

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**Methods used to Account for Concurrent Analgesic Use in Randomized  
Controlled Trials of Interventional Pain Treatments: A Meta-Epidemiologic Study**

Balaji V Sridhar, MD, PhD, MPH<sup>a</sup>; Andrew Humbert, PhD<sup>b</sup>; Adam Babitts, DPT, PT<sup>b</sup>;  
Carina Staab, DC, Med:<sup>c</sup> Clinton J. Daniels, DC, MS:<sup>b,d</sup> Malka Dhillon, BS;<sup>b</sup> Patrick  
Heagerty, PhD<sup>e</sup>; Joshua Goldenberg, ND<sup>f</sup>; Mark Jensen, PhD;<sup>b</sup> Pradeep Suri, MD,  
MSc<sup>b,d,g</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, University of Washington

<sup>b</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Washington

<sup>c</sup>Department of Child, Family, and Population Health Nursing, University of Washington

<sup>d</sup>Rehabilitation Care Services, VA Puget Sound Health Care System

<sup>e</sup>Department of Biostatistics, University of Washington

<sup>f</sup>Helfgott Research Institute, National University of Natural Medicine

<sup>g</sup>Seattle Epidemiologic Research and Information Center, , VA Puget Sound Health Care  
System

**Corresponding Author:** Pradeep Suri, MD, MSc. Mailing Address: Rehabilitation Care  
Services, VA Puget Sound Health Care System, S-RCS-117, 1660 S. Columbian Way,  
Seattle, WA, 98108; email: [pradeep.suri@va.gov](mailto:pradeep.suri@va.gov); phone 206-764-2673; fax 206-716-  
5977

Running Title: Concurrent analgesic use in pain trials

22 **ABSTRACT**

23

24 **Objective:** The modest effect sizes of most pain treatments make it essential that  
25 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) use methods that clearly define treatment effects of  
26 interest and consider the role of concurrent treatments. This study aims to determine  
27 how frequently concurrent analgesic use is reported in interventional pain RCTs and  
28 how accounting for analgesic use can affect pain intensity outcomes.

29 **Design:** Meta-epidemiologic study.

30 **Methods:** We conducted a study of concurrent analgesic use among RCTs from a  
31 recent systematic review of non-surgical interventional pain treatments (n= 37). We  
32 calculated the prevalence of different methods used to report concurrent analgesic use.  
33 We performed meta-analyses to compare treatment effects on pain intensity with vs.  
34 without accounting for concurrent analgesic use via a novel quantitative composite  
35 outcome, the “QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>.”

36 **Results:** About half of interventional pain RCTs reported concurrent analgesic use, but  
37 only one RCT directly accounted for concurrent analgesic use in their pain intensity  
38 outcome. Analyses accounting for concurrent analgesic use using the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>  
39 substantially increased the estimated treatment effect of interventions on pain intensity  
40 by an average of -0.45 numeric rating scale points (95% CI -0.76 to -0.14; p<0.001),  
41 as compared to analyses that did not adjust for analgesic use.

42 **Conclusion:** Concurrent analgesic use is sometimes reported in interventional pain  
43 RCTs, but rarely accounted for when examining treatment effects on pain intensity.

44 Accounting for concurrent analgesic use changes the treatment effect of interest to  
45 remove differential analgesic rates and has the potential to significantly affect estimates  
46 of effect sizes on pain treatments.

47

48 Keywords: analgesics, randomized controlled trial, bias, epidemiology

49

50

51

## 52 INTRODUCTION

53 Pain affects 100 million adults in the United States (US) and costs up to \$635 billion  
54 annually.<sup>1,2</sup> Many interventional pain treatments have been developed to mitigate the  
55 negative impacts of pain. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) provide the strongest  
56 level of evidence to support pain treatment effectiveness.<sup>3,4</sup> However, the modest effect  
57 sizes of most current pain treatments make it essential that RCTs use the most rigorous  
58 analytic methods to reduce the likelihood that meaningful treatment effects are  
59 obscured by other factors.

60 The use of analgesics following randomization may be an important factor to  
61 account for in interventional pain RCTs. Differential post-randomization analgesic use  
62 between intervention and control groups in an RCT may reflect participants' efforts to  
63 self-manage pain intensity after receiving the randomized treatment, and such efforts  
64 may decrease the magnitude of treatment effects on pain intensity in an RCT if not  
65 accounted for.<sup>5,6</sup> Our observation is that concurrent analgesic use is not well-reported  
66 in many RCTs evaluating pain treatments and, even when reported, is not explicitly  
67 considered when defining or estimating treatment effects on pain intensity. Consistent  
68 with this, a systematic review of analgesic treatment RCTs for back pain and  
69 neuropathic pain found that about half of trials allowed study-specified "rescue"  
70 analgesic use and/or participants to continue to use analgesics other than the  
71 randomized treatment.<sup>7</sup>

