

**Title:** Developing Consensus for an Upper and Lower Limb Athlete Pain Assessment Framework – A Real-time Delphi Study with International Sports Physiotherapists

**Authors:**

Ciarán Purcell,PT,MSc<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup> Brona M Fullen,PT,PhD<sup>1</sup> Tomás Ward,PhD<sup>2</sup> Brian M Caulfield,PT,PhD<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Sports Science, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland*

<sup>2</sup>*Insight SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics, Dublin, Ireland*

<sup>3</sup>*School of Allied Health, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

<sup>4</sup>*Physical Activity for Health Research Cluster, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

<sup>5</sup>*Sports and Human Performance Centre, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

<sup>6</sup>*Ageing Research Centre, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

**Corresponding Author:** Ciaran Purcell – [ciaran.purcell@ul.ie](mailto:ciaran.purcell@ul.ie)

**Address:** HS2-024, Allied Health Department, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, Health Science Building, University of Limerick North Campus, Castletroy, Limerick, Ireland

**Word Count:** 4432/4500

1 **Abstract**

2 Objectives: There is no current consensus on the key items sports physiotherapists should consider  
3 when completing a comprehensive biopsychosocial upper or lower limb pain assessment with  
4 athletes. We sought to develop recommendations to inform a framework for the assessment of upper  
5 and lower limb pain in athletes.

6 Design; Real-time Delphi

7 Methods: We recruited sports physiotherapists currently working with athletes through the  
8 International Society of Sports Physical Therapists and Irish Society of Chartered Physiotherapists.  
9 Participants voted on 86 pain assessment items chosen using best available evidence. The real-time  
10 Delphi method facilitated independent anonymous voting, commenting and immediate review of  
11 consensus. Participants indicated level of agreement for inclusion in an upper and lower limb athlete  
12 pain assessment framework on a 6-point Likert scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, and  
13 how often they are/will be required in practice on a 5-point scale from *Never* to *Always*. Criteria for  
14 consensus agreement and inclusion were i) >70% sports physiotherapists voting agree/strongly agree  
15 AND ii) median vote selected by physiotherapists was Agree or Strongly Agree.

16 Results: 41 sports physiotherapists (female n=20, male n=21), visited the survey an average of 5.3  
17 times ( $\pm 5$ ), resulting in a completion rate of 98%. 64 assessment items (neurophysiological n=20,  
18 biomechanical n=15, affective n=8, cognitive n=3, socioenvironmental n=10, general assessment  
19 aspects of assessment n=8) met the criteria for consensus. Frequency of use in practice was *Always* for  
20 28 items *Often* for 32 items and *Sometimes* for 4 items.

21 Conclusion: We have presented stakeholder-generated recommendations and priorities for athlete pain  
22 assessment.

23

24

25

26 **Key Words:** “Pain Measurement” “Delphi Technique” “Physical Therapists” “Athletes” “Upper  
27 Extremity” “Lower Extremity”

28

## 29 **Introduction**

30 Pain is a complex biopsychosocial experience, with sensory and affective aspects.<sup>44</sup> The modern  
31 predictive processing model sheds light on how pain shapes the way we interact in the world which  
32 both influences and is influenced by a host of internal and external contextual and environmental  
33 factors.<sup>29</sup> Pain assessment includes embracing the multidimensional nature of pain which has led to  
34 pain assessment guidelines for many aspects of musculoskeletal pain.<sup>13, 30</sup> Pain in athletes is a lesser-  
35 explored phenomenon that significantly impacts performance and well-being yet is often undervalued  
36 due in part to a focus on a time-loss definition of injury severity reporting in research and a “play  
37 through pain” sports culture that prioritises availability to compete.<sup>1, 3</sup> The subjective, individual and  
38 complex nature of pain poses a challenge for time-pressured clinicians and athletes.<sup>28, 39</sup>  
39 The International Olympic Committee’s (IOC) consensus statement on pain in elite athletes and  
40 related works recommend a comprehensive multidimensional assessment of pain.<sup>22, 23, 26</sup> A scoping  
41 review of the assessment tools for athletes experiencing pain in the upper or lower limb identified 175  
42 tools used in research and practice, 77 of which were used in nine or more studies.<sup>42</sup> The review in the  
43 IOC consensus (neurophysiological n =32, biomechanical n =96, affective n=21, cognitive n=8,  
44 socioenvironmental n=18).<sup>22</sup> A gap in the use of tools assessing the the internal contextual factors  
45 (affective and cognitive ) and external contextual factors (socioenvironmental) was highlighted,  
46 aligning with gaps identified by the IOC.<sup>57</sup> Qualitative research harnessing the athlete’s voice has is  
47 an effective method to explore the comprehensive nature of pain in athletes, with insights identifying  
48 the importance of contextual factors when it comes to understanding pain and making informed  
49 decisions.<sup>2, 6, 10</sup> A series of focus groups of athletes and sports physiotherapists<sup>40, 41</sup> highlighted a need  
50 for increased integration of multidimensional pain assessment methods alongside considering aspects  
51 surrounding the assessment process such as clear and timely communication and developing strong  
52 therapeutic relationships, aligning with contemporary athlete pain research.<sup>8, 25</sup>  
53 Despite research highlighting a comprehensive list of important components for a multidimensional  
54 assessment that athletes and sports physiotherapists *could* consider, there is no consensus on how they  
55 *should* be applied. A practical, clinician-friendly, integrative framework that identifies the most  
56 important and relevant pain assessment tools for use across a range of athletic cohorts is lacking. It is

57 unclear how and when a sports physiotherapist should apply the available tools when completing an  
58 upper or lower limb pain assessment with an athlete. There is a need to develop an upper and lower  
59 limb pain assessment framework that is comprehensive, effectively representing an athlete's pain  
60 experience, whilst also being practical to facilitate implementation in clinical practice.  
61 We aimed to generate sports physiotherapist consensus-derived recommendations for an upper and  
62 lower limb athlete pain assessment framework for research and clinical practice using the real-time  
63 Delphi (RTD) consensus method.

64

## 65 **Methods**

66 This RTD study followed contemporary reporting guidelines developed for Delphi techniques in the  
67 health sciences and the ACCurate CONsensus Reporting Document (ACCORD) reporting  
68 guidelines.<sup>17, 51</sup> Ethical permission was granted for our study by the Universities' Human Research  
69 Ethics Committee. (LS-22-40-xxx-xxx) Informed consent was provided by each participant and the  
70 rights of participants were protected throughout the study.

## 71 **Participants**

72 An international panel of sports physiotherapists was established through purposive sampling and  
73 recruitment via the Irish Society of Chartered Physiotherapists Sports and Exercise Medicine Special  
74 Interest Group and the International Federation of Sports Physical Therapy. A Group of 30-50 Sports  
75 Physiotherapists, with three years minimum postgraduate experience working with athletes as part of  
76 their weekly caseload were sought, allowing for representation in the breadth of experience, gender,  
77 geographical location, sports caseload and assessment perspectives whilst also facilitating consensus  
78 development.<sup>14, 46, 54</sup>

## 79 **Patient, athletes and public involvement.**

80 Five athletes, (n=3 female, n=2 male) across a range of competition levels and sports formed a PPI  
81 panel. They initially reviewed and commented on the research questions and initial survey and their

82 feedback was incorporated into the design and delivery of the RTD. The athletes were subsequently  
83 consulted regarding the analysis and presentation of the results.

