

Running title: Measuring the adequacy of cancer pain management

How do we measure the adequacy of cancer pain management? Testing the performance of 4 commonly used measures and steps towards measurement refinement

Vanja Cabric^{§4,7*}, Rebecca Harrison^{§7*,9}, Lynn R. Gauthier^{8*,10,11,12,13}, Carol A Graham^{5,7*}, Lucia Gagliese^{1,2,3,6,7*,8*}

¹School of Kinesiology and Health Science, York University, Toronto, Canada.

Departments of Anesthesia² Psychiatry³, Pediatrics⁴ and Medicine⁵, University of Toronto, Toronto Ontario Canada

⁶Department of Anesthesia and Pain Management, Mount Sinai Hospital, Sinai Health System, Toronto, Canada

⁷Department of Anesthesia and Pain Management, University Health Network, Toronto, Canada;

⁸Department of Supportive Care, Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, University Health Network, Toronto, ON, Canada.

⁹Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's Newfoundland Canada

¹⁰Department of Family and Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada.

¹¹Équipe de recherche Michel-Sarrazin en oncologie psychosociale et soins palliatifs, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada.

¹²CHU de Québec-Université Laval Research Center, Oncology Division, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada.

¹³Université Laval Cancer Research Center, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada.

Number of tables: 6

Number of figures: 0

§ co-first authorship

* former affiliation

Address correspondence to: Lucia Gagliese

Professor, School of Kinesiology and Health Science, York University
367 Norman Bethune College, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M3J 1P3.
Telephone:416-736-2100(#77234). email:gagliese@yorku.ca

Key words: Pain Management Index, cancer pain, pain management adequacy, construct validity

Disclosures: This work was supported by awards from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR MOP-62866) and the Canada Foundation for Innovation to LG. LRG is supported by a Fonds de recherche - Santé de Quebec Research Scholars Junior 1 award in partnership with the Quebec Breast Cancer Foundation and the Fondation J.-Louis Lévesque. These funding sources had no involvement in the study design, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data, the writing of the report, and the decision to submit the article for publication.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Presented, in part, at the 39th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Canadian Pain Society, Montreal, QC, May 24-26, 2018

Abstract

Although pain is the most common and disabling cancer symptom requiring management, the best index of cancer pain management adequacy is unknown. While the Pain Management Index is most commonly used, other indices have included relief, satisfaction, and pain intensity. We evaluated their correlations and agreement, compared their biopsychosocial correlates, and investigated whether they represented a single construct reflecting the adequacy of cancer pain management in 269 people with advanced cancer and pain. Despite moderate-to-severe average pain in 52.8% of participants, 85.1% had PMI scores suggesting adequate analgesia, pain relief was moderate and satisfaction was high. Correlations and agreement were low-to-moderate, suggesting low construct validity. Although the correlates of pain management adequacy were multidimensional, including lower pain interference, neuropathic and nociceptive pain, and catastrophizing, shorter cancer duration, and greater physical symptoms, no single index captured this multidimensionality. Principal component analysis demonstrated a single underlying construct, thus we constructed the Adequacy of Cancer Pain Management from factor loadings. It had somewhat better agreement, however correlates were limited to pain interference and neuropathic pain. This study demonstrates the psychometric shortcomings of commonly used indices. We provide suggestions for future research to improve measurement, a critical step in optimizing cancer pain management.

Perspective: The Pain Management Index and other commonly used indices of cancer pain management adequacy have poor construct validity. This study provides suggestions to improve the measurement of the adequacy of cancer pain management.

Introduction

Pain is among the most common symptoms of cancer and interferes with multiple aspects of daily life. Unrelieved pain impacts wellbeing, relationships, and is associated with suicidality^{16,37,38,79,96,107}. It carries an economic burden, causing unnecessary or prolonged hospitalization³⁹. It may also contribute to opioid seeking outside medical settings^{6,18,119}.

Despite our best treatments, 51-64% of patients with cancer continue to report pain^{19,108} with 35-49% reporting moderate-to-severe pain^{19,84}. To date, we have not identified the best way to measure how well this pain is managed. Prior to the World Health Organization's (WHO) 2018 update to their cancer pain management guidelines¹²³, the standard of care for cancer pain was based on the WHO's three-step analgesic ladder, which offers recommendations on which analgesic class to prescribe based on pain intensity⁸⁵. It has been suggested that, if followed, these recommendations are 80-90% effective in treating cancer pain¹²². However, the analgesic ladder has been criticized due to its focus on opioids as the primary method of analgesia and the lack of controlled clinical trials demonstrating its ability to provide patients with adequate pain management^{1,3,58}. In order to improve treatment of cancer pain and identify at-risk patients, it is vital to accurately quantify pain management adequacy.

Despite the recent WHO update¹²³, the Pain Management Index (PMI) remains the most commonly used index of the adequacy of cancer pain management^{24,28,31,50,100}. It compares the highest WHO ladder score of prescribed analgesics to reported worst pain intensity to create a numerical index which is then categorized as "Adequate" or "Inadequate" pain management²⁴. Following its initial development, the PMI was further refined by the inclusion of adjuvant analgesics in the "Non-opioid analgesics" category¹¹. Despite its ubiquity, the PMI's validity remains to be elucidated, and the cross-study variability in the proportion of inadequately

managed patients, ranging from 4% to 82%^{28,31,40,50,64,100,101,106,112,117}, makes it difficult to draw conclusions about pain management as assessed with the PMI.

Other indices of pain management adequacy have included pain intensity, pain relief, and satisfaction with pain control^{55,67,81,120,121}. However, the percentage of cancer patients receiving adequate pain management varies widely depending on the measure used^{120,121}. While no studies have assessed the agreement between different indices, many studies comparing two or more of these measures have found that the assessments based on different measures are often inconsistent^{32,62,98,121}. Thus, the best index remains unknown. It is possible that any single index provides information about only one of many different dimensions of pain management, but does not fully capture an individual's pain management experience.