72 A recent study by Suri et al. found that ignoring concurrent analgesic use in the  
73 analysis of pain RCTs may lead to substantial underestimation of treatment effects on  
74 pain intensity and may affect power.<sup>5</sup> Simple methods of accounting for concurrent

75 analgesic use, such as analyzing analgesic use as a binary outcome or adjusting for it  
76 as a covariate, decreased power.<sup>5</sup> Suri et al. proposed a new measure to account for  
77 concurrent analgesic use: the Quantitative Pain and Analgesic Composite outcome  
78 (QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>). The QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> is a composite measure that combines pain intensity and  
79 concurrent analgesic use into a single 0 to 10 numeric rating scale (NRS) of pain  
80 intensity. Prior work has suggested that concurrent analgesic use has an average  
81 impact on perceived pain intensity of 1.5 NRS points<sup>6</sup>. Accordingly, the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>  
82 attributes a 1.5-NRS-point weight to concurrent analgesic use when approximating a  
83 research participant's counterfactual pain NRS rating that *would have been* reported in  
84 the absence of analgesic use, by adding 1.5 NRS points to a participant's conventional  
85 pain intensity NRS rating if the participant is taking analgesics at the time of pain  
86 intensity reporting. While the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> applies a 1.5-NRS-point weight to concurrent  
87 analgesic use, the approach is flexible, and could instead apply a different weight if  
88 appropriate for a given clinical population. The QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> has the same range and  
89 interpretation as the conventional pain intensity NRS, facilitating easy comparisons  
90 between the two measures.<sup>5</sup> Statistical simulations and analyses of trial data have  
91 found that the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> may increase power in pain RCTs relative to analyses that look  
92 only at the total effects of treatment on pain intensity without removing impacts on pain  
93 intensity that occur due to differential analgesic use.<sup>6</sup>

94 To our knowledge, no prior studies have evaluated how often interventional pain  
95 RCTs report on concurrent analgesic use or examined whether the analysis methods  
96 used accounted for analgesic use when analyzing pain intensity outcomes. Similarly, no  
97 prior meta-analyses have compared treatment effects on pain intensity with and without

98 the use of methods to account for post-randomization concurrent analgesic use.  
99 Therefore, we conducted a meta-epidemiologic study of concurrent analgesic use  
100 reporting among RCTs included in a 2021 comprehensive systematic review of  
101 emerging non-surgical interventional procedural treatments for pain.<sup>8</sup> The primary study  
102 aims were to examine (1) the prevalence of reporting concurrent analgesic use among  
103 included RCTs, and (2) the methods used to account for concurrent analgesic use. A  
104 secondary aim of the study was to investigate the impact of accounting for post-  
105 randomization concurrent analgesic use on estimated treatment effects on pain  
106 intensity, using the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>.

107

## 108 **METHODS**

### 109 Data Source

110 Before any study-related activities began, the study protocol and analysis plan were  
111 registered on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/syug3/>).<sup>9</sup> We conducted a  
112 meta-epidemiologic study of interventional pain treatment parallel-group RCTs identified  
113 from a 2021 systematic review by Chou et al., to determine the prevalence of reporting  
114 concurrent analgesic use and how analgesic use was accounted for in analyses of pain  
115 intensity. This high-quality systematic review followed the methods suggested in the  
116 *Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Methods Guide for Effectiveness and*  
117 *Comparative Effectiveness Reviews*, which was developed for the Evidence-based  
118 Practice Centers.<sup>8</sup> The review methods were determined *a priori* using a protocol  
119 developed through a process that included public input and was published on the

120 Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) website  
121 (<https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/products/interventional-treatments-pain/protocol>)  
122 and on the PROSPERO systematic reviews registry (CRD42021226947). The AHRQ  
123 review examined interventional procedures for acute and chronic pain that are either not  
124 currently covered by the United States (US) Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  
125 (CMS), or procedures that are covered but for which there is uncertainty or controversy  
126 regarding their use, including: vertebral augmentation; cooled or pulsed radiofrequency  
127 ablation (RFA); intradiscal and facet-joint platelet-rich plasma injections; other  
128 intradiscal procedures; sphenopalatine blocks; occipital nerve stimulation; piriformis  
129 injections; and peripheral nerve stimulation. The review included 37 trials published  
130 between 2002 and 2020.<sup>8</sup>

131

### 132 Data Extraction

133 Data elements of all trials were extracted from the published articles and cross-  
134 referenced with what was reported in the AHRQ systematic review. Extracted variables  
135 included baseline characteristics of the control and intervention groups; whether  
136 baseline concurrent analgesic use was reported in the intervention and control groups;  
137 and if baseline concurrent analgesic use was reported, how it was measured and  
138 reported. We also extracted whether concurrent analgesic use was reported post-  
139 randomization in control and intervention arms, and if it was reported, how it was  
140 measured and reported. Finally, we extracted the primary pain intensity outcome at the  
141 primary trial endpoint.<sup>10</sup> If cross-over was allowed, the post-randomization time point

142 prior to cross-over was analyzed to preserve the benefits of randomization. All major  
143 data elements were extracted by two or more reviewers (BS, AB, CS, CD, MD). Areas of  
144 uncertainty were reviewed by the senior author (PS) and resolved by discussion.