#### 84 **Protocol**

85 The Delphi technique is a method of consensus generation suited to exploring complex phenomena  
86 including pain.<sup>17</sup> It facilitates the equal contribution of participants and identifies areas of convergence  
87 as well as divergence providing valuable insights.<sup>51</sup> The RTD method facilitates participants to view  
88 evolving consensus in real-time, contribute comments and revisit their responses and consensus  
89 multiple times throughout the study without the burden of engagement and analysis required in  
90 traditional round-based Delphi studies.<sup>19, 20</sup> The RTD format has been validated against traditional  
91 approaches with researchers commenting on its practicality and efficiency within healthcare  
92 settings.<sup>37, 43</sup>

93 Using the Surveylet commercial software package (Calibrium Inc, Utah, USA) sports physiotherapists  
94 anonymously completed baseline demographics followed by the RTD. The initial survey (Appendix  
95 A) contained 86 assessment items across six domains (neurophysiological, biomechanical, affective,  
96 cognitive, socioenvironmental and general aspects of assessment). The survey was designed using the  
97 IOC athlete pain consensus statement and related works,<sup>22, 23</sup> findings from a scoping review of athlete  
98 pain assessments,<sup>42</sup> focus groups exploring athlete pain assessment priorities from shared athlete and  
99 physiotherapist perspectives,<sup>40, 41</sup> and additional qualitative research.<sup>2, 10</sup> Feedback from two expert  
100 physiotherapist pain researchers, with over 25 years of experience was sought alongside consultation  
101 with the athlete PPI panel. Following an initial pilot with three members of the research team, the  
102 RTD survey was released to all participants on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023, and ran for eight weeks. Weekly  
103 reminders were sent to all participants yet to complete the survey and fortnightly emails were sent to  
104 encourage participants to revisit the survey, review the evolving consensus and contribute comments  
105 as often as they wished, facilitating engagement.

#### 106 **Consensus**

107 The survey was designed to address; i) whether participants felt each assessment items *should* be  
108 included in an athlete upper and lower limb pain assessment framework, as well as ii) how often they  
109 would expect these assessment items to be required. Participants were asked to indicate their level of  
110 agreement for (i) using a 6-point Likert scale (strongly disagree–disagree–somewhat disagree–  
111 somewhat agree–agree– strongly agree) which was chosen as a valid measure to establish consensus.  
112 It has been used in previous research to generate expert physiotherapist consensus and avoids  
113 ambivalent participant voting.<sup>46</sup> Consensus agreement criteria was defined a priori; i) a minimum of  
114 70% of participants either *agree* or *strongly agree* with the inclusion of the item. AND ii) the median  
115 vote must be either *agree* or *strongly agree* for the item to meet consensus threshold for inclusion. iii)  
116 Items where a minimum of 70% of participants voted either *strongly disagree* or *disagree* met the  
117 consensus threshold for exclusion. iv) All other items would therefore fail to reach the threshold for  
118 consensus. We chose a consensus threshold of 70% in line with consensus agreement guidelines that  
119 discuss the value of setting a specific threshold (51-90%) for a specific portion of votes within a  
120 certain range alongside the median value.<sup>15</sup> In this case we chose a relatively narrow range (2 points  
121 on the 6 point Likert scale, Agree and Strongly Agree). 70% was chosen to facilitate consensus on  
122 important items whilst ensuring sufficient agreement and has been used in similar studies seeking  
123 consensus from Physiotherapists.<sup>46</sup>

124 Participants were encouraged to think about the potential practicality and feasibility of the pain  
125 assessment items and asked to select how often they felt each of the pain assessment items are/will be  
126 required in practice on a 5-point scale. (*never – rarely – sometimes – often – always* The mean score  
127 was reported. Participants were able to view the current consensus immediately upon completion of  
128 their initial voting. (Appendix B) The number of times participants reviewed the evolving consensus  
129 for each item, changed their score and added a comment on an assessment item are reported in the  
130 results.

131

132

## 133 **Results**

### 134 **Respondents**

135 In total, 49 sports physiotherapists responded to our invitation. Of those, 41 sports physiotherapists  
136 (N=20 female, N= 21 male) took part in the RTD. 38 participants completed the entire survey (100%).  
137 Three participants completed 90%, 65% and 55% of the survey respectively. Of the 41 participants  
138 who began the survey, the mean completion rate was 98 %. Those who responded to the initial survey  
139 but did not complete any of the survey sections were removed from analysis.

140 Sports physiotherapists were from a number of countries (Ireland n=20, UK n=7, US n=4, South  
141 Africa n=4, Spain n=2, Australia n=2, Sweden n=1, Switzerland n=1) and worked with athletes from a  
142 range of sports (skill, power, endurance and mixed).<sup>36</sup> Participants had a mean of 15 years (+/- 5.7)  
143 post-graduate experience with 28 participants (68%) having completed additional sports  
144 physiotherapy/sports medicine postgraduate education and 33 participants (80%) having sports  
145 physiotherapist accreditation. Participants visited the survey an average of 5.3 times ( $\pm 5$ , median - 4).  
146 See Figure 1 for the full participant descriptive statistics.

147

### 148 **FIGURE 1 – Participant Demographics**

149

### 150 **Response and engagement**

151 Consensus for each assessment item was viewed on average 98 times (+/-31, median=105). The RTD  
152 presented the assessment items for each of the six domains on a separate page. Therefore, consensus  
153 was viewed an equal number of times for all items in each domain. Consensus was viewed by all  
154 participants for all items at least once. Pain assessment items in the neurophysiological domain were  
155 reviewed on average 2.6 times (+/- 1.6, median=2) per participant. The biomechanical items were  
156 reviewed 3.6 (+/- 4.5, median=2) times, the affective items 2 (+/-1.9, median=1) times, the cognitive

157 items 1.7 (+/-1.3, median=1) times the socioenvironmental items 1.6 (+/- 1.3. median=1) times and  
158 the general aspects of pain assessment items 1.9 (+/- 1.7, median =1) times.

159 Of the 8472 consensus reviews, there were 66 participant changes in consensus vote. The mean  
160 change in consensus vote was 1.3 (+/-0.7) on the 6-point Likert scale. There was a total of 218  
161 comments made by 18 participants across the 86 pain assessment items. There was a mean of 2.2 (+/-  
162 1.3) comments on items that achieved consensus and 3.5 (+/- 2.1) comments on items that did not.

163

### 164 **Section 1 - Neurophysiological Domain**

165 Table 1 displays the level of consensus reached for each of the neurophysiological pain assessment  
166 items. 20 out of 27 neurophysiological items met the consensus threshold for inclusion. Participants  
167 indicated that 16 neurophysiological items are *always* and four are *often* required in practice.

168

169

### 170 **TABLE 1 Neurophysiological Domain Assessment Items and Consensus**

171

### 172 **Section 2 - Biomechanical and Affective Domains**

173 Table 2 displays the level of consensus reached for each of the biomechanical and affective pain  
174 assessment items. 15 out of 20 biomechanical items met the consensus threshold for inclusion: six  
175 *always*, nine *often*. Participants voted to include eight out of nine affective items: seven *often* and one  
176 *sometimes*.

177

178



179 **TABLE 2 – Biomechanical and Affective Domain Assessment Items and Consensus**

180

181 **Section 3 – Cognitive, Socioenvironmental and General Aspects of Assessment Domains**

182 Table 3 displays the level of consensus reached for each of the cognitive, socioenvironmental and  
183 general aspects of assessment items. Three out of six cognitive domain items met the consensus  
184 threshold for inclusion, participants indicated all three are required *often*. Participants voted to include  
185 ten out of 15 socioenvironmental items: seven *often* and three *sometimes*. Eight out of nine general  
186 aspects of assessment met the consensus threshold for inclusion: six *always*, two *often*. In total, 64  
187 items met consensus for inclusion, no items met consensus for exclusion. 22 items failed to meet  
188 consensus.