As cancer pain is a multidimensional experience that is impacted by psychosocial factors^{86,110}, it is possible that psychosocial factors also impact cancer pain management, as well as the various management adequacy indices. For example, increasing age, female gender, and minority status predict inadequate pain management on the PMI^{22,24,33,106}. Pain intensity is correlated with functional status, depression, anxiety, anger, confusion and fatigue^{49,68}. Beliefs about cancer pain are also associated with pain relief scores⁵⁷. This indicates that beyond the treatments provided to patients, psychosocial factors may impact differently across the various indices of pain management. These differences may provide insight as to why the indices frequently provide conflicting reports.

Given the possibility that these indices measure somewhat different, but potentially overlapping, aspects of pain management, considering them together may provide a more comprehensive assessment of pain management adequacy. The objective of this study was to

assess agreement among four commonly used indices of cancer pain management and relationships among the indices, and to compare their biopsychosocial correlates. We also investigated whether the four indices are indicators of the same underlying construct representing the adequacy of cancer pain management.

Materials and Methods

Participants

This is a secondary analysis of a larger study on which we have previously reported analyses of unrelated research questions^{43,44,46,47,71,73} Clinic outpatients of Princess Margaret Cancer Centre and people receiving home palliative care in Toronto, Ontario were recruited between May 2006 and August 2012. Inclusion criteria were 1) Age ≥ 18 ; 2) advanced cancer operationally defined as metastatic or unresectable; 3) pain due to the disease or treatment; and 4) sufficient English language ability to provide informed consent and complete the questionnaires. Those with documented cognitive impairment, identified by healthcare provider or a score of <20 on the SOMC, were excluded from the study⁵⁹. Ethical approval was obtained from the research ethics boards of the University Health Network, York University and Mount Sinai Hospital.

The clinical team identified potentially eligible participants, who was then approached by a Research Assistant (RA). The RA explained the study and obtained informed consent from eligible patients who wished to participate. The RA then collected demographic, disease and treatment-related information through a brief interview and medical chart review. Participants were provided with a questionnaire package that they completed with the help of the RA or took home to complete. Reminder phone calls were made after two weeks to participants who had not yet returned questionnaire packages. Reasons for participant withdrawal were recorded.

Measures

Patient demographic information collected included age, sex, ethnicity, primary language, religion, education, marital and parental status, and living arrangements. Patient clinical information collected included cancer duration, pain duration, primary tumor type, presence of chronic non-malignant pain and information regarding treatment modalities.

Outcome Variables.

Four facets of pain management were used: Satisfaction with Pain Control (SAT), Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) Average Pain, BPI Relief, and Pain Management Index (PMI).

SAT was measured with an 11-point numeric rating scale (NRS), with a score of 0 describing “extremely dissatisfied, and a score of 10 describing “extremely satisfied”.

The Brief Pain Inventory²⁵ measures different aspects of pain intensity, interference, and management. The BPI Average Pain score is an 11-point NRS of average pain over the past 24 hours, with 0 representing “no pain”, and 10 representing “pain as bad as you can imagine”.

BPI Relief is assessed with a 1-item question on the BPI assessing the percent relief achieved by the pain treatments that patients are using, ranging from 0% to 100%²⁵.

The PMI is calculated using the BPI Worst Pain Score (BPI-W) and the analgesics prescribed. The BPI-W describes pain at its worst in the past 24 hours, on an 11-point NRS. The PMI is calculated using the following steps. First, the patient’s BPI Worst Pain Score is categorized as: 0-no pain (BPI-W=0), 1-mild pain (BPI-W=1-3), 2-moderate pain (BPI-W=4-7), 3-severe pain (BPI-W=8-10). The patient’s analgesic is then categorized according to the World Health Organization’s (WHO) Analgesic Ladder: 0-no analgesic; 1-non-opioid/adjuvant; 2-weak opioid, 3-strong opioid. Finally, the BPIW category (range 0-3) is subtracted from the WHO

Analgesic Ladder score, to give a score ranging from -3 to +3. Pain management is considered inadequate if $PMI < 0$ ²⁴.

Other pain and physical and psychosocial well-being measures:

The following measures were selected for their impact on the biopsychosocial aspects of pain management. These were selected for the larger study^{43,44} where they are described in full.

The BPI was used to measure Pain Interference. This measure includes 7 items assessing pain interference in various aspects of daily life (e.g. “general activity”, “sleeping”, “relations with others”, etc.) with scores ranging from 0 (does not interfere) to 10 (completely interferes).

The Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire 2 (SF-MPQ 2) assesses 24 pain qualities on an 11-point intensity NRS³⁵. These qualities are categorized into the following subscales: Continuous, Intermittent, Neuropathic and Affective pain. We have previously reported on its validation in a subsample of this study⁴³.

Measures of physical function included: 1) the Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) to measure 19 potential comorbid conditions²¹, 2) the Karnofsky Performance Status Scale (KPS) to assess functional status as rated by the RA, ranging from 0 (dead) to 100 (no evidence of disease)⁸², 3) the Medical Outcomes Study 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) – Physical Health Component Score to assess general health and physical health-related quality of life¹¹⁸, and 4) the Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale (ESAS) to measure intensity of 9 cancer-related symptoms¹³. The ESAS has 2 subscales consisting of physical symptoms and psychological symptoms, however due to poor validity²⁰, the psychological symptom scale was excluded from the analysis. An average of ESAS physical symptoms was calculated, excluding pain intensity.

Measures of Psychological well-being included the Centre for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D) to measure depressive symptoms⁷⁶, the Pain Catastrophizing Scale (PCS)¹⁰⁹ to measure rumination, magnification, and helplessness toward the management of pain, the Pain Anxiety Symptom Scale (PASS-20) to measure fear and anxiety in reaction to pain⁹⁷, the Chronic Pain Acceptance Questionnaire (CPAQ) to assess pain acceptance¹¹⁶, the Pain Attitudes Questionnaire - Cancer (PAQ-C) to measure pain attitudes stoicism and cautiousness to label sensations as painful^{124,125}, the SF-36 Mental Health Component score, to measure mental health-related quality of life¹¹⁸, and the Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy – Spiritual Wellbeing 12 (FACIT-Sp 12) to measure spiritual wellbeing⁹¹.