145

146 Reported concurrent analgesic use and methods used to account for concurrent  
147 analgesic use

148 *Baseline concurrent analgesic use variables:* If concurrent analgesic use was reported,  
149 the manner of analgesic reporting was classified as reporting of average dose of  
150 medication, prevalence of opioid use, prevalence of non-opioid use, prevalence of  
151 individual medication or medication category use, prevalence of any analgesic use, or  
152 “other”.

153 *Post-randomization concurrent analgesic use variables at the primary trial endpoint.* If  
154 concurrent analgesic use was reported, the manner of analgesic reporting was  
155 classified using the same options as used for classifying the baseline analgesic use  
156 reporting. If the primary trial endpoint was not explicitly noted in a trial, we decided *a*  
157 *priori* to define the primary endpoint (for the purposes of this meta-epidemiologic study)  
158 as the time point when the largest treatment effect was expected based on clinical  
159 knowledge, factoring in the expected onset of effect and duration of effect for both the  
160 treatment and control groups. For example, for vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty, after  
161 which pain relief is thought to be rapid, we reasoned that the maximal treatment effect  
162 would be at 1-month post-randomization. On the other hand, for RFA we reasoned that  
163 the maximal treatment effect would be at 3 months post RFA (as relief after



164 radiofrequency is not expected to be immediate, and post-RFA periods of increased  
165 pain [“neuritis”] may occur).<sup>11</sup>

166 *Methods to account for concurrent analgesic use in the analysis of the primary pain*  
167 *intensity endpoint:* We classified the methods used to account for concurrent analgesic  
168 use in the analysis of the primary pain outcome, including whether analgesic use was  
169 adjusted for as a covariate, analyzed as a binary outcome, incorporated into a  
170 composite outcome, used for imputation of pain intensity, or “other“. We planned *a priori*  
171 to expand this list of categories as needed, depending on the frequency of the methods  
172 to account for concurrent analgesic use encountered among included RCTs from the  
173 AHRQ systematic review.

174

#### 175 Data Analysis and Synthesis:

176 To address the descriptive primary aims of the study, we: (1) calculated the  
177 prevalence of any concurrent analgesic use reported at baseline and post-  
178 randomization, (2) calculated the frequency of different methods of reporting analgesic  
179 use, and (3) determined how frequently authors accounted for concurrent analgesic use  
180 in the analysis of pain intensity outcomes. Although the primary aims were descriptive in  
181 nature, we anticipated based on the literature<sup>7</sup> that most of the trials would not report  
182 concurrent analgesic use, that a high proportion of trials would ignore analgesic use  
183 post-randomization when analyzing pain intensity outcomes, and that the most common  
184 analytic method related to concurrent analgesic use in pain RCTs would be to analyze  
185 analgesic use as a separate binary outcome. Of note, this last method does not account

186 for concurrent analgesic use in the analysis of pain intensity outcomes *per se* but  
187 analyzes analgesic use as a secondary outcome, ignoring that analgesic use may be  
188 impacting the primary as-randomized comparison of treatment groups with regards to  
189 pain intensity.

190 We also conducted a meta-analysis of treatment effects on pain intensity measured  
191 using the conventional 0 to 10 Numeric Rating Scale of pain intensity (NRS) vs.  
192 treatment effects measured using the recently-developed QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> composite outcome.  
193 This meta-analysis was conducted among the subset of trials that reported conventional  
194 NRS outcomes and concurrent analgesic use (both of which are needed to calculate the  
195 QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>) for each of the intervention and control groups, at the primary trial endpoint.  
196 As the use of analgesics may be associated with pain intensity, when calculating the  
197 standard deviation of the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> we assumed a correlation between analgesic use  
198 and pain NRS of 0.08 based on a prior report,<sup>6</sup> sensitivity analyses were conducted  
199 using other assumptions for this correlation. The details of how the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> was  
200 calculated is provided in the Supplementary Materials.