189

190

191 **TABLE 3 Cognitive, Socioenvironmental and General Aspects of Assessment Domain Items and**  
192 **Consensus**

193

194 **Discussion**

195 This RTD provides a set of assessment items across six pain assessment domains. It is useful to  
196 consider why certain items met the threshold for consensus drawing on contemporary research and  
197 practical experience and consider the implications for research. Similarly, there is value in considering  
198 the reasoning behind the exclusion of certain aspects and comparing the value of a comprehensive  
199 pain assessment with the importance of practicality. Some limitations will also be considered.

200 ***Neurophysiological Pain Assessment Domain***

201 Neurophysiological assessment items such as pain location, quality and influencing factors are  
202 established aspects of a physiotherapist's pain assessment.<sup>13, 22, 23</sup> Thirteen items in the *pain*

203 *characteristics, pain history* and *pain impact* categories achieved consensus to *always* be included as  
204 part of an assessment of upper and lower limb pain in athletes. Including the history of previous pain  
205 episodes is crucial for understanding the current pain presentation. Previous experiences and  
206 comparisons can significantly influence an athlete's perception and impact of pain. This understanding  
207 can help guide the educational aspect of pain management.<sup>5,9</sup> The *impact of pain* category included  
208 assessment items related to both sports performance and daily activities, which are valuable indices of  
209 severity.<sup>1</sup> Written measures such as pain diaries did not achieve consensus for inclusion, perhaps due  
210 to the time and effort to complete, despite the value of reflection and quantifying pain timelines  
211 during pain assessments.<sup>21</sup>

212 Pain severity scales are a staple of traditional pain assessment practice, however, the limitations of the  
213 available tools have been documented, including ceiling and floor effects, inability to compare  
214 athletes and pain episodes (reliability) and reducing the experience of pain to a single item.<sup>12, 31</sup>

215 Although previous research has highlighted how alternative pain scales may be more relevant to an  
216 athlete's experience<sup>40</sup> it was the Numerical Pain Rating Scale alone that met the threshold for  
217 inclusion, perhaps due to its ease and ubiquitous use in pain research and practice.<sup>31,52</sup> Consensus  
218 indicated a pain severity measure should be included *often*, not *always* perhaps indicating the  
219 limitations sports physiotherapists encountered in using these tools in practice. Alternative scales such  
220 as the traffic light system are embedded in clinical practice, particularly in the case of upper and lower  
221 limb tendon pain and should be considered in the next stage of developing the pain assessment  
222 framework.<sup>48</sup> Understanding the dominant pain mechanism (nociceptive, neuropathic or nociplastic) is  
223 best practice in pain assessment both in general and athletic populations, guiding appropriate  
224 management.<sup>22, 44</sup> However, formal measures of pain mechanisms did not meet the threshold for  
225 inclusion, in line with recent scoping review findings<sup>42</sup> which found just one in four papers  
226 investigating pain assessment in athletes included a pain classification system, with those that did  
227 often choosing the outdated biomedical model. In line with previous qualitative research<sup>40</sup>, some  
228 sports physiotherapists commented how formal questionnaires and measures can be time-consuming,  
229 preferring to establish the pain mechanism using the pain interview questions such as asking about  
230 neurological signs and symptoms which participants felt should *always* be asked. Quantitative sensory

231 testing did not achieve consensus for inclusion despite demonstrating value for quantifying pain  
232 sensitivity and predicting pain and function in research settings.<sup>52</sup> The lack of perceived clinical utility  
233 aligns with previous findings that have demonstrated a lack of consensus regarding how they should  
234 be applied in practice.<sup>18, 53</sup> Consensus on items regarding the physical aspects of assessment to  
235 identify the patient's pain included *always* assessing range of motion and sports-specific functional  
236 tasks to identify the athlete's specific pain. Special tests are a physical measure meeting consensus to  
237 be used *often*. Identifying the athlete's specific pain experience is an important aspect of validating  
238 pain allowing the athlete to feel understood.<sup>25, 35</sup>

239

#### 240 ***Biomechanical Pain Assessment Domain***

241 Biomechanical assessments include local measures of movement, strength and function as well as  
242 wider aspects like an athlete's training load, sleep, nutrition, fatigue and fitness. Complimenting the  
243 physical aspects of neurophysiological pain assessment tools, sports physiotherapists felt testing full  
244 range of motion of local joints and assessing sport-specific postures and tasks while noting pain and  
245 symptoms were items that should *always* be included. These aspects align with current athlete pain  
246 assessment guidance and offer further opportunities to validate the athlete's pain.<sup>22, 35</sup> Measures of  
247 strength (such as repetition max, isokinetic dynamometry and local muscle endurance), balance  
248 (dynamic balance tests), motor control (quality of movement such as lumbopelvic or scapular control)  
249 and power (sprints/jumps) were aspects identified that should be included *often* to demonstrate the  
250 athlete's movement profile. Pain, through arthrogenic muscle inhibition and other mechanisms, can  
251 impact performance and these markers provide a battery of tests to quantify impact in clinical  
252 practice.<sup>33</sup> Fitness and agility and less challenging static balance and manual muscle testing (MMT)  
253 components were not included. Whilst MMT may be superseded by more objective measures it is  
254 frequently used in practice and remains a cornerstone of physiotherapy education, a useful option  
255 when more sophisticated and sport-specific measures are unavailable.<sup>45</sup>

256

257 Regarding wider biomechanical/biological considerations, the importance an athlete's training load,  
258 occupational workloads and rehabilitation activities has been discussed widely including the IOC

259 consensus statement on load.<sup>50</sup> Sports physiotherapists opted to *always* include these measures  
260 indicating their relevance to the practical assessment of pain. The influence of wider lifestyle factors  
261 such as sleep, nutrition and menstrual cycle status on overall health and function, performance and  
262 pain perception has been established.<sup>16, 24</sup> Sports physiotherapists indicated that they should *often* be  
263 included. Whilst biomarkers such as blood tests may form a part of diagnosis in sports and pain  
264 medicine this was not deemed to be necessary to include in a pain assessment framework.

265

### 266 ***Affective Pain Assessment***

267 The International Association for the Study of Pain definition of pain demonstrates that there is an  
268 emotional component that accompanies the sensory aspect of pain perception, highlighting the value  
269 of affective pain assessment strategies.<sup>44</sup> Sports physiotherapists opted to include stress, mood and  
270 emotions such as fear, willingness to play through pain, adherence to rehabilitation and confidence to  
271 return to training/competition *often* as part of a pain assessment framework. The value of gauging an  
272 athlete's understanding and tolerance for pain during rehabilitation and willingness to perform  
273 through pain has been established and may help guide clinical decision-making.<sup>3, 49</sup> Understanding  
274 feelings and emotions may improve an athlete's interoceptive capabilities which can have positive  
275 effects on sporting performance and general health.<sup>47</sup> Additionally, screening for specific mental  
276 health diagnoses is something sports physiotherapists felt is *sometimes* required. Qualitative research  
277 findings have highlighted the emotional toll of pain and the lack of assessments in this area with a  
278 strong athlete voice calling for their inclusion, indicating the importance of these aspects.<sup>10, 39-41, 56</sup>  
279 Understanding or assessing specific personality traits did not meet consensus.