Social measures that were used included the Medical Outcomes Social Support Survey to measure social support¹⁰³, the Experience in Close Relationships Inventory (ECR)¹² to measure attachment anxiety or avoidance in close relationships with others, and the Multidimensional Pain Inventory (MPI) Caregiver Responses Scale⁶⁰ to measure the extent to which patients perceived their significant other's responses to their pain as being solicitous, distracting and punishing.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all study measures, demographics and clinical factors.

In order to conduct a sensitivity-specificity analysis to assess the agreement between indices, each of the four main outcome variables was divided into two groups representing adequate and inadequate pain management. The PMI was divided into Adequate (≥ 0) and Inadequate (< 0) Pain Management²⁴. BPI Average Pain was divided into None-Mild (0-3) and Moderate-Severe (4-10) based on the cutoffs that determine pain descriptors (Mild, Moderate

and Severe) used in the PMI²⁴. SAT was divided into Low (0-7) and High (8-10) based on the median split. BPI Relief was divided into Inadequate (<50%) and Adequate (\geq 50%) based on patient perspectives of adequate pain management⁸¹. Sensitivity, specificity, and an accuracy index were calculated for each of the four main outcome variables in relation to each other. Cohen's Kappa was calculated for each pair of indices as a measure of agreement. Values are reported as slight (0 - .20), fair (.21 - .40), moderate (.41 - .60), substantial (.61 - .80) and almost perfect (.81 - 1) according to standard cutoffs⁶⁵.

Several procedures were carried out to identify correlates of the four main outcomes. Bivariate tests of association, using either Pearson correlation for continuous variables, or Spearman correlation for categorical variables were used to compare the four main outcomes first to each other, and then to pain and biopsychosocial well-being factors in order to determine which should be retained for entry into the multivariate models. Candidate correlates were chosen using an entry criterion of $p \leq 0.001$ with at least one outcome variable based on a Bonferroni correction. To avoid multicollinearity, when variables correlated at $r > 0.70$ with each other, one of these variables was chosen based on completeness of data and strength of association with the outcome variables. Previous literature suggests that age^{36,78} and gender^{22,33} contribute to differences in pain management outcomes; therefore they were forced into the regression models. Candidate correlates were then used in backward multivariate linear regression models (criteria to remove $p \geq .10$) to identify variables that were independently related to the 4 main outcomes ($p \leq 0.05$). Regressions were run separately for each outcome.

In order to assess whether the outcomes measure the same underlying construct, principal component analysis with the 4 outcomes was performed on the correlation matrix, with oblimin rotation. Components with Eigenvalues > 1 were retained.

Analyses were computed with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 23 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL). As reported ⁴⁴ Little's Missing Completely at Random test⁶⁹ demonstrated that missing data were missing completely at random or missing at random, therefore expectation maximization was used to impute missing data on questionnaires and scores were calculated using imputed values¹¹¹.

Results

Sample Characteristics

The study sample consisted of 269 participants recruited between May, 2006 and August, 2012. Recruitment details, and demographic and clinical characteristics of this sample ⁷³ and sub-samples of patients from this study(L.R. Gauthier et al., 2014; Lynn R Gauthier et al., 2018) have been reported previously. Table 1 describes demographic, clinical, and descriptive statistics for each outcome measure. The majority of the participants were female (57.6%) and Caucasian (77.7%). Participants ranged in age from 21 to 87 years of age, with mean age of the sample 57.6±11.7 years. The majority of participants (85.5%) reported English as their primary language. Most participants were married (64.3%), parents (73.2%), and living with their partner or other family members (78.8%). Cancer duration ranged from 1 month to 26 years. Primary tumor group varied among participants, with gastrointestinal being the most common (22.3%). Thirty-five percent had more than one comorbidity and 26.7% had co-occurring chronic non-malignant pain.

Pain intensity and control

Participants experienced a significant pain burden. Mean BPI Average pain was 3.91±2.14, and mean worst pain was 5.51±2.58. 74.7% reported moderate-to-severe Worst pain (≥ 4), and 52.8%

reported moderate-to-severe Average pain. All participants chose ≥ 1 non-neuropathic word on the SFMPQ-2 and 83% chose ≥ 1 neuropathic pain descriptors. The mean severities on the SFMPQ-2 Continuous and Intermittent subscales were 3.33 ± 2.15 and 2.53 ± 2.31 respectively, while the mean severity of the neuropathic scale was 2.03 ± 1.78 (Table 4).

Despite the significant burden of pain reported by the participants, mean BPI Relief was moderate ($68.2 \pm 23.6\%$) and mean SAT was high (7.00 ± 2.23). 90.4% of patients were prescribed an opioid, with 59.9% prescribed a strong opioid (Table 1). 87.4% of patients were prescribed ≥ 1 adjuvant medication^{7,8,10,15,34,61,66}. The most commonly prescribed adjuvant medications were gabapentin or pregabalin (33.8%). 85.1% of patients had a PMI score indicating adequate pain management (0-3).

Sensitivity, Specificity and Accuracy Index

Tables 2a-f display the distribution, sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy index of each of the outcome variables in relation to the others. PMI had a mean sensitivity of 21.3%, mean specificity of 90.6% and mean accuracy index of 61.1%. BPI Average Pain had a mean sensitivity of 75.4%, mean specificity of 56.5% and accuracy index of 59.9%. SAT had a mean sensitivity of 75.3%, mean specificity of 53.2% and accuracy index of 57.9%. BPI Relief had a mean sensitivity of 25.5%, specificity of 89.5% and accuracy index of 62.6%. Agreement was slight for most indices, except for BPI Average Pain to SAT, where it was fair, and BPI Average Pain to BPI Relief, where it was moderate (Table 3).

Multivariate Regression Analyses

At the bivariate level, all main outcomes were significantly correlated in the low to moderate range, suggesting little measurement overlap and low convergent validity (Table 4)²⁷.