201 Based on the theory underlying the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>,<sup>5</sup> this measure would be expected to  
202 increase the estimated treatment effect in a given RCT *if* a direct treatment effect exists  
203 when comparing the intervention and control groups and when analgesic use is  
204 differential across groups. In contrast, if no direct treatment effect exists when  
205 comparing the intervention and control treatments and when there is no treatment  
206 impact on analgesic use, then the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> would not be expected to change estimated  
207 treatment comparisons.<sup>5</sup> With this reasoning in mind, we pre-specified a subset of RCTs  
208 from the AHRQ systematic review for further study in a meta-analysis comparing

209 different methods of accounting for post-randomization concurrent analgesic use on  
210 estimated treatment effects on pain intensity. In this subset of RCTs, we expected  
211 clinically-relevant treatment effects *a priori* given the intervention and control treatments  
212 involved. Accordingly, we hypothesized that, in this subset of RCTs, analyses of the  
213 QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> would produce larger treatment effects than analyses of the conventional NRS.  
214 As we have described elsewhere,<sup>5</sup> the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> estimates a *controlled direct* treatment  
215 effect, whereas the conventional NRS estimates a *total* treatment effect, so each of  
216 these two measures targets a slightly different estimand. The subset of RCTs from the  
217 AHRQ review included those comparing (1) vertebral augmentation vs. usual care  
218 control, and (2) cooled RFA vs. control.<sup>9</sup> We also pre-specified (3) a group of “positive  
219 control” interventional trials from outside the AHRQ review to include in the meta-  
220 analysis, in order to encompass another interventional pain treatment for which  
221 clinically-relevant treatment effects would generally be expected. For this positive  
222 control group, we selected trials of transforaminal epidural steroid injections (TF ESI) vs.  
223 control for lumbosacral radicular pain, as such trials have generally shown consistent  
224 statistically significant treatment effects on pain intensity in past RCTs.<sup>12</sup> Pain intensity  
225 data for RCTs of TF ESI were extracted from a Cochrane systematic review,<sup>12</sup> and  
226 analgesic data were extracted from the original articles.

227 Any RCT in these 3 groups of trials which reported a pain intensity outcome at the  
228 time of the primary endpoint, and also reported concurrent analgesic use, contributed to  
229 the meta-analyses. We conducted random-effects meta-analyses. The first meta-  
230 analysis estimated the total treatment effect on pain intensity using the conventional  
231 pain intensity NRS. The second meta-analysis estimated the treatment effect on the

232 post-randomization proportion of concurrent analgesic use. These two meta-analyses  
233 examine standard outcomes that are typically reported in pain RCTs. The third meta-  
234 analysis estimated the approximate controlled direct treatment effect on pain intensity  
235 using the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>.<sup>5</sup> The QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> assumes that the average impact of analgesic use is  
236 a 1.5-NRS-point change in pain intensity, but otherwise estimates a well-defined  
237 contrast in mean values of a weighted composite outcome so is more generally a valid  
238 comparison.<sup>5</sup> Last, the fourth meta-analysis directly assessed the impact of the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>  
239 by comparing the difference between analyses of treatment effects on pain intensity  
240 using paired analyses of the conventional pain NRS as compared to the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>.  
241 Accordingly, the primary statistical inference for the secondary aim of this study was  
242 based on the fourth meta-analysis; we note that the p-value produced by this meta-  
243 analysis is equivalent to that produced by the second meta-analysis (which examined  
244 the proportion of concurrent analgesic use across the included RCTs). We considered a  
245 p-value <0.05 as the threshold for statistical significance. We examined the differences  
246 in heterogeneity ( $I^2$ ) of the meta-analyses with the conventional NRS vs. the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>.  
247 Details of the meta-analyses can be found in the Supplemental Materials.

248

## 249 **RESULTS**

250

251 The characteristics of the 37 trials included in the current review are listed in Table 1.  
252 We found that 17 of 37 (46%) of trials reported concurrent analgesic use at baseline  
253 and that the most common method used was to report the prevalence of any opioid use  
254 (11 of 37 [30%] of all trials) (Table 2).

255 We also found that 20 of 37 (54%) of the studied trials reported concurrent analgesic  
256 use post-randomization and that the most common method used was to report the  
257 prevalence of any analgesic use (11 of 37 (30%) of all trials) (Table 3). Four of 37 (11%)  
258 of trials used analgesic scoring methods that were specific to their trial and not  
259 otherwise widely used in the field. For example, one trial created an arbitrary grading for  
260 each type and/or dose of analgesic and summed the gradings across analgesics  
261 used.<sup>13</sup> The most common method of incorporating analgesic use in analyses was to  
262 report analgesic use as a binary outcome. Fourteen of 37 (38%) of trials analyzed  
263 whether the pain intervention affected the frequency of analgesic use. Only one trial  
264 accounted for concurrent analgesic use directly in their analysis of treatment effects on  
265 pain intensity, by using a binary composite “responder” outcome. This responder  
266 outcome was defined as a 30% pre-to-post reduction in pain intensity without an  
267 increase in pain medication.<sup>14</sup> None of the included trials accounted for analgesic use  
268 using the approach of treating the pain NRS as if it was missing when there is  
269 concurrent analgesic use, a strategy that is sometimes used.<sup>10</sup>