280

### 281 ***Cognitive Pain Assessment***

282 The cognitive aspects of assessment provide a window into the athlete's understanding of their pain  
283 and the internal context of their pain experience.<sup>23</sup> Asking about or assessing pain-related beliefs using  
284 the validated Athlete Fear-avoidance Questionnaire and the Pain Catastrophising Scale narrowly  
285 missed consensus reflecting their lack of use in pain research and practice.<sup>42</sup> Given the importance of  
286 beliefs in the perception and experience of pain<sup>3, 5</sup> and how they inform an athlete's actions and the

287 management of their pain<sup>8, 9, 52</sup> this is something that should be reconsidered when further developing  
288 the pain assessment framework. In contrast, asking an athlete “What does your pain mean to  
289 you/What is your understanding of your pain?”, alongside asking about coping strategies and their  
290 level of confidence (efficacy) to manage their pain all achieved consensus to be included *often*. These  
291 items are less time-demanding and translate to practice and the pain management process.. The  
292 cognitive pain assessment domain is the least frequently used in both research and practice.<sup>42</sup>  
293 Including the items highlighted here by sports physiotherapists may help fill this void. Distraction and  
294 managing attention and focus are tools sometimes employed by athletes during the pain management  
295 process.<sup>10, 39</sup> Both athletes and clinicians have expressed concerns about the overassessment of pain  
296 increasing the athlete’s attention on and therefore amplifying, their pain.<sup>40, 56</sup> Despite the potential  
297 value of exploring attention and distraction, they did not achieve consensus, with the potential for  
298 implicit assessment of these aspects through the initial interview.

299

### 300 ***Socioenvironmental Pain Assessment***

301 The impact of context on injury prevention and pain management has been established<sup>7, 10, 52</sup> including  
302 in athlete pain guidelines.<sup>22</sup> Whilst an athlete’s internal context can be best understood by considering  
303 affective and cognitive factors, the external context of athlete pain experience can be optimally  
304 expressed and assessed by considering the socioenvironmental aspects of pain.<sup>22</sup> Of note, asking  
305 athletes about the pain culture within their sport or team did not meet consensus. Perhaps an  
306 appreciation of the prevailing culture is something that is gauged implicitly through a wider  
307 understanding of the team/sport. Indeed, previous qualitative insights have outlined how an attitude of  
308 respect and response to pain rather than ignoring pain may positively influence an athlete’s pain  
309 perception.<sup>3, 5, 10, 39, 56</sup>

310 Understanding the time of the season (*sometimes*) and pressure to perform or return to play an athlete  
311 feels within their specific sports environment (*often*) were deemed to be key aspects for inclusion.  
312 Regarding lifestyle factors, asking about general well-being met the threshold to be included *often*,  
313 with asking about alcohol/recreational drugs being deemed necessary *sometimes*, likely when  
314 suspected to be a contributor in specific presentations. Quality of life was not included with some

315 participants commenting this is not something they ask but gauge implicitly throughout the  
316 assessment. The effect of pain on income/resources (*sometimes*) and access to appropriate facilities  
317 and healthcare (*often*) were, with education/employment and sociocultural background and pain  
318 culture not meeting the threshold. Although education and sociocultural aspects have been highlighted  
319 as key prognostic indicators in the literature when it comes to overall health and development of  
320 chronic pain,<sup>32,55</sup> sports physiotherapists tended to favour questions related to modifiable aspects that  
321 have practical solutions and implications. Although this consensus may facilitate the development of a  
322 practical and implementable framework it is important not to lose sight of the wider aspects  
323 influencing an athlete's pain that are significant in understanding their unique presentation.  
324 Highlighting the wider socioeconomic and sociocultural aspects may help facilitate systemic changes  
325 that may be needed in the future (e.g., social policy).<sup>55</sup>

326

### 327 ***General Aspects of Pain Assessment***

328 This domain identifies key components of the assessment process and conduct that accompany  
329 practical assessment items. The nine items in this domain were included based on recent evidence  
330 surrounding communication, timing, knowledge/education, relationships and the integration of  
331 technology including clinical guidelines<sup>4,30</sup> and qualitative insights.<sup>10,11,40,41</sup> Items based on effective  
332 and clear communication, building a rapport/trust and getting to know the athlete and their sport as  
333 well as using the assessment as an opportunity to educate the athlete about their pain all met the  
334 consensus to *always* be included. Communicating and collaborating with the athlete's support  
335 network and coaches, with the athlete's permission, achieved 100% consensus and was deemed  
336 something that should *always* be considered, highlighting the role of communication in athlete  
337 welfare and performance aligning with findings from the literature.<sup>11,27</sup> Furthermore, the importance  
338 of clear communication, considering principles of health literacy and using plain uncomplicated  
339 language is an aspect sports physiotherapists felt should *always* be included. Clear communication has  
340 been linked to positive outcomes in healthcare and sport, particularly when assessing and explaining  
341 pain and injury.<sup>6,27,32</sup> Sports physiotherapists opted to include knowing and understanding the athlete  
342 and their sport, in essence, their internal (pain perception and experiences) and external (sports

343 environment) context as something that is *always* required, underscoring the importance of context.<sup>7</sup>

344 <sup>52</sup> Pain neuroscience education or 'explaining pain', has been established as an important aspect of

345 pain management in athletes.<sup>38</sup> Effective communication and explanation of pain during the

346 assessment guides the management process with one athlete in our previous research<sup>40</sup> stating;

347

348 *"I know exactly what it is, and I nearly come to terms with it an awful lot quicker .. I feel like my*

349 *education around it has a huge impact.."* – A08

350

351 Additionally, considering the individual and their pain timeline when selecting pain assessment items

352 was deemed something that is *always* required. This links with the need to be judicious when selecting

353 pain assessment items, avoiding over-assessment and selecting appropriate pain assessment items at

354 key time points agreed with the athlete (e.g. before/after training/competition) which sports

355 physiotherapists felt is *often* required and facilitates the clinical reasoning process prioritised in

356 clinical practice guidelines.<sup>30</sup> These three aspects taken together speak to the need for an

357 individualised and selective pain assessment that requires clinical reasoning from the sports

358 physiotherapist to understand pain mechanisms, tissue healing and pain timelines (acute, subacute and

359 chronic) and the spectrum from sports injury to sports-related pain<sup>25</sup> and may ultimately ease the

360 assessment burden on both athletes and physiotherapists who operate in the time-pressured sports

361 performance environment.<sup>6</sup>

362

363 Finally, the integration of technology into the assessment did not meet consensus despite its value in

364 healthcare and performance and the integration within national physiotherapy frameworks<sup>34</sup> and the

365 ubiquitous role of technology in the life of the modern athlete. This may be due to a reticence on the

366 physiotherapist's part to add additional inputs to over encumbered athletes with collection of data that

367 may be irrelevant to the pain presentation. Some clinicians commented they were wary of adding

368 additional smartphone use to athletes who are inundated with information. Additionally, currently

369 available technologies that may not have been developed in partnership with physiotherapists and

370 athletes may fail to meet the specific demands of assessments in sport, with guidelines highlighting  
371 the importance of co-creation and user-centred design in technology and connected health.<sup>34</sup>

372

### 373 **Limitations and Considerations for Framework Development**

374 On one hand, the development of a practical pain assessment framework necessitates the inclusion of  
375 a set of measures that can be integrated into the clinical workflow of a sports physiotherapist working  
376 across a variety of clinical settings and at times with suboptimal facilities.<sup>6</sup> Consensus for cognitive,  
377 affective and socioenvironmental (contextual) factors in this study often favoured these practical  
378 approaches that may inform pain management. On the other hand, prioritising a comprehensive  
379 assessment that appreciates and represents the athlete's pain experience encourages physiotherapists  
380 to challenge their current practice to consider alternative methods and measures to ensure the wider  
381 contextual is understood. Whilst some outcome measures that address these wider aspects may be  
382 burdensome, or their inclusion may seem arbitrary when information related to an aspect of pain  
383 assessment might be gathered implicitly, it is important to recognise the use of standardisation and  
384 protocols in optimising health and performance outcomes and reducing clinical errors and omissions,  
385 particularly in a realm where athletes often feel misunderstood. Future work should focus on distilling  
386 the findings of this RTD into a practical yet comprehensive pain assessment tool that clinicians and  
387 researchers can use.