Cancer duration, BPI Interference, all SFMPQ-2 subscales, ESAS average physical (excluding pain), CESD total, and PCS total each correlated at $p \leq 0.001$ with at least one main outcome and were deemed candidate correlates for the backward multivariate linear regressions (Table 4). Other physical and psychosocial well-being measures that did not meet this criterion were not considered further in the analysis. Descriptive data for these measures are reported elsewhere (Lynn R Gauthier et al., 2018; Kenneth Mah et al., 2017, 2018) . Including age and gender, 11 correlates were entered into the regression models, with none having to be excluded because of multicollinearity. Table 5 displays all significant correlates of each multivariate model.

For BPI Average Pain, three variables were significantly positively associated and were retained in the multivariate analysis. These were BPI Interference ($\beta = .381$, $p = .001$), SFMPQ-2 Continuous ($\beta = .317$, $p = .001$) and SFMPQ-2 Intermittent ($\beta = .122$, $p = .036$). This model accounted for 48% of the variance in average pain.

For BPI Relief, three variables were retained in the final multivariate model and two were significant negative correlates. These were BPI Interference ($\beta = -.164$, $p = .011$), and the SFMPQ-2 Neuropathic subscale ($\beta = -.243$, $p = .001$). Cancer duration was a significant positive correlate ($\beta = .113$, $p = .05$). This model accounted for only 12% of the variance in Relief.

For PMI, four variables were significant correlates and were retained in the multivariate analysis. These were BPI Interference ($\beta = -.263$, $p \leq .001$), SFMPQ-2 Continuous subscale ($\beta = -.304$, $p \leq .001$), ESAS physical average ($\beta = .185$, $p = .004$) and cancer duration ($\beta = -.151$, $p = .006$). This model accounted for 23% of the variance in PMI scores.

For SAT, four variables were retained in the multivariate analysis. Three variables were significant correlates. These were BPI Interference ($\beta = -.229$, $p = .002$), PCS total ($\beta = -.162$,

p=.014), and ESAS physical average ($\beta = .146$, $p=.039$). SFMPQ-2 Neuropathic subscale ($\beta = -.124$, $p=.062$) was also retained but did not reach significance. This model accounted for 11% of the variance in Satisfaction scores.

Principal Component Analysis

A single component was extracted by PCA of the four main outcomes. This variable explained 53.38% of the variance of the 4 main study outcomes. Table 6 shows the factor loadings of the 4 main study outcomes onto this component. The rank order from highest to lowest is BPI Average Pain, BPI Relief, SAT, and PMI.

Since only one component was extracted, a variable was constructed based on the factor loadings. Due to its relationship to the four main outcomes, pain and biopsychosocial well-being factors, this variable was interpreted as a composite measure of the adequacy of cancer pain management; therefore it was named Adequacy of Cancer Pain Management (ACPM) scale. The new variable was calculated using unstandardized b-values to form the following multiple regression equation: $ACPM = (BPI \text{ Average Pain} * -0.786) + (BPI \text{ Relief} * 0.761) + (SAT * 0.704) + (PMI * 0.666)$.

In order to determine cut-off values for adequate pain management as determined by the ACPM, a linear regression of ACPM was performed with BPI Interference. Based on the equation of the line of best fit, a cut-off ACPM value of 50.4 was determined as corresponding to BPI Interference score of 5 (the cut-off between adequate and inadequate pain management as determined by the clinically relevant outcome of pain interference), and thus was used as a cut-off in determining adequate and inadequate pain management based on the ACPM.

Sensitivity/specificity analysis of the ACPM was then performed in relation to the four main

outcome variables. Tables 2g-j display the results of these analyses. The ACPM had a mean sensitivity of 65.9%, mean specificity of 78.5%, and mean accuracy index of 70.6%. Agreement was slight with the PMI, fair with SAT, and moderate with BPI Average Pain and BPI Relief (Table 3).

Backward multivariate linear regression using the same candidate correlates as in the previous regression models was used to assess ACPM as a measure of adequacy of pain management. Linear regression determined that greater BPI Interference ($\beta = -.215$, $p=0.001$) and SFMPQ-2 Neuropathic pain ($\beta = -.259$, $p<0.001$) were associated with lower ACPM scores. Cancer duration was retained in the model but was not a significant correlate of the ACPM ($\beta = .101$, $p = .08$). This regression model accounted for 16% of the variance in ACPM scores.

In summary, BPI Interference was the only common correlate of all four main study outcomes and the ACPM. SFMPQ-2 Neuropathic was a significant negative correlate for both BPI Relief and the ACPM. It also showed a trend for a negative relationship with SAT. SFMPQ-2 Continuous was a correlate for both BPI Average Pain and the PMI. ESAS Physical was a common correlate of PMI and SAT. Cancer duration was associated with greater Relief, but lower PMI. There were no other common correlates.

Two variables were unique correlates with only one of the four main outcomes. PCS was a significant negative correlate of SAT. SFMPQ-2 Intermittent was a significant positive correlate of BPI Average Pain.

Discussion

This is the first study to compare agreement and the biopsychosocial correlates of four commonly used indices of cancer pain management adequacy. Although participants experienced a high pain burden, few were inadequately managed according to the PMI, and many were satisfied and reported high pain relief. Correlations were weak and agreement among indices was mainly low, suggesting low construct validity. While their correlates spanned the biopsychosocial spectrum, with the exception of pain interference, there was little consistency across indices. Taken together, these data suggest measurement inadequacy. We determined that four commonly used indices were indicators of the same underlying construct. As such, we constructed the novel Adequacy of Cancer Pain Management (ACPM) scale, which demonstrated somewhat better agreement. However, like the other indices, it did not capture the multidimensional nature of pain management. We provide suggestions for future research to improve measurement, a critical step in optimizing cancer pain management.