270 Only 5 trials from the AHRQ systematic review met our pre-specified inclusion  
271 criteria (intervention-control comparisons for which clinically relevant treatment effects  
272 were expected *a priori*) and had the requisite data needed to calculate the QPAC<sub>1,5</sub> in  
273 treatment and control groups (pain intensity outcome reporting and concurrent  
274 analgesic use prevalence at the primary pain intensity endpoint), and therefore were  
275 included in the meta-analyses.<sup>15-19</sup> Four meta-analyses were conducted in this  
276 subgroup of 5 trials. Among the trials of transforaminal lumbar epidural steroid injections  
277 from the Cochrane review that we considered for inclusion in the meta-analysis (the

278 “positive control” group),<sup>12</sup> none reported concurrent analgesic use at the primary  
279 endpoint when pain intensity outcomes were reported. Therefore, the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> could not  
280 be calculated for these studies and they were not included in the meta-analyses.

281 In the first meta-analysis, we examined treatment effects on the conventional pain  
282 intensity NRS at the primary trial endpoint in the 5 trials that met our inclusion criteria.  
283 This revealed a significant (beneficial) average treatment effect on pain intensity  
284 comparing the interventional treatments to controls of -2.31 NRS points (95% CI -3.50  
285 to -1.11, Supplemental Figure 1), reflecting less pain in those who received  
286 interventional pain treatments. In the second meta-analysis, we estimated the average  
287 treatment effect on the post-randomization proportion of concurrent analgesic use. We  
288 found a statistically significant 30% lower proportion of analgesic use in patients who  
289 received the interventional treatments ( $p < 0.001$ ), as compared to the control treatments  
290 (Supplemental Figure 2).

291 In the third meta-analysis, we estimated treatment effects on pain intensity  
292 measured using the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>. We found a large-magnitude treatment effect for  
293 interventional pain treatments as compared to control treatments (Supplemental Figure  
294 3), with an estimated difference of -2.77 points on the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> (95% CI -4.17 to -1.37).  
295 This treatment effect point estimate (-2.77 points) was slightly larger than the treatment  
296 effect on the pain intensity NRS (-2.31 points) found in the first meta-analysis. One trial  
297 of the 5 included in the meta-analysis, which had not show a statistically significant  
298 improvement with the interventional treatment when analyzing the conventional pain  
299 intensity NRS (Supplemental Figure 1), *did* show a statistically significant improvement  
300 with the interventional treatment when analyzing the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>.<sup>16</sup> Finally, in the fourth

301 meta-analysis, on which we based our primary statistical inference, we estimated the  
302 difference between treatment effects using the conventional pain NRS as reported and  
303 treatment effects using the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>. We found a significantly larger overall treatment  
304 effect with the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> as compared to the standard analysis of the conventional NRS  
305 while ignoring concurrent analgesic use, with a reduction in pain intensity of -0.45 NRS  
306 points [95% CI -0.76 to -0.14];  $p < 0.001$  (Figure 1). This indicates a nearly 0.5 NRS-  
307 point larger treatment effect on pain intensity when accounting for concurrent analgesic  
308 use via the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>. Heterogeneity with all four analyses was high (85-90%).

309 Sensitivity analyses assuming different correlations between concurrent analgesic  
310 use and pain NRS scores, and using leave-one-out meta-analyses, did not show  
311 material differences from the primary results in terms of treatment effect estimates or  
312 heterogeneity (data not shown).

313

## 314 **DISCUSSION**

315 This study sought to determine the frequency of reporting concurrent analgesics use  
316 at baseline and post-randomization among interventional pain RCTs included in a high-  
317 quality systematic review of interventional procedural treatments for pain. We also  
318 conducted a meta-analysis to determine if accounting for concurrent analgesic use in  
319 analyses of pain intensity using a novel composite pain intensity-analgesia outcome, the  
320 QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>, would produce a significantly larger treatment effect size than analyses of the  
321 conventional pain NRS. We found that only half of the trials studied reported whether  
322 concurrent analgesics were used at baseline and post-randomization, and only one trial  
323 directly accounted for concurrent analgesic use post-randomization in the primary pain

324 intensity outcome.<sup>14</sup> Our meta-analysis found that accounting for concurrent analgesic  
325 use with the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> led to statistically significantly larger treatment effects on pain  
326 intensity of -0.45 NRS points (95%CI -0.76 to -0.14) compared to analyses of pain  
327 intensity using the conventional NRS.