388 Although there was a high completion rate (98%), assessment items in the latter portion of the survey  
389 were completed by less participants than those in the earlier portion. Additionally, the number of  
390 consensus reviews differed across the six assessment domains. Including randomisation of survey  
391 domains and a mandatory review of consensus in all domains should be considered in future RTD  
392 studies.

393

### 394 **Conclusion**

395 This RTD study with international sports physiotherapists presents a comprehensive set of  
396 recommendations for assessing upper and lower limb pain in athletes. Our findings highlight the



397 importance of a multidimensional approach, incorporating neurophysiological, biomechanical,  
398 affective, cognitive, socioenvironmental, and general assessment aspects. The consensus-derived  
399 recommendations offer practical, implementable strategies for routine clinical use, balancing the need  
400 for thorough assessment with the practical constraints of sports physiotherapy practice.  
401 It is hoped that these recommendations can guide clinicians in delivering more comprehensive and  
402 context-sensitive pain assessments, ultimately improving pain management and rehabilitation  
403 outcomes for athletes. Future work should focus on refining these recommendations into a cohesive,  
404 user-friendly framework that can be validated and integrated into clinical settings.

405

## 406 **Practical Implications**

### 407 **Findings:**

408 - We present a comprehensive and practical set of expert sports physiotherapist consensus-  
409 derived pain assessment items across six key domains for pain assessment. (20  
410 neurophysiological, 15 biomechanical, 8 affective, 3 cognitive, 10 socioenvironmental and 8  
411 assessment aspects) alongside the frequency with which they are required. (29 *always*, 32  
412 *often*, 4 *sometimes*).

### 413 **Implications**

414 - This study establishes expert consensus regarding the choice and frequency of pain  
415 assessment items for athlete pain across six domains: neurophysiological, biomechanical,  
416 affective, cognitive, socioenvironmental and general aspects of assessment. Sports  
417 physiotherapists can use these recommendations to inform their pain assessment with athletes  
418 experiencing upper and lower limb pain.

419

### 420 **Caution:**

421 - Consideration should be given to aspects that may have been excluded due to perceived  
422 practical feasibility to ensure a comprehensive assessment is delivered with clinicians being  
423 encouraged to apply clinical reasoning and judgement in each athlete scenario.

424

425

426 **Study Details**

427

428 **Institutional Review Board Approval**

429 Ethical permission was granted for our study by the Universities Human Research Ethics Committee.

430 (LS-22-40-xxx-xxx)

431

432 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank Prof Kieran O’Sullivan for providing expert

433 consultation regarding the development of the initial Delphi Survey.

434

435 **Author Contribution Statement**

436 CP conceived the original idea and developed the initial survey. CP, BC, BF and TW developed the

437 original idea and survey. CP completed data collection and data analysis. BC, BF and TW reviewed

438 the data analysis. CP composed the initial manuscript draft. BC TW and BF provided comments on

439 and contributed towards the writing and editing of the final draft. All authors have read and agreed to

440 the published version of the manuscript.

441

442 **Patient, athletes and public involvement statement.**

443 A PPI panel of athletes as described in the methods section was integral in the conduct of this research

444 project. The panel have been involved in the previous aspects of this research which involved focus

445 groups of athletes and physiotherapists and provided feedback towards the development of this paper.

446 The PPI panel will continue to be involved with the final development of the pain assessment

447 framework, the next stage of this research project.

448 **Data Sharing**

449 Data are available through the Open Science Framework (OSF) which is a public open access

450 repository and can be accessed at [10.17605/OSF.IO/D8T3N](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/D8T3N)

451

452

453

454

455

456 **References**

457

- 458 1. Bahr R, Clarsen B, Derman W, et al. International Olympic Committee consensus  
459 statement: methods for recording and reporting of epidemiological data on injury and  
460 illness in sport 2020 (including STROBE Extension for Sport Injury and Illness  
461 Surveillance (STROBE-SIIS)). *Br J Sports Med.* 2020;54:372-389.
- 462 2. Barber P, Lack SD, Bartholomew C, et al. Patient experience of the diagnosis and  
463 management of patellofemoral pain: A qualitative exploration. *Musculoskeletal  
464 Science and Practice.* 2022;57:102473.
- 465 3. Barrette A, Harman K. Athletes Play Through Pain-What Does That Mean for  
466 Rehabilitation Specialists? *J Sport Rehabil.* 2020;29:640-649.
- 467 4. Bishop A, Blackburn, J., Hallam, F., McComiskie, E., Rankin, G. Musculoskeletal  
468 physiotherapy service standards; The delivery of musculoskeletal (MSK)  
469 physiotherapy services in the UK for adults of 16 years and over. London: 2021.
- 470 5. Bolling C, Delfino Barboza S, Van Mechelen W, Pasman HR. How elite athletes,  
471 coaches, and physiotherapists perceive a sports injury. *Translational Sports  
472 Medicine.* 2019;2:17-23.
- 473 6. Bolling C, Delfino Barboza S, van Mechelen W, Pasman HR. Letting the cat out of  
474 the bag: athletes, coaches and physiotherapists share their perspectives on injury  
475 prevention in elite sports. *British Journal of Sports Medicine.* 2020;54:871-877.
- 476 7. Bolling C, Van Mechelen W, Pasman HR, Verhagen E. Context Matters: Revisiting  
477 the First Step of the 'Sequence of Prevention' of Sports Injuries. *Sports Medicine.*  
478 2018;48:2227-2234.
- 479 8. Caneiro JP, Alaiti RK, Fukusawa L, Hespanhol L, Brukner P, O'Sullivan PP. There is  
480 more to pain than tissue damage: eight principles to guide care of acute non-  
481 traumatic pain in sport. *British Journal of Sports Medicine.* 2021;55:75-77.
- 482 9. Caneiro JP, Smith A, Bunzli S, Linton S, Moseley GL, O'Sullivan P. From Fear to  
483 Safety: A Roadmap to Recovery From Musculoskeletal Pain. *Phys Ther.* 2022;102:  
484 10. Casey MB, Wilson F, Ng L, et al. "There's definitely something wrong but we just  
485 don't know what it is": A qualitative study exploring rowers' understanding of low back  
486 pain. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2022;25:557-563.
- 487 11. Charmant WM, van der Wees PJ, Staal JB, van Cingel R, Sieben JM, de Bie RA. A  
488 framework exploring the therapeutic alliance between elite athletes and  
489 physiotherapists: a qualitative study. *BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil.* 2021;13:122.
- 490 12. Correll DJ. Chapter 22 - The Measurement of Pain: Objectifying the Subjective. In:  
491 Waldman SD, eds. *Pain Management (Second Edition)*. Philadelphia: W.B.  
492 Saunders; 2011:191-201.
- 493 13. Dansie EJ, Turk DC. Assessment of patients with chronic pain. *Br J Anaesth.*  
494 2013;111:19-25.
- 495 14. de Villiers MR, de Villiers PJT, Kent AP. The Delphi technique in health sciences  
496 education research. *Medical Teacher.* 2005;27:639-643.
- 497 15. Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, et al. Defining consensus: a systematic review  
498 recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *J Clin Epidemiol.*  
499 2014;67:401-409.