Although more than 75% of participants reported moderate-to-severe worst pain fewer than 15% had PMI scores suggesting undertreatment. This paradox is consistent with data from a large, multicentre study of patients with similar disease characteristics where more than 70% had moderate-to-severe pain, yet only 25% PMI scores suggesting undertreatment⁸⁰. The PMI's correlations with other indices were low-to-moderate, agreement was slight, and its sensitivity was the lowest of all indices. In a separate study, the PMI's sensitivity to detect pain interference was similarly low and varied widely with different cut-offs for inadequate management¹⁰⁰. It is not associated with wanting more focus on pain management¹¹². Moreover, the consistency by which it represents pain management adequacy may vary across cancer pain syndromes: Someone with severe worst pain in the context of bone metastases prescribed hydromorphone would be “adequately treated” ($3 [\text{WHO Analgesic ladder score}] - 3 [\text{worst pain score}] = 0$),

whereas someone with severe worst pain in the context of chemotherapy-induced neuropathy (CIPN) prescribed duloxetine, the only recommended agent for painful CIPN^{56,70} would be “undertreated” (1 [WHO Analgesic ladder/adjuvant score – 3 [worst pain score] = -2). Taken together, the PMI suffers from poor construct validity.

Like the PMI, correlations between satisfaction, relief, and average pain were low-to-moderate. Agreement was only marginally better than agreement on the PMI. Overall, this suggests that use of any single index is inadequate. Satisfaction and pain relief were high, consistent with the paradox of high pain burden and high satisfaction with pain management³⁰ and relief⁵⁵ noted in other studies.

These paradoxes may reflect the multidimensional nature of pain management. Negative PMI scores have been associated with poor performance status¹¹², impaired quality of life¹⁰², and high depressive symptoms⁴⁰. Satisfaction and relief have been associated with information received from the healthcare provider, willingness to take opioids, and beliefs about cancer pain, but not pain management^{30,57}. Pain intensity is associated with biopsychosocial factors, such as primary tumor type, depression, and social support^{5,42,51,93}, but only weakly associated with opioid use⁵⁵. This study also elucidates the multidimensional nature of pain management adequacy. Higher pain management adequacy was associated with lower pain interference (PMI, satisfaction, relief), neuropathic (satisfaction and relief) and nociceptive pain (PMI), but more severe physical symptoms (PMI), shorter cancer duration (PMI), and lower pain catastrophizing (satisfaction). However, no single index sufficiently captured this multidimensionality.

Importantly, the ability of each index to address the etiology of pain varied. In a separate study, patients with neuropathic pain were less likely than those without neuropathic pain to have negative PMI scores⁹⁶. This may simply reflect the PMI’s reliance on the WHO Analgesic

Ladder's scoring algorithm, which allocates higher scores to opioids while ignoring co-analgesics and evidence that some may be more appropriate than opioids or that they result in important opioid sparing effects for certain cancer pain syndromes^{70,94,95,114}.

In contrast with previous research^{22,24,28,33,96,102} age and sex were not associated with any of the indices. The indices' poor construct validity and sensitivity to detect adequate analgesia may be important contributors to cross-study inconsistencies. Future studies with better measures are needed to address age- and sex- and gender-related disparities in access to good cancer pain management.

This study contributes important empirical evidence describing the significant psychometric shortcomings of the PMI, and other, commonly used, single item indices of pain management adequacy. With respect to the PMI, cancer pain management is much more complex than the subtraction of pain intensity from a crudely constructed analgesic class scale.^{3,58,115} These indices ignore potentially important underlying constructs, including, but not limited to pain mechanism, drug dose, duration of action, breakthrough analgesia, and adherence to treatment guidelines and prescribing standards^{4,41,58,77,88,89,98,112,115}. They also ignore potential influencing factors, such as comorbidities, cognitive status, polypharmacy, concurrent non-pharmacological treatment and other pain self-management behaviours, patient goals, preferences, and values for pain management, and the social context of pain communication^{2,30,44,75,83,100}.

Despite the PMI's limitations, it continues to be the most widely used measure of analgesic adequacy⁵⁰. Meta-analyses of 64 studies published over 19 years have reported PMI-measured undertreatment ranging from 4% – 82%^{31,50}. This range has not narrowed substantially in more recently published studies^{28,40,64,96,105,112,117}, with undertreatment ranging from 14.9% in this

study to 77%¹¹². It is difficult to interpret these data in light of the measurement challenges exposed here. Together with growing criticisms of the PMI, they call into question findings from over a quarter century's worth of research into the adequacy of cancer pain management.

Given the major knowledge gaps resulting from inadequate assessment of cancer pain management, we attempted to refine its measurement. Principal component analysis determined all four indices tapped into a single underlying construct. Thus, we constructed the ACPM from the factor loadings of each index. It had somewhat better sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy than each individual index. However, the factors associated with lower ACPM were limited to higher pain interference and neuropathic pain. Thus, like other indices, the ACPM did not fully capture the multidimensional nature of pain management.

A new, comprehensive, multidimensional measure of cancer pain management adequacy is needed^{55,100}. It must be a valid and reliable measure of not only undertreatment, given the profound effects of inadequate pain management on patient wellbeing and the healthcare system^{39,52,53,79}, but also of overtreatment, a clinically relevant outcome just starting to be recognized(Paice & Von Roenn, 2014a). Clinical experience suggests the risk factors of overtreatment include , anxiety, depression, sleep difficulty, financial strain, and pre-existing substance use disorders, that it may be more frequent in post-treatment survivors than in those at other stages of the cancer continuum¹⁴, and that it may contribute to cognitive impairment, falls, sedation, opioid misuse and abuse, iatrogenic addiction, overdose, or death^{6,26,63,87,90}. Measures of overtreatment are unavailable. Studies are needed to determine its underlying constructs and defining characteristics.

Future measurement improvement efforts could also rely on core outcome measure recommendations for chronic pain clinical trials¹¹³. Alternatives to the WHO Analgesic Ladder

could be considered, such as the Medication Quantification Scale⁵⁴ which considers therapeutic class, dose, and clinical risks of analgesics and adjuvants, or the Analgesic Quantification Algorithm²³, which may be more sensitive than the WHO Analgesic Ladder to detect treatment responses. Efforts to quantify treatment should pay careful attention to inconsistencies in equianalgesic conversion factors²⁹, find ways to incorporate non-pharmacologic treatments and other pain self-management behaviours, and use dynamic methods of quantifying treatment response (P B Russell et al., 2006). Pain interference was a common correlate of all indices, highlighting its clinical relevance^{96,105} and importance in future tests of criterion validity and responsiveness.

