1 727 words

A comparison of pain registration by Visual Analog Scale and Numeric Rating Scale – a cross-sectional study of primary triage registration

Jofrid Kollltveit^{1*}, Malin Osaland^{1*}, Marianne Reimers², Magnus Berle³

1. University of Bergen – Faculty of Medicine, Bergen, Norway

2. Haukeland University Hospital, Emergency Clinic

3. Haukeland University Hospital, Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery and University of Bergen, Department of Clinical Medicine.

* The authors have contributed equally

Correspondance to: Magnus.berle@uib.no

Background

Pain is a subjective sensation; self-reporting is important for quantifying pain intensity. There are several different validated tools for this, such as Visual Analog Scale and Numeric Rating Scale. In the clinic, these terms are often used as equivalent. The objective of this study was to examine correlation and agreement between the pain registration tools in triage in an emergency department.

Materials and Methods

The study was performed in the Department of Emergency Medicine at Haukeland University Hospital in the period June-August 2019. We registered the pain score with two tools in 200 unselected patients in emergency admission with pain. In addition, we registrered gender, age, triage and general department affiliation.

29

30 **Results**

31 We found a strong correlation between the pain registration tools by Spearman's
32 correlation test ($\rho=0,930$, $p<0,001$). There were no significant difference
33 between the pain registration tools within the subgroups. Bland-Altman analysis
34 show agreement between the two pain registration tools.

35

36 **Conclusions**

37 In an Emergency Department triage is it acceptable to use Visual Analog Scale and
38 Numeric Rating Scale as equivalent, as long as the correct terminology is used.

39

40 **Keywords:** Triage, Pain, Pain score, VAS, NRS,

41

42 **Background**

43 Pain is a subjective sensation, which is important to quantify in a clinical setting (1,
44 2). Pain score is a part of defining the degree of urgency of diagnostics and
45 treatment, and is important for evaluating the effect of treatment. There are several
46 validated tools to rate pain, as Visual Analog Scale (VAS) and Numeric Rating
47 Scale (NRS) (2, 3). Using VAS, the patient defines the degree of pain on a visual
48 scale without numeric values, while the values are visible on the back side for the
49 registrar. NRS is a verbal numeric scale, where the patient grades their own pain on
50 a scale between 0 and 10. Both methods are much used in clinical practice and
51 research (3). In the clinic, the terms are often used as interchangeable, and NRS is
52 in general noted as VAS (4). Several studies have shown a strong statistical
53 correlation between VAS and NRS scores (1, 5, 6, 7). Some studies show good
54 agreement between methods (1, 6) while others find a larger discrepancy (5, 7, 8).
55 The objective of this study was to examine correlation and agreement between

VAS and NRS score in patients admitted with pain to an emergency department in Norway.

Materials and Methods

We performed a cross-sectional study of pain in primary triage registration at the emergency department at Haukeland University Hospital in the period June to August 2019. As a part of the primary triage at admission, the nurse collected pain score by use of NRS. The nurse asked the patient to grade their pain with an integer between 0 and 10, where 0 is no pain and 10 is the worst thinkable pain. After the nurse had finished the triage, the patients were asked to participate in a study. After oral approval, the patient was again scored with VAS. We used a horizontal VAS-ruler (0-100 mm) with the endpoints “no pain” to the left and “worst thinkable pain” to the right. The patient graded their pain with a moveable plastic marker to their pain level. We transcribed the value in mm and converted to the closest integer (0-10). The following variables were registered on paper: VAS, NRS, gender, age, triage and general department affiliation.

The target population were patients with pain in triage in the Emergency Department. We made a general estimation in advance on the number of patients to include, based on presumed sufficient material and a general achievable number. 200 unselected patients with pain were included, no clinical groups of patients were excluded. Exclusion criteria were age under 18 years, lack of competence to consent, cognitive failure as well as lack of lingual or motor skills.

The study included patients after informed oral consent. We have in our study design refrained from written informed consent to reduce the amount of registered personal information. The patient information was anonymized immediately after inclusion. The procedure of inclusion was made in agreement with the Data Protection Officer of the Hospital and the Regional Ethics Board of Western Norway.

84 We predefined a *null hypothesis* of no significant difference between VAS and
85 NRS value. *A priori* acceptable clinical difference between the scores were defined
86 to a maximum of +/- 1, based on repeatability of test-retest of VAS (1). The
87 collected data were organized in MS Excel, then analyzed in SPSS v2.5. We
88 utilized Spearman correlation coefficient and Bland-Altman plot to study
89 correlation and agreement between VAS and NRS value. Kruskal-Wallis test was
90 used for the subgroup analyses between VAS and NRS for gender (female/male),
91 age (over/under 30 years old), triage (green/yellow/orange) and general department
92 affiliation (surgery/medicine)

93

94 **Results**

95 Table 1 shows descriptive statistics with mean for VAS and NRS with standard
96 deviation, as well as values for statistical tools. Spearman correlation coefficient
97 ($\rho = 0,93$) show strong correlation between VAS and NRS value ($p < 0,001$).
98 Subgroup analysis by Kruskal-Wallis test does not show significant differences
99 between VAS and NRS-value within the subgroups ($p < 0,05$). Bland-Altman plot
100 (Figure 1) show agreement between VAS and NRS-value as pain scores.