- 500 16. Doherty R, Madigan S, Warrington G, Ellis J. Sleep and Nutrition Interactions:  
501 Implications for Athletes. *Nutrients*. 2019;11:
- 502 17. Gattrell WT, Logullo P, van Zuuren EJ, et al. ACCORD (ACcurate COnsensus  
503 Reporting Document): A reporting guideline for consensus methods in biomedicine  
504 developed via a modified Delphi. *PLOS Medicine*. 2024;21:e1004326.
- 505 18. Georgopoulos V, Akin-Akinyosoye K, Zhang W, McWilliams DF, Hendrick P, Walsh  
506 DA. Quantitative sensory testing and predicting outcomes for musculoskeletal pain,  
507 disability, and negative affect: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pain*.  
508 2019;160:1920-1932.
- 509 19. Gnatzy T, Warth J, Von Der Gracht H, Darkow I-L. Validating an innovative real-time  
510 Delphi approach - A methodological comparison between real-time and conventional  
511 Delphi studies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 2011;78:1681-1694.
- 512 20. Gordon T, Pease A. RT Delphi: An efficient, "round-less" almost real time Delphi  
513 method. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 2006;73:321-333.
- 514 21. Haase I. Accuracy of retrospective pain measurement in patients with chronic pain.  
515 *Med Int (Lond)*. 2023;3:35.
- 516 22. Hainline B, Derman W, Vernec A, et al. International Olympic Committee consensus  
517 statement on pain management in elite athletes. *Br J Sports Med*. 2017;51:1245-  
518 1258.
- 519 23. Hainline B, Turner JA, Caneiro JP, Stewart M, Lorimer Moseley G. Pain in elite  
520 athletes-neurophysiological, biomechanical and psychosocial considerations: a  
521 narrative review. *Br J Sports Med*. 2017;51:1259-1264.
- 522 24. Hayward E, Akam L, Hunter D, Mastana S. Role of the Menstrual Cycle on  
523 Performance and Injury Risk: A Survey of Female Professional Rugby Players in the  
524 United Kingdom. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2024;21:
- 525 25. Hoegh M, Stanton T, George S, Lyng KD, Vistrup S, Rathleff MS. Infographic. Pain  
526 or injury? Why differentiation matters in exercise and sports medicine. *British Journal  
527 of Sports Medicine*. 2022;56:299-300.
- 528 26. Igolnikov I, Gallagher RM, Hainline B. Sport-related injury and pain classification.  
529 *Handb Clin Neurol*. 2018;158:423-430.
- 530 27. Jan E, Daniel L, Michael D, Michel DH, Anne Marte P. Communication quality  
531 between the medical team and the head coach/manager is associated with injury  
532 burden and player availability in elite football clubs. *British Journal of Sports  
533 Medicine*. 2019;53:304.
- 534 28. Kerai S, Wadey R, Salim J. Stressors Experienced in Elite Sport by Physiotherapists.  
535 *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*. 2019;8:
- 536 29. Kiverstein J, Kirchhoff MD, Thacker M. An Embodied Predictive Processing Theory of  
537 Pain Experience. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*. 2022;10.1007/s13164-022-  
538 00616-2:
- 539 30. Lin I, Wiles L, Waller R, et al. What does best practice care for musculoskeletal pain  
540 look like? Eleven consistent recommendations from high-quality clinical practice  
541 guidelines: systematic review. *Br J Sports Med*. 2020;54:79-86.
- 542 31. Litcher-Kelly L, Martino SA, Broderick JE, Stone AA. A systematic review of  
543 measures used to assess chronic musculoskeletal pain in clinical and randomized  
544 controlled clinical trials. *J Pain*. 2007;8:906-913.
- 545 32. Mackey LM, Blake C, Casey MB, et al. The impact of health literacy on health  
546 outcomes in individuals with chronic pain: a cross-sectional study. *Physiotherapy*.  
547 2019;10.1016/j.physio.2018.11.006.:
- 548 33. McPherson AL, Schilaty ND, Anderson S, Nagai T, Bates NA. Arthrogenic muscle  
549 inhibition after anterior cruciate ligament injury: Injured and uninjured limb recovery  
550 over time. *Front Sports Act Living*. 2023;5:1143376.
- 551 34. Middleton K, Bailey M. Physiotherapy Health Informatics Strategy. Optimising use of  
552 technology in our profession. London: Chartered Society of Physiotherapy; 2023.

- 553 35. Nicola M, Correia H, Ditchburn G, Drummond PD. Defining pain-validation: The  
554 importance of validation in reducing the stresses of chronic pain. *Front Pain Res*  
555 *(Lausanne)*. 2022;3:884335.
- 556 36. Niebauer J, Borjesson M, Carré F, et al. Recommendations for participation in  
557 competitive sports of athletes with arterial hypertension: a position statement from  
558 the sports cardiology section of the European Association of Preventive Cardiology  
559 (EAPC). *European heart journal*. 2018;39:
- 560 37. O'Shaughnessy Í, Fitzgerald C, Whiston A, et al. Establishing the core elements of a  
561 frailty at the front door model of care using a modified real-time Delphi technique.  
562 *BMC Emergency Medicine*. 2023;23:123.
- 563 38. Puentedura EJ, Louw A. A neuroscience approach to managing athletes with low  
564 back pain. *Phys Ther Sport*. 2012;13:123-133.
- 565 39. Purcell C, Barry Walsh C, Van Oirschot G, Fullen BM, Ward T, Caulfield BM. Another  
566 world of pain - Athlete and Sport Physiotherapist perspectives on the unique  
567 experience of pain in sport. *medRxiv*.  
568 2023;10.1101/2023.12.28.23300487:2023.2012.2028.23300487.
- 569 40. Purcell C, Barry Walsh C, Van Oirschot G, Fullen BM, Ward T, Caulfield BM.  
570 Exploring athlete pain assessment experiences and priorities; A two-part qualitative  
571 series of athlete and physiotherapist interactions. Part One. "Gauging and discerning"  
572 - Athlete and physiotherapist pain assessment experiences and interactions.  
573 *medRxiv*. 2024;10.1101/2024.01.05.24300908:2024.2001.2005.24300908.
- 574 41. Purcell C, Barry Walsh C, Van Oirschot G, Fullen BM, Ward T, Caulfield BM.  
575 Exploring athlete pain assessment experiences and priorities; A two-part qualitative  
576 series of athlete and physiotherapist interactions. Part Two. "Forging Our Future" -  
577 Athlete and physiotherapists' priorities for pain assessment and beyond. *medRxiv*.  
578 2024;10.1101/2024.01.20.24301522:2024.2001.2020.24301522.
- 579 42. Purcell C, Duignan C, Fullen BM, Ryan S, Ward T, Caulfield B. Comprehensive  
580 assessment and classification of upper and lower limb pain in athletes: a scoping  
581 review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2023;10.1136/bjsports-2022-  
582 106380:bjsports-2022-106380.
- 583 43. Quirke FA, Battin MR, Bernard C, et al. Multi-Round versus Real-Time Delphi survey  
584 approach for achieving consensus in the COHESION core outcome set: a  
585 randomised trial. *Trials*. 2023;24:461.
- 586 44. Raja SN, Carr DB, Cohen M, et al. The revised International Association for the  
587 Study of Pain definition of pain: concepts, challenges, and compromises. *Pain*.  
588 2020;161:1976-1982.
- 589 45. Ryder D, Barnard K. *Petty's Musculoskeletal Examination and Assessment*. 6th.  
590 Elsevier; 2023.
- 591 46. Sánchez Milá Z, Muñoz TV, Ferreira Sánchez MD, et al. *Therapeutic Exercise*  
592 *Parameters, Considerations and Recommendations for the Treatment of Non-*  
593 *Specific Low Back Pain: International DELPHI Study*. 2023.
- 594 47. Seabury T, Benton D, Young HA. Interoceptive differences in elite sprint and long-  
595 distance runners: A multidimensional investigation. *PLoS One*. 2023;18:e0278067.
- 596 48. Silbernagel KG, Thomeé R, Eriksson BI, Karlsson J. Continued sports activity, using  
597 a pain-monitoring model, during rehabilitation in patients with Achilles tendinopathy: a  
598 randomized controlled study. *Am J Sports Med*. 2007;35:897-906.
- 599 49. Smith BE, Hendrick P, Smith TO, et al. Should exercises be painful in the  
600 management of chronic musculoskeletal pain? A systematic review and meta-  
601 analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2017;51:1679-1687.
- 602 50. Soligard T, Schwelinius M, Alonso JM, et al. How much is too much? (Part 1)  
603 International Olympic Committee consensus statement on load in sport and risk of  
604 injury. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50:1030-1041.
- 605 51. Spranger J, Homberg A, Sonnberger M, Niederberger M. Reporting guidelines for  
606 Delphi techniques in health sciences: A methodological review. *Z Evid Fortbild Qual*  
607 *Gesundhwes*. 2022;172:1-11.