Some limitations should be considered when interpreting these data. All patients had pain in the context of advanced cancer and most were receiving specialized symptom management. It is unclear how findings generalize to people at different phases of the cancer continuum not receiving such care. This is a secondary analysis of a larger study, and we used stringent criteria to identify correlates of pain management adequacy to minimize chance or spurious findings due to multiple tests. However, this may have contributed to the low number of correlates detected across indices. Future research with larger sample sizes should replicate and extend these analyses to other potentially important correlates. Finally, this is a cross-sectional study. Longitudinal studies are needed to assess intervention responses, given the dynamic nature of pain and its management^{99, 98}.

Four commonly used indices of cancer pain management adequacy have low construct validity and insufficiently capture the multidimensional nature of pain management. Pain is highly prevalent across the cancer continuum: 66.4% of patients with advanced cancer, 55% of patients undergoing active treatment, and 39.3% of patients after curative treatment report pain⁹.

Moreover, as people live for years or decades with cancer as a chronic illness⁹², and as survival rates grow^{17,104}, they may experience prolonged exposure to opioid management. The risks of this are unclear because we lack valid and reliable measures. Improved measurement would be an important, foundational step in efforts to optimize treatment for the many people who experience pain across the cancer continuum.

Acknowledgements: We thank the staff at Princess Margaret Cancer Centre and the Temmy Latner Centre for Palliative Care, Mount Sinai Hospital, and Laura Katz, Kim Thao Tran, and Victoria Treister for help with recruitment. We also thank the members of the Cancer Pain Research Unit for comments on earlier drafts of the manuscript. Most importantly, we are grateful to the participants, whose time and efforts made this study possible.

Table 1. Participant demographic and clinical information and descriptive statistics for pain management indices

N=269	Mean ± SD or N (%)
Age	57.56±11.74
Female	155 (57.6)
Caucasian Race	209 (77.7)
Primary language English	230 (85.8)
Affiliated with an organized religion	196 (74.2)
<i>Highest level of education</i>	
Elementary school or high school	94 (34.9)
College or bachelor's degree	131 (48.7)
Postgraduate degree	41 (15.2)
Missing	3 (1.1)
<i>Marital status</i>	
Married/partnered	173 (64.3)
Single	47 (17.5)
Separated or divorced	30 (11.2)
Widowed	19 (7.1)
Parent of one or more children	197 (73.2)
<i>Living arrangements</i>	

With partner or other family	212 (78.8)
Alone	53 (19.7)
Assisted living facility or with friends	4 (1.5)
<i>Recruitment site</i>	
Palliative Care Clinic	209 (77.7)
Other Solid Tumor Clinics	34 (12.6)
Pain Service	23 (8.6)
In-Home Palliative Care	3 (1.1)
<i>Primary Tumor Group</i>	
Gastrointestinal	60 (22.3)
Breast	48 (17.8)
Lung/Thoracic	45 (16.7)
Genitourinary	44 (16.4)
Gynecologic	32 (11.9)
Other	24 (8.9)
Head & Neck	15 (5.6)
Cancer Duration (months)	42.21±49.27
Pain Duration (months)	18.82±27.56
Ongoing chronic non-malignant pain	72 (26.8)
CCI >0	94 (35.1)
KPS	79.33 ± 10.49
ADS	2.54±2.12

<i>WHO Analgesic Ladder Score</i>	
No analgesics prescribed	2 (0.7)
Level 1 (Acetaminophen, ASA, NSAID, Adjuvant)	24 (8.9)
Level 2	82 (30.5)
Level 3	161 (59.9)
Prescribed weak opioid	124 (46.1)
Prescribed NSAID	64 (23.8)
Prescribed acetaminophen (alone or in combination with opioid)	138 (51.3)
Prescribed ASA	12 (4.5)
Prescribed an adjuvant	235 (87.4%)
BPI Average Pain	3.91 ± 2.14
PMI ≥ 0	229 (85.1)
Pain Relief (0-100%)	68.16 ± 23.64
Satisfaction with pain control	7.00 ± 2.23

Notes. ADS, Anticholinergic Drug Scale; CCI, Charlson Comorbidity Index; KPS, Karnofsky Performance Status Scale; WHO, World Health Organization; NSAID, Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory; ASA, Acetylsalicylic acid; BPI, Brief Pain Inventory; PMI, Pain Management Index

Table 2a. Distribution of BPI Average Pain Scores vs. PMI Score

		PMI Score		
		Inadequate Pain Management	Adequate Pain Management	
BPI Average Pain in Past 24 Hours	Moderate - Severe	33 (82.5%)	109 (47.6%)	Sensitivity (PMI to BPI Average): 23.2%
	None – Mild	7 (17.5%)	120 (52.4%)	Specificity (PMI to BPI Average): 94.4%
		Sensitivity (BPI Average to PMI): 82.5%	Specificity (BPI Average to PMI): 52.4%	Accuracy Index: 56.9%

κ BPI Average Pain x PMI = 0.1701

Table 2b. Distribution of BPI Average Pain Scores vs. BPI Relief

		Percentage of Pain Relief in Past 24 Hours		
		<50%	≥50%	
BPI Average Pain in Past 24 Hours	Moderate - Severe	36 (76.6%)	106 (47.8%)	Sensitivity (Relief to BPI Average): 25.4%
	None – Mild	11 (23.4%)	116 (52.2%)	Specificity (Relief to BPI Average): 91.3%
		Sensitivity (BPI Average to Relief): 76.6%	Specificity (BPI Average to Relief): 52.2%	Accuracy Index: 56.5%

κ BPI Average Pain x BPI Relief = 0.4457

Table 2c. Distribution of BPI Relief vs. PMI

		PMI Score		PMI compared to Relief
		Inadequate Pain Management	Adequate Pain Management	
BPI Percent Pain Relief In Past 24 Hours	<50%	10 (25.0%)	37 (16.2%)	Sensitivity: 21.3%
	≥50%	30 (75.0%)	192 (83.8%)	Specificity: 86.5%
Relief compared to PMI		Sensitivity: 25.0%	Specificity: 83.8%	Accuracy Index: 75.1%