328 Randomized controlled pain trials are very important for determining the  
329 effectiveness of new interventional pain medicine treatments. Recent work suggests  
330 that a seemingly minor secondary outcome reported in pain RCTs, concurrent analgesic  
331 use, can have a substantial impact on overall treatment effect estimates, sometimes  
332 affecting whether a trial yields a statistically significant result for the primary pain  
333 intensity endpoint.<sup>6</sup> The current study highlights that only half of interventional pain trials  
334 studied in a major systematic review reported concurrent analgesic use. Moreover,  
335 when pain trials do assess and report concurrent analgesic use, they usually report it as  
336 the prevalence of any analgesic used and do not directly account for this use in their  
337 primary outcomes. Assessing analgesic use as a binary outcome does not allow  
338 investigators to account for analgesic use in the analyses of treatment effects on pain  
339 intensity, but treats analgesic use as a distinct outcome, when in actuality both pain  
340 intensity and analgesic use outcomes reflect different aspects of the same pain  
341 construct (improvement in pain intensity). This can alter treatment effect estimates and  
342 potentially fundamentally affect the main conclusions drawn from a pain RCT. A unique  
343 finding from the current study is that accounting for concurrent analgesic use when  
344 analyzing pain intensity outcomes using the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> increased treatment effect  
345 estimates on pain intensity by nearly 0.5 NRS points, indicating a larger *beneficial* effect  
346 of the procedural treatments studied. One out of 5 trials in the meta-analysis shifted



347 from having non-significant to significant effects on pain intensity after applying the  
348 QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>.<sup>16</sup> This illustrates how accounting for analgesic use and pain intensity in the  
349 same composite outcome can potentially improve the power of pain RCTs and even  
350 affect the main conclusions drawn from certain trials. This finding is consistent with prior  
351 work,<sup>5</sup> supporting the composite score's validity.

352 The current study's findings reinforce the need to uniformly report and account for  
353 analgesic use in interventional pain trials. The pre-specified subset of RCTs we selected  
354 for the current meta-analysis was chosen specifically because they included treatment  
355 vs. control contrasts where large treatment effects on pain intensity were expected. This  
356 is the context in which larger between-group differences in analgesic would be  
357 expected, resulting in larger estimates of the treatment effects on pain intensity when  
358 using the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>. It cannot be expected that the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> will always increase  
359 treatment effect size estimated on pain intensity when applied to RCT data, however,  
360 and in the context of an RCT of a treatment with no meaningful treatment effect on pain  
361 intensity, the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> would not be expected to produce a net increase in treatment  
362 effect size.

363 One implication of this study is that a lack of accounting for concurrent analgesic use  
364 may increase the proportion of trials not finding statistically significant between-group  
365 differences in treatment effects and may decrease the size of the estimated treatment  
366 effects such that clinically relevant treatment effects are interpreted as not being  
367 clinically relevant.<sup>20</sup> This may carry forward into evidence synthesis and clinical practice  
368 guidelines, resulting in potentially effective pain treatments being discarded. This

369 possibility suggests that further studies of methods to account for concurrent analgesic  
370 use in pain RCTs should perhaps be a high priority for future research.

371 A strength of the current work is that it is the first comprehensive study to examine  
372 the frequency of reporting of concurrent analgesic use and the impact of analgesic use  
373 on the overall treatment effects of interventional pain trials. Limitations include the fact  
374 that we included clinical trials from only one systematic review of interventional pain  
375 trials from 2021, which focused primarily on emerging interventional treatments. These  
376 findings therefore may not represent other trials of other pain treatments, nor the current  
377 state of pain trials reported in the last 4 years. While responder outcomes were not  
378 examined in this study, as the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> is oriented towards analysis of mean outcomes  
379 and the same responder outcomes were not reliably reported across studies (i.e., not  
380 permitting meta-analysis), the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> approach could be converted into a binary  
381 responder outcome. Furthermore, heterogeneity was high in the meta-analyses we  
382 conducted, but was consistently high with or without applying the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub>. We used a  
383 random-effects meta-analysis to account for this, yet despite the often lower power of  
384 this meta-analytic approach, we still found statistically significant results. Nevertheless,  
385 future studies are needed to evaluate the applicability of the current findings to trials of  
386 other procedural and non-procedural pain treatments.

387

## 388 **CONCLUSIONS**

389 This study found that about half of non-surgical interventional pain RCTs from a  
390 major systematic review did not report on post-randomization concurrent analgesic use,

391 and that only one trial accounted for analgesic use directly in analyses of treatment  
392 effects on pain intensity at the primary trial endpoint. When accounting for concurrent  
393 analgesic use with the QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> in a meta-analysis, treatment effects on pain intensity  
394 were nearly 0.5 NRS points larger compared to when concurrent analgesic use was  
395 ignored. Future studies are needed to determine how pain trials should best account for  
396 concurrent analgesic use in the analyses of pain intensity outcomes. Applying those  
397 methods to pain RCTs may improve our ability to identify treatments with clinically  
398 relevant effects.

399

#### 400 *ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS*

401 We thank Coralynn Sack, MD, MPH for providing feedback on the final manuscript.

402 *Funding source:* We thank the UW CLEAR Center for partial study funding and  
403 provision of methodologic guidance by the CLEAR Center Methodologic Core.

