein J, Kirchhoff MD, Thacker M. An Embodied Predictive Processing Theory of Pain Experience. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 2022 doi: 10.1007/s13164-022-00616-2

4. Hainline B, Derman W, Vernec A, et al. International Olympic Committee consensus statement on pain management in elite athletes. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(17):1245-58. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-097884 [published Online First: 2017/08/23]

5. Caneiro JP, Alaiti RK, Fukusawa L, et al. There is more to pain than tissue damage: eight principles to guide care of acute non-traumatic pain in sport. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2021;55(2):75-77. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-101705

6. Hoegh M, Stanton T, George S, et al. Infographic. Pain or injury? Why differentiation matters in exercise and sports medicine. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2022;56(5):299-300. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-104633

7. Purcell C, Duignan C, Fullen BM, et al. Comprehensive assessment and classification of upper and lower limb pain in athletes: a scoping review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2023:bjsports-2022-106380. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2022-106380

8. Everard C, Wadey R, Howells K. Storying sports injury experiences of elite track athletes: A narrative analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 2021;56:102007. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.102007

9. Tabben M, Verhagen E, Warsen M, et al. Obstacles and opportunities for injury prevention in professional football in Qatar: exploring the implementation reality. *BMJ Open Sport & Exercise Medicine* 2023;9(1):e001370. doi: 10.1136/bmjsem-2022-001370

10. Costa N, Butler P, Dillon M, et al. “I felt uncertain about my whole future”—a qualitative investigation of people's experiences of navigating uncertainty when seeking care for their low back pain. *PAIN* 2023

11. Purcell C, Barry Walsh C, Van Oirschot G, et al. Exploring athlete pain and pain assessment experiences and priorities; A three part qualitative series of athlete and physiotherapist interactions. Part One. “Through their eyes” - Athlete and physiotherapist pain experiences and perspectives. *medRxiv* 2023:2023.12.28.23300487. doi: 10.1101/2023.12.28.23300487

12. McMillan SS, King M, Tully MP. How to use the nominal group and Delphi techniques. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy* 2016 doi: 10.1007/s11096-016-0257-x

13. Delbecq ALG, David H & Van de Ven, Andrew H. Group techniques for program planning : a guide to nominal group and Delphi processes / Andre L. Delbecq, Andrew H. Van de Ven, David H. Gustafson. III ed. Foresman Glenview: Scott 1975.

14. US Dept of Health & Human Services, . Gaining Consensus Among Stakeholders Through the Nominal Group Technique. In: Prevention DoHHSCfDCa, ed. Evaluation Briefs Centre for Disease Control & Prevention 2018.

15. Dallinga J, Janssen M, van der Werf J, et al. Analysis of the Features Important for the Effectiveness of Physical Activity–Related Apps for Recreational Sports: Expert Panel Approach. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 2018;6:e143. doi: 10.2196/mhealth.9459

16. Louw A, Puentedura EJ, Diener I, et al. Pain neuroscience education: Which pain neuroscience education metaphor worked best? *South African Journal of Physiotherapy* 2019;75(1) doi: 10.4102/sajp.v75i1.1329

17. Melzack R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: major properties and scoring methods. *Pain* 1975;1(3):277-99. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(75)90044-5 [published Online First: 1975/09/01]

18. Cleeland CS, Ryan KM. Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. *Ann Acad Med Singap* 1994;23(2):129-38. [published Online First: 1994/03/01]

19. Pagé MG, Gauvin L, Sylvestre M-P, et al. An Ecological Momentary Assessment Study of Pain Intensity Variability: Ascertaining Extent, Predictors, and Associations With Quality of Life,

Interference and Health Care Utilization Among Individuals Living With Chronic Low Back Pain. *The Journal of Pain* 2022;23(7):1151-66. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2022.01.001

20. Reifsteck EJ, Anderson SN, Newton JD, et al. A practical guide and empirical example for implementing ecological momentary assessment in sport psychology research with athletes. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology* 2021;10(3):408-22. doi: 10.1037/spy0000252

21. Saw AE, Main LC, Gastin PB. Monitoring the athlete training response: subjective self-reported measures trump commonly used objective measures: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2016;50(5):281-91. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-094758 [published Online First: 2015/10/02]

22. Duignan C, Doherty C, Caulfield B, et al. Single-Item Self-Report Measures of Team-Sport Athlete Wellbeing and Their Relationship With Training Load: A Systematic Review. *J Athl Train* 2020;55(9):944-53. doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-0528.19 [published Online First: 2020/09/30]

23. Bishop A, Blackburn, J., Hallam, F., McComiskie, E., Rankin, G. Musculoskeletal physiotherapy service standards; The delivery of musculoskeletal (MSK) physiotherapy services in the UK for adults of 16 years and over. In: Physiotherapy TCSo, ed. London 2021.

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

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

Figure Captions

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

Figure 2. **Athlete pain assessment priorities themes and subthemes.** The themes for each part of this series represent a row in the priorities for pain assessment pyramid, this paper presents the top row of the pyramid, the themes and subthemes that address the priorities for athlete pain assessment. These themes build on the bottom row or foundation of the pyramid presented in Part One and the middle row presented in Part Two of this series.

Appendix A – The Five Steps of the Nominal Group Technique

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

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%

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



Figure 2. **Athlete pain assessment priorities themes and subthemes.** The themes for each part of this series represent a row in the priorities for pain assessment pyramid, this paper presents the top row of the pyramid, the themes and subthemes that address the priorities for athlete pain assessment. These themes build on the bottom row or foundation of the pyramid presented in Part One and the middle row presented in Part Two of this series.



Source: The cartoon element at the top of this image was designed by Freepik www.freepik.com