- 608 52. Thornton C, Baird A, Sheffield D. Athletes and Experimental Pain: A Systematic  
609 Review and Meta-Analysis. *The Journal of Pain*.  
610 2023;<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2023.12.007:104450>.  
611 53. Uddin Z, MacDermid JC. Quantitative Sensory Testing in Chronic Musculoskeletal  
612 Pain. *Pain Medicine*. 2016;17:1694-1703.  
613 54. Varndell W, Fry M, Elliott D. Applying real-time Delphi methods: development of a  
614 pain management survey in emergency nursing. *BMC Nursing*. 2021;20:  
615 55. Wiese-Bjornstal DM. Psychology and socioculture affect injury risk, response, and  
616 recovery in high-intensity athletes: a consensus statement. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*.  
617 2010;20 Suppl 2:103-111.  
618 56. Wilson F, Ng L, O'Sullivan K, et al. 'You're the best liar in the world': a grounded  
619 theory study of rowing athletes' experience of low back pain. *Br J Sports Med*.  
620 2021;55:327-335.  
621 57. Zideman DA, Derman W, Hainline B, et al. Management of Pain in Elite Athletes:  
622 Identified Gaps in Knowledge and Future Research Directions. *Clin J Sport Med*.  
623 2018;28:485-489.  
624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649 **FIGURE 1** – Participant Demographics

650 UK – United Kingdom, USA – United States of America, AUS – Australia, SE – Sweden, CH – Switzerland \*

651 Some Physiotherapists worked with athletes competing across various competition levels.

652 \*\*Skill Sports – golf, dance, equestrian etc. Power Sports – weightlifting, sprinting etc. Endurance Sports - running,

653 swimming cycling etc. Mixed Sports – team sports, tennis, boxing etc.<sup>36</sup>



Pain Assessment Category	Pain Assessment Item	Responses	Consensus	Median Vote	Agreement	Included	Frequency
Neurophysiological Domain	Locating the specific site of the athletes pain through questioning (e.g. can you pinpoint your pain?).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Asking the athlete about the nature of their pain which may include specific adjectives or descriptors.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	95.12%	Yes	Always
	Asking about the irritability of the athletes pain (how long it takes to come on/go away).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Asking about night pain.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	95.12%	Yes	Always
	Asking about the 24 hour pattern of pain.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Asking about aggravating and easing factors.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Asking the athlete about medication - current, previous, or recent changes. (This may be pain medication or any other medication they are on)	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Asking about the athletes specific pain history and experiences and establishing the context of this pain	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	90.24%	Yes	Always
	Asking about pain duration. (e.g. acute, subacute, chronic).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	100.00%	Yes	Always
	Asking about the onset and timeline of pain (e.g. gradual onset, sudden onset, recurrent, etc).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	100.00%	Yes	Always
	Asking the athlete to complete a pain diary and/or reflections in their own time.	41	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	56.10%	No	Sometimes
	Asking the athlete about the impact of their pain on their activities of daily living.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	87.80%	Yes	Always
	Asking the athlete about the impact of their pain on their sport performance (e.g. training and/or competition).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	95.12%	Yes	Always
	Asking the athlete about specific sporting tasks that pain is experienced during/exacerbated by.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Numerical Pain Rating Scale	41	Agree	Agree	78%	Yes	N/A
	The Visual Analogue Scale (VAS).	41	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	46.34%	No	N/A
	The Pain Faces Scale (Could be used with Paediatric athletes).	41	Agree	Agree	53.66%	No	N/A
	A Descriptive pain scale (e.g. mild moderate and severe, or threatening, non-threatening).	41	Agree	Somewhat Agree	48.78%	No	N/A
	Establishing the underlying pain mechanism based on the International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) pain mechanisms classification through questionnaires/checklist.	41	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	*70.73%	No	N/A
	How Often Should a Pain Scale Be Used	41	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Often
Neurological aspects	Asking about neurological signs and symptoms. (shooting/stabbing type pain, loss of sensation, loss of power, pins and needles and other paresthesias).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	100.00%	Yes	Always
	Completing a neurological examination (myotomes/dermatomes/reflexes).	41	Agree	Agree	85.37%	Yes	Often
	Assessing neurodynamics (through upper limb neural tension tests, slump, straight leg raise etc).	41	Agree	Agree	78.05%	Yes	Often
	Screen for neuropathic pain using validated measures (eg. DN4, PainDETECT).	41	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	63.41%	No	Sometimes
	Completing Quantitative Sensory Testing (e.g. pressure pain threshold, pain to crance, hot/cold sensitivity)	41	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	58.54%	No	Sometimes
Physical/manual pain assessment	Pain provocation/identification of the athletes pain through range of motion	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Pain provocation/identification of the athletes pain Special Tests (e.g. Empty Can/Hawkins Kennedy for shoulder, McMurrays test for knee, Talar tilt for ankle).	41	Agree	Agree	70.73%	Yes	Often
	Pain provocation/identification of pain through athlete identified functional task. (E.g. climbing/descending stairs, brushing hair, carrying bags)	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always

TABLE 1 Neurophysiological Assessment Items and Consensus



\* items where >70% of participants voted either somewhat agree or somewhat disagree indicating a neutral consensus