404

405

406

407 **REFERENCES**

- 408 1. *Relieving Pain in America: A Blueprint for Transforming Prevention, Care,*  
409 *Education, and Research.* Washington (DC); 2011.
- 410 2. Dzau V, Pizzo P. Relieving pain in America: insights from an Institute of Medicine  
411 committee. *JAMA.* 2014;312:1507-1508.
- 412 3. Chou R, Deyo R, Friedly J, Al. E. *Noninvasive Treatments for Low Back Pain.*  
413 Rockville, MD; 2016.
- 414 4. Skelly A, Chou R, Dettori J, Al. E. *Noninvasive Nonpharmacological Treatment for*  
415 *Chronic Pain: A Systematic Review Update.* Rockville (MD); 2020.
- 416 5. Suri P, Heagerty PJ, Korpak A, et al. Improving Power and Accuracy in  
417 Randomized Controlled Trials of Pain Treatments by Accounting for Concurrent  
418 Analgesic Use. *J Pain.* 2023;24(2):332-344. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2022.09.017
- 419 6. Suri P, Heagerty P, Timmons A, Jensen M. Description and initial validation of a  
420 novel measure of pain intensity: the Numeric Rating Scale of Underlying Pain  
421 without concurrent Analgesic use. *Pain.* 2024;165(7):1482-1492.
- 422 7. Grøvlø L, Hasvik E, Haugen AJ. Impact of rescue medication in placebo-  
423 controlled trials of pharmacotherapy for neuropathic pain and low back pain. *Pain.*  
424 2022;163(3):E417-E425. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002380
- 425 8. Chou R, Fu R, Dana T, Pappas M, Hart E, Mauer KM. Interventional Treatments  
426 for Acute and Chronic Pain: Systematic Review. 2021;(247).  
427 [https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/products/interventional-treatments-](https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/products/interventional-treatments-pain/research)  
428 [pain/research.](https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/products/interventional-treatments-pain/research)
- 429 9. Sridhar B, Staab C, Suri P. A Meta-Epidemiologic Study of Methods used to  
430 Account for Concurrent Treatments in Randomized Controlled Trials of Pain  
431 Interventions. Open Science Framework.
- 432 10. Estimation methods for estimands using the treatment policy strategy; a  
433 simulation study based on the PIONEER 1 TRIAL. *arXiv.* 2024.
- 434 11. Cohen SP, Bhaskar A, Bhatia A, et al. Consensus practice guidelines on  
435 interventions for lumbar facet joint pain from a multispecialty, international working  
436 group. *Reg Anesth Pain Med.* 2020;0:1-44. doi:10.1136/rapm-2019-101243
- 437 12. Oliveira C, Maher C, Ferreira M, et al. Epidural corticosteroid injections for  
438 lumbosacral radicular pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2020;(4).
- 439 13. Peng B, Pang X, Wu Y, Zhao C, Song X. A randomized placebo-controlled trial of  
440 intradiscal methylene blue injection for the treatment of chronic discogenic low  
441 back pain. *Pain.* 2010;149(1):124-129.
- 442 14. Deer T, Pope J, Benyamin R, et al. Prospective, Multicenter, Randomized,

- 443 Double-Blinded, Partial Crossover Study to Assess the Safety and Efficacy of the  
444 Novel Neuromodulation System in the Treatment of Patients With Chronic Pain of  
445 Peripheral Nerve Origin. *Neuromodulation*. 2016;19(1):91-100.
- 446 15. Blasco J, Martinez-Ferrer A, MacHo J, et al. Effect of vertebroplasty on pain relief,  
447 quality of life, and the incidence of new vertebral fractures: A 12-month  
448 randomized follow-up, controlled trial. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2012;27(5):1159-1166.  
449 doi:10.1002/jbmr.1564
- 450 16. Chen D, An Z, Song S, Al. E. Percutaneous vertebroplasty compared with  
451 conservative treatment in patients with chronic painful osteoporotic spinal  
452 fractures. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2014;21(3):473-477.
- 453 17. Berenson J, Pflugmacher R, Jarzem P, Al. E. Balloon kyphoplasty versus non-  
454 surgical fracture management for treatment of painful vertebral body compression  
455 fractures in patients with cancer: a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*  
456 *Oncol*. 2011;12(3):225-235.
- 457 18. Wardlaw D, Cummings S, Van Meirhaeghe J, Al. E. Efficacy and safety of balloon  
458 kyphoplasty compared with nonsurgical care for vertebral compression fracture  
459 (FREE): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9668):1016-1024.
- 460 19. Cohen S, Hurley R, Buckenmaier C, Al. E. Randomized placebo-controlled study  
461 evaluating lateral branch radiofrequency denervation for sacroiliac joint pain.  
462 *Anesthesiology*. 2008;109(2):279-288.
- 463 20. Finnerup, NB Haroutounian S, Baron R, Dworkin R, et al. Neuropathic pain  
464 clinical trials: factors associated with decreases in estimated drug efficacy. *Pain*.  
465 2018;159(11):2339-2346.
- 466