κ BPI Relief x PMI = 0.0825

Table 2d. Distribution of Satisfaction with Pain Control vs. BPI Average Pain

		BPI Average Pain in Past 24 Hours		BPI Average compared to Satisfaction
		Moderate - Severe	None - Mild	
Satisfaction with Pain Control	Low	100	49	Sensitivity: 67.1%
	High	42	78	Specificity: 65.0%
Satisfaction compared to BPI Average		Specificity: 70.4%	Specificity: 61.4%	Accuracy Index: 66.2%

κ SAT x BPI Average Pain = 0.3193

Table 2e. Distribution of Satisfaction with Pain Control vs. BPI Relief

		BPI Percentage of Pain Relief in Past 24 Hours		Relief compared to Satisfaction
		<50%	≥50%	
Satisfaction with Pain Control	Low	39 (83.0%)	110 (49.5%)	Sensitivity: 26.2%
	High	8 (17.0%)	112 (50.5%)	Specificity: 93.3%
Satisfaction compared to relief		Sensitivity: 83.0%	Specificity: 50.5%	Accuracy Index: 56.1%

κ SAT x BPI Relief = 0.1802

Table 2f. Distribution of Satisfaction with Pain Control vs. PMI

		PMI Score		PMI compared to satisfaction
		Inadequate Pain Management	Adequate Pain Management	
Satisfaction with Pain Control	Low	29 (72.5%)	120 (52.4%)	Sensitivity: 19.5%
	High	11 (27.5%)	109 (47.6%)	Specificity: 90.8%
Satisfaction compared to PMI		Sensitivity: 72.5%	Specificity: 47.6%	Accuracy Index: 51.3%

κ SAT x PMI = 0.0946

Table 2g. Distribution of ACPM vs. PMI

		ACPM		ACPM vs. PMI
		Inadequate Pain Management	Adequate Pain Management	
PMI	Inadequate Pain Management	24	16	Sensitivity: 60.0%
	Adequate Pain Management	72	157	Specificity: 68.6%
PMI vs. ACPM		Sensitivity: 25.0%	Specificity: 90.8%	Accuracy Index: 67.3%

κ ACPM x PMI = 0.1810

Table 2h. Distribution of ACPM vs. BPI Average Pain

		ACPM		ACPM vs. BPI Average Pain
		Inadequate Pain Management	Adequate Pain Management	
BPI Average Pain	Moderate-Severe	76	66	Sensitivity: 52.5%
	None-Mild	20	107	Specificity: 84.3%
BPI Average Pain vs. ACPM		Sensitivity: 79.2%	Specificity: 61.8%	Accuracy index: 68.0%

κ ACPM x BPI Average Pain = 0.3706

Table 2i. Distribution of ACPM vs. BPI Relief

		ACPM		ACPM vs. Percent Relief
		Inadequate Pain Management	Adequate Pain Management	
Percent Relief	<50%	47	0	Sensitivity: 100%
	≥50%	49	173	Specificity: 77.9%
Percent Relief vs. ACPM		Sensitivity: 49.0%	Specificity: 100%	Accuracy Index: 81.8%

κ ACPM x BPI Relief = 0.5523

Table 2j. Distribution of ACPM vs. Satisfaction with Pain Control

		ACPM		ACPM vs. Satisfaction with Pain Control
		Inadequate Pain Management	Adequate Pain Management	
Satisfaction with Pain Control	Low	76	73	Sensitivity: 51.0%
	High	20	100	Specificity: 83.3%
Satisfaction vs. ACPM		Sensitivity: 79.2%	Specificity: 57.8%	Accuracy Index: 65.4%

κ ACPM x SAT = 0.3462

Table 3. Kappa by measure

	PMI	SAT	Average pain	Relief
SAT	Slight			
Average pain	Slight	Fair		
Relief	Slight	Slight	Moderate	
ACPM	Slight	Fair	Fair	Moderate

SAT, Satisfaction with Treatment; Average pain, BPI Average Pain; Relief, BPI Relief from Treatments; ACPM, Adequacy of Cancer Pain Management scale

Table 4. Pearson and Spearman Correlations between 4 Main Outcome variables and Candidate Correlates and their descriptive statistics

	Mean ± SD*	BPI Average Pain	BPI Relief	PMI	SAT
BPI Average Pain			-.430	-.505	-.325
BPI Relief				.253	.507
PMI					.236
Age		-.024 (p = .70)	-.03 (p=.62)	-.001 (p=.98)	-.06 (p=.36)
Sex		-.04 (p=.49)	.04 (p=.52)	-.02 (p=.70)	.10 (p=.11)
Cancer Duration				-.20	
BPI Interference	4.86 ± 2.39	.602	-.265	-.334	-.265
SF-MPQ-2 Continuous	3.33 ± 2.15	.581	-.203	-.387	
SF-MPQ-2 Intermittent	2.53 ± 2.31	.501	-.253	-.292	-.213
SF-MPQ-2 Neuropathic	2.03 ± 1.78	.477	-.299	-.287	-.230
SF-MPQ-2 Affective	2.86 ± 2.36	.471	-.254	-.264	
ESAS Physical Symptoms (excluding pain)	4.05 ± 1.76	.321	-.234		
CES-D Total	20.81 ± 10.58	.263			
PCS	20.19 ± 12.10	.246			-.218

p values are ≤.001 for all correlations displayed, except where indicated for age and sex. Correlations between outcome variables and candidate correlates where p >.001 are not presented. * Descriptive statistics for outcome measures, age, sex, and cancer duration reported in Table 1

Notes. BPI, Brief Pain Inventory; PMI, Pain Management Index; SAT, Satisfaction; SF-MPQ-2, Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire-2; C, Continuous; I, Intermittent; N, Neuropathic; ESAS, Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale; CES-D, Center for Epidemiologic Scale – Depression; PCS, Pain Catastrophizing Scale