101

102 **Discussion**

103 The strength of this study is that pain was reported by VAS short time after NRS
104 by standardized questions in such a way that the information to the patient group
105 was the same. The data collection was in daytime and evening in an un-selected
106 patient group to ensure a more representative material.

107 The study has some limitations. Presenting VAS short time after NRS may
108 introduce a bias. Collection of oral informed consent creates an emphasis on the
109 fact that this is a study, with risk of patients attempting to answer the same. All
110 patients were presented to NRS before VAS, where the triage nurse collected NRS-
111 value while the VAS-value was collected by two medical students. We do only

112 present a single time point and the data cannot tell of changes in VAS versus NRS
 113 over time. We have not examined which method is the better, only whether the two
 114 methods produce equal results. Earlier studies establish a consensus that NRS is
 115 easier to perform than VAS (2, 9). The results of this study do not establish that the
 116 method is equal in all populations. There are similar studies in other populations,
 117 among them orthopedic patients and cancer patients. These studies show good
 118 correlation between VAS and NRS (10, 11).
 119 There are conflicting studies on the agreement between NRS and VAS (1, 5, 6, 7,
 120 8). Our results support the studies showing good correlation and agreement
 121 between the methods (1, 6). We cannot abandon the null hypothesis of no
 122 significant difference and the limits of agreement in Bland-Altman plot is within
 123 the a priori clinical acceptable difference. This can indicate that the methods are
 124 interchangeable. NRS being noted as VAS will not cause errors in the clinic but we
 125 would advocate the use of proper terminology.

126

127 **Conclusions**

128 The study shows a strong statistical correlation and a good agreement for reported
 129 scores between VAS and NRS. In an Emergency Department triage is it acceptable
 130 to use Visual Analog Scale and Numeric Rating Scale as equivalent, as long as the
 131 correct terminology is used.

132

133 **List of abbreviations**

134 VAS – Visual Analog Scale

135 NRS – Numeric Reported Scale

136

137 **Declarations**

138 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

139 The study was approved by the Data Protection Officer of the Hospital and the
140 Regional Ethics Board of Western Norway, approval REK Vest (2019/484).

141 **Consent for publication**

142 Patients were included by oral consent to limit registered personal information in
143 accordance with the Data Protection Officer and the Regional Ethics Committee.

144 **Availability of Data**

145 The data in anonymized form is included as supplementary data.

146 **Competing interests**

147 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

148 **Funding**

149 The article costs is funded by University of Bergen grants to MB.

150 **Authors' contributions**

151 Patient inclusion and data collection JK, MO. Project plan, implementation and
152 data analysis JK, MO, MR, MB. Writing of manuscript JK, MO, MB. Original idea
153 MB. All Authors read and approved the final manuscript.

154

155

156 **Figure and table text**

157 Table 1: Descriptive statistics and statistical calculations

158 Figure 1: Bland-Altman plot of NRS vs VAS.

159 Additional file 1: Anonymized registered data

160

161

162

163

164 **References**

- 165 1. Bahreini M, Jalili M, Moradi-Lakeh M. A comparison of three self-report
166 pain scales in adults with acute pain. J Emerg Med 2015; 48: 10-8.
- 167 2. Karcioğlu O, Topacoglu H, Dikme O et al. A systematic review of the pain
168 scales in adults: Which to use? Am J Emerg Med 2018; 36: 707-14
- 169 3. Ferreria-Valenta MA, Pais-Ribeiro JL, Jensen MP. Validity of four pain
170 intensity rating scales. Pain 2011; 152: 2399-404
- 171 4. Faiz KW. VAS – visuall analog skala. Tidsskr Nor Legeforen 2014; 134:
172 323
- 173 5. Holdgate A, Asha S, Craig J et al. Comparison of a verbal numeric rating
174 scale with the visual analogue scale for the measurement of acute pain.
175 Emergency Medicine 2003; 15: 441-6.
- 176 6. Bijur PE, Latimer CT, Gallagher EJ. Validation of a Verbally
177 Administered Numerical Rating Scale of Acute Pain for Use in the
178 Emergency Department. Acad Emerg Med 2003; 10: 390-2
- 179 7. Mohan H, Ryan J, Whelan B et al. The end of the line? The Visual
180 Analogue Scale and Verbal Numerical Rating Scale as pain assessment
181 tools in the emergency department. Emerg Med J 2010; 27: 372-5
- 182 8. Hartrick AT, Kovan JP, Shapiro S. The Numeric Rating Scale for Clinical
183 Pain Measurement: A Ratio Measure? Pain Pract 2003; 3: 310-6
- 184 9. Safikhani S, Gries KS, Trudeau JJ et al. Response scale selection in adult
185 pain measures: results from a literature review. J Patient Rep Outcomes
186 2018; 2: 40
- 187 10. Paice JA, Cohen FL. Validity of a verbally administered numeric rating
188 scale to measure cancer pain intensity. Cancer Nurs 1997; 20: 88-93
- 189 11. Alghadir AH, Anwer S, Iqbal A et al. Test–retest reliability, validity, and
190 minimum detectable change of visual analog, numerical rating, and verbal
191 rating scales for measurement of osteoarthritic knee pain. J Pain Res 2018;
192 11: 851-6

193

194

195

196

197