467 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

468

469

470 **Figure 1.** Forest plot of the difference in the treatment effect on the conventional pain  
471 intensity NRS (ignoring concurrent analgesic use) vs. the treatment effect on the  
472 QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> (n=5 trials)

473

474 Point estimates less than 0 indicate that the treatment effect on pain intensity using the  
475 QPAC<sub>1.5</sub> is, on average, larger than the treatment effect on pain intensity using the  
476 conventional pain NRS. Whiskers show the bounds of the 95% confidence intervals.

**Table 1. Characteristics of Analyzed Trials**

Author	Year	Intervention	Control (sham vs usual care)	Number randomized to intervention	Number randomized to control
Buchbinder	2009	Vertebroplasty	Sham	38	40
Blasco	2012	Vertebroplasty	Usual care	64	61
Yang	2016	Vertebroplasty	Usual care	66	69
Clark	2016	Vertebroplasty	Sham	61	59
Firanesco	2018	Vertebroplasty	Sham	91	89
Hansen	2019	Vertebroplasty	Sham	26	26
Kallmes	2009	Vertebroplasty	Sham	68	63
Chen	2014	Vertebroplasty	Usual care	46	50
Farrokhi	2011	Vertebroplasty	Usual care	40	42
Klazen	2010	Vertebroplasty	Usual care	93	95
Leali	2016	Vertebroplasty	Usual care	200	200
Rousing	2009	Vertebroplasty	Usual care	26	24
Voormolen	2007	Vertebroplasty	Usual care	18	16
Berenson	2011	Kyphoplasty	Usual care	70	64
Wardlaw	2009	Kyphoplasty	Usual care	149	151
Cady	2015	Sphenopalatine nerve block	Usual care	27	14
Serra	2012	Occipital nerve stimulation	Sham	16	16
Silberstein	2012	Occipital nerve stimulation	Sham	105	52
Saper	2011	Occipital nerve stimulation	Usual care	49	17
Cohen	2008	Cooled radiofrequency ablation	Sham	14	14
Patel	2012	Cooled radiofrequency ablation	Sham	34	17
McCormick	2019	Cooled radiofrequency ablation	Usual care	21	18
Kroll	2008	Pulsed radiofrequency ablation	Continuous RFA	13	13
Moussa	2020	Pulsed radiofrequency ablation	Sham and continuous RFA	100	50
Tekin	2007	Pulsed radiofrequency ablation	Sham and continuous RFA	20	40
Wosornu	2016	Intradiscal PRP Injection	Sham	36	22
Amirdelfan	2020	Intradiscal Stem Cell Injection	Sham	30	20
Kallewaard	2019	Intradiscal Methylene Blue Injection	Sham	40	41
Peng	2010	Intradiscal Methylene Blue Injection	Sham	36	36
Haseeb	2019	Intradiscal Ozone Injection	Sham	80	20
Nilachandra	2016	Intradiscal Ozone Injection	Usual care	40	40
Gallucci	2007	Intradiscal Ozone Injection	Usual care	82	77
Childers	2002	Piriformis Injection	Sham	5	5
Fishman	2002	Piriformis Injection	Sham	63	24
Fishman	2017	Piriformis Injection	Sham	26	28
Misirlioglu	2015	Piriformis Injection	Sham	25	22
Deer	2016	Peripheral nerve stimulation	Sham	45	49

477

<b>Table 2. Reporting of Concurrent Analgesic Use at Baseline Among Included RCTs (n=37)</b>	
<b>Analgesic use Characteristics</b>	<b>n (%)</b>
<b>Reported analgesic use at baseline</b> (any method)	17 (46%)
<b>Method used to report concurrent analgesia*</b>	
Average dose of medication	4 (11%)
Prevalence of any opioid use	11 (30%)
Prevalence of non-opioid use	7 (19%)
Prevalence of individual medication use	1 (3%)
Prevalence of any analgesic use	7 (19%)
Other method	1 (3%)

\*Some studies reported more than one method

478

<b>Table 3. Reporting on Concurrent Analgesic Use Post-Randomization Among Included RCTs (n=37)</b>	
<b>Analgesic use Characteristics</b>	<b>n (%)</b>
<b>Reported analgesic use post-randomization</b> (any method)	20 (54%)
<b>Method used to report concurrent analgesia</b>	
Average dose of medication	1 (3%)
Prevalence of any opioid use	4 (11%)
Prevalence of non-opioid use	3 (8%)
Prevalence of individual medication use	1 (3%)
Prevalence of any analgesic use	11 (30%)
Other method	4 (11%)

479

480

481