Pain Assessment Category	Pain Assessment Item	Responses	Consensus	Median Vote	Agreement	Included	Frequency
Biomechanical Domain	Objective strength assessments (handheld dynamometry, isometric strength testing, repetitions max testing)	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	87.80%	Yes	Often
	Local muscle endurance tests (e.g. single leg hamstring bridge/single leg squat to box to failure).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	85.37%	Yes	Often
	Manual muscle testing (Oxford grading etc).	41	Agree	Agree	68.29%	No	Often
	Passive and active range of motion testing (noting range +/- pain/stiffness).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	95.12%	Yes	Always
	Static balance measures (eyes open/eyes closed, single leg, tandem, unstable surface, Romberg etc)	41	Agree	Agree	56.10%	No	Sometimes
	Dynamic balance measures (Y-Balance Test, Star Excursion Balance Test, multi-directional hopping).	41	Agree	Agree	75.61%	Yes	Often
	Motor control (landing mechanics, lumbopelvic control, trunk control, scapular control etc).	41	Agree	Agree	87.80%	Yes	Often
	Sport specific movement or postural assessment (eg Squat, lunge, running, jumping, throwing, kicking).	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	92.68%	Yes	Always
	Power/speed assessment: (timed sprint, counter movement jump, broad jump, single leg hop, triple hop, reactive)	41	Agree	Agree	78.05%	Yes	Often
	Agility Test (5-0-5, Illinois, T-test etc.).	41	Agree	Agree	51.22%	No	Sometimes
	Fitness Test (VO2 max or submaximal testing, bleep test, intermittent shuttle test, timed test to exhaustion).	41	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	*70.73%	No	Sometimes
	Establishing current training load.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Establishing current rehab/prehab activities.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.56%	Yes	Always
	Establishing chronic training load/ capacity.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	90.24%	Yes	Always
	Asking the athlete about current level of general and sports related fatigue/tiredness (or asking about unusual)	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	82.93%	Yes	Often
	Asking about sleep duration and quality.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	92.68%	Yes	Often
	Asking about nutrition quality/status or whether athlete is meeting current energy demands.	41	Agree	Agree	85.37%	Yes	Often
	Asking females about their menstrual cycle status/regularity and the influence on pain.	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	87.80%	Yes	Often
	Asking athlete about results from recent blood tests, biomarkers etc.	41	Agree	Agree	65.85%	No	Sometimes
	Asking athletes with a job outside of their sport about their occupational related loads	41	Agree	Strongly Agree	92.68%	Yes	Always
Affective/ Psychological Domain	Asking about mood, feelings and emotions related to pain and/or sport.	40	Agree	Agree	85.00%	Yes	Often
	Asking about/assessing general stress.	40	Agree	Agree	85.00%	Yes	Often
	Asking about/assessing sports related stress.	40	Agree	Agree	82.50%	Yes	Often
	Asking about/assessing fear, worry, concern or anxiety related to their pain and/or sport.	40	Agree	Strongly Agree	92.50%	Yes	Often
	Asking about past or present mental health or learning disorder diagnoses (eg anxiety, depression, bipolar,	40	Agree	Agree	80.00%	Yes	Sometimes
	Asking about psychological readiness/confidence to train/compete.	40	Agree	Strongly Agree	95.00%	Yes	Often
	Asking about willingness to exercise/train/ with pain.	40	Agree	Agree	80.00%	Yes	Often
	Asking about/assessing risk taking versus safety personality traits.	40	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	65.00%	No	Sometimes
	Asking about/assessing rehabilitation adherence/motivation.	40	Agree	Agree	90.00%	Yes	Often

TABLE 2 – Biomechanical and Affective Assessment Items and Consensus

\*items where >70% of participants voted either somewhat agree or somewhat disagree indicating a neutral consensus

	Pain Assessment Category	Pain Assessment Item	Responses	Consensus	Median Vote	Agreement	Included	Frequency
Cognitive Domain	Understanding of pain and cognitions.	Asking about or assessing pain related beliefs (including helpful/unhelpful beliefs, pain catastrophization etc)	39	Agree	Agree	69.23%	No	Often
		Asking the athlete what does this pain mean to them/ what is their understanding of their pain.	39	Agree	Strongly Agree	87.18%	Yes	Often
		Asking the athlete about their coping their strategies for pain.	39	Agree	Agree	71.79%	Yes	Often
		Asking the athlete about their pain related self-efficacy (confidence to manage their pain effectively).	39	Agree	Agree	87.18%	Yes	Often
		Asking about/assessing the level of attention on the athletes days to their pain.	39	Agree	Agree	64.10%	No	Sometimes
		Assessing cognitive traits/tendencies (explore/explicit, alertness/arousal).	39	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	56.41%	No	Sometimes
Socio environmental Domain	Sports environment	Asking the athlete about pain culture within their sport/team.	39	Agree	Agree	51.28%	No	Sometimes
		Asking the athlete about the impact of the specific time of season on their pain.	39	Agree	Agree	71.79%	Yes	Sometimes
		Asking the athlete about pressure to perform/return to play for their team/sport.	39	Agree	Strongly Agree	74.36%	Yes	Often
	Support network	Asking the athlete about personal relationships and their support network.	39	Agree	Agree	76.92%	Yes	Often
		Asking the athlete about their home stress/commitments.	39	Agree	Agree	82.05%	Yes	Often
		Asking the athlete about their work/school/university relationships and support network.	39	Agree	Agree	74.36%	Yes	Often
	Lifestyle factors	Asking the athlete about their work/school/university stress/commitments.	39	Agree	Agree	76.92%	Yes	Often
		Asking the athlete about their alcohol or recreational drug intake.	39	Agree	Agree	71.79%	Yes	Sometimes
		Asking the athlete whether they are a current or previous smoker.	39	Agree	Agree	58.97%	No	Sometimes
		Asking the athlete about their general wellbeing/health. (including physical, mental and social)	39	Agree	Agree	87.18%	Yes	Often
	Socioeconomic and sociocultural factors	Asking the athlete about/assessing their current quality of life.	39	Agree	Agree	58.97%	No	Sometimes
		Asking the athlete about the effect of pain/injury on their income and resources.	39	Agree	Agree	71.79%	Yes	Sometimes
Asking the athlete about their access to appropriate sport and health facilities.		39	Agree	Agree	79.49%	Yes	Often	
Asking the athlete about their sociocultural background and pain culture.		39	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	51.28%	No	Sometimes	
General Aspects of Assessment	Aspects and considerations for athlete pain	Asking the athlete about their current level of education/employment.	39	Agree	Agree	53.85%	No	Sometimes
		Clinicians should be mindful not to over assess athletes when selecting pain assessment tools.	38	Agree	Strongly Agree	86.84%	Yes	Often
		Pain assessment tools should be selected based on the individual athlete and their pain timeframe.	38	Agree	Strongly Agree	89.47%	Yes	Always
		Time appropriate pain assessments (before/after training, on waking/at night etc.) at key time points agreed	38	Agree	Strongly Agree	84.21%	Yes	Often
		Knowing and understanding the athlete and their sport is an important aspect of athlete pain assessment.	38	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.37%	Yes	Always
		Developing a rapport and trust within the athlete-clinician relationship is an important aspect of the athlete	38	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.37%	Yes	Always
		Communicating clearly using health literate language so that the athlete understands the assessment is important to build confidence between the athlete and clinician.	38	Agree	Strongly Agree	97.37%	Yes	Always
		Clinicians should use the athlete pain assessment to educate, empower and guide the athlete.	38	Agree	Strongly Agree	92.11%	Yes	Always
		Clinicians should integrate technology into pain assessment data capture (wearables/mobile sports objective data capture and/or recording subjective updates) as appropriate	38	Agree	Agree	55.26%	No	Sometimes
Clinicians should employ open and collaborative communication with the athlete's coach and wider network during the pain assessment process with the athletes permission.	38	Agree	Strongly Agree	100.00%	Yes	Always		

TABLE 3 Cognitive, Socioenvironmental and General Aspects of Assessment Items