Table 5. Multivariate linear regression analyses of pain management indices

	BPI Average Pain			BPI Relief			PMI			Satisfaction			ACPM		
	B (SE)	β	P \leq	B (SE)	β	P \leq	B (SE)	β	P \leq	B (SE)	β	P \leq	B (SE)	β	P \leq
BPI Interference	.341 (.048)	.381	.001	-1.622 (.636)	-.164	.011	-.105 (.027)	-.263	.001	-.214 (.067)	-.229	.002	-1.778 (.521)	-.215	.001
SF-MPQ-2 Neuropathic				-3.237 (.865)	-.243	.001				-.157 (.084)	-.124	.062	-2.892 (.709)	-.259	.001
Cancer duration				.054 (.028)	.113	.054	-.003 (.001)	-.151	.006				.041 (.023)	.101	.08
SF-MPQ-2 Continuous	.316 (.058)	.317	.001				-.135 (.028)	-.304	.001						
ESAS Physical							.100 (.034)	.185	.004	.186 (.090)	.146	.039			
SF-MPQ-2 Intermittent	.113 (.054)	.122	.036												

PCS											-.030 (.012)	-.162	.014			
R ²	.475			.123			.226			.113			.162			
	F(3,265) = 79.91, p<.001			F(3,265) = 12.40, p<.001			F(4,264) = 19.24, p <.001			F(4,264) = 8.42, p<.001			F(3,265) = 17.04, p<.001			

Notes. BPI, Brief Pain Inventory; PMI, Pain Management Index; SF-MPQ-2, Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire-2; ESAS, Edmonton

Symptom Assessment Scale; CES-D, PCS, Pain Catastrophizing Scale; ACPM, Adequacy of Cancer Pain Management scale

Table 6 - Component Matrix extracted using Principal Component Analysis

	Component Factor Loadings – B-values
	Adequacy of Cancer Pain Management (ACPM)
BPI Average Pain	-0.786
BPI Relief	0.761
Satisfaction with Pain Control	0.704
PMI	0.666

Note. BPI, Brief Pain Inventory; PMI, Pain Management Index

References

1. Ahmedzai SH: Cancer pain for the 21st century: Stepping off the ladder, stepping up to new challenges. *Br. J. Pain.* 2014.
2. Arthur J, Edwards T, Lu Z, Hui D, Fellman B, Bruera E: Health Care Provider Attitudes, Beliefs, and Perceived Confidence in Managing Patients With Cancer Pain and Nonmedical Opioid Use. *J Pain Symptom Manage*; 61:128-135.e6, 2021.
3. Azevedo Sao Leao Ferreira K, Kimura M, Jacobsen Teixeira M: The WHO analgesic ladder for cancer pain control, twenty years of use. How much pain relief does one get from using it? *Support Care Cancer* 14:1086–93, 2006.
4. Azevedo Sao Leao Ferreira K, Kimura M, Jacobsen Teixeira M: The WHO analgesic ladder for cancer pain control, twenty years of use. How much pain relief does one get from using it?. *Support. Care Cancer.* page 1086–932006.
5. Baider L, Andritsch E, Uziely B, Goldzweig G, Ever-Hadani P, Hofman G, Krenn G, Samonigg H: Effects of age on coping and psychological distress in women diagnosed with breast cancer: review of literature and analysis of two different geographical settings. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 46:5–16, 2003.
6. Ballantyne JC: Opioid misuse in oncology pain patients. *Curr Pain Headache Rep* 11:276–82, 2007.
7. Bennett MI: Effectiveness of antiepileptic or antidepressant drugs when added to opioids for cancer pain: systematic review. *Palliat Med* 25:553–9, 2011.
8. Bernabei R, Gambassi G, Lapane K, Landi F, Gatsonis C, Dunlop R, Lipsitz L, Steel K, Mor V: Management of pain in elderly patients with cancer. *JAMA J Am Med Assoc* 279:1877–82, 1998.
9. Van Den Beuken-Van Everdingen MHJ, Hochstenbach LMJ, Joosten EAJ, Tjan-Heijnen VCG, Janssen DJA: Update on Prevalence of Pain in Patients with Cancer: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 51:1070-1090.e9, 2016.
10. Breitbart W: Psychotropic adjuvant analgesics for pain in cancer and AIDS. *Psychooncology* 7:333–45, 1998.
11. Breitbart W, Rosenfeld BD, Passik SD, McDonald M V, Thaler H, Portenoy RK: The undertreatment of pain in ambulatory AIDS patients. *Pain* 65:243–9, 1996.
12. Brennan KA, Clark CL, Shaver PR: Self-report measurement of adult attachment: an integrative overview. In: Simpson JA, Rholes WS, editors. *Attach Theory Close Relationships* New York, NY: The Guilford Press; page 46–761998.
13. Bruera E, Kuehn N, Miller MJ, Selmsler P, Macmillan K: The Edmonton Symptom Assessment System (ESAS): a simple method for the assessment of palliative care patients. *J Palliat Care* 7:6–9, 1991.

14. Bruera E, Paice JA: Cancer Pain Management: Safe and Effective Use of Opioids. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ B* :e593–9, 2015.
15. Bruera E, Palmer JL, Bosnjak S, Rico MA, Moyano J, Sweeney C, Strasser F, Willey J, Bertolino M, Mathias C, Spruyt O, Fisch MJ: Methadone versus morphine as a first-line strong opioid for cancer pain: a randomized, double-blind study. *J Clin Oncol* 22:185–92, 2004.
16. Caltagirone C, Spoletini I, Gianni W, Spalletta G: Inadequate pain relief and consequences in oncological elderly patients. *Surg Oncol* 19:178–83, 2010.
17. Canadian Cancer Society: Canadian Cancer Statistics 2017. Canadian Cancer Society 2017:1–132, 2017.
18. Carmichael A-N, Morgan L, Del Fabbro E: Identifying and assessing the risk of opioid abuse in patients with cancer: an integrative review. *Subst Abuse Rehabil* 7:71–9, 2016.
19. Cataldo JK, Paul S, Cooper B, Skerman H, Alexander K, Aouizerat B, Blackman V, Merriman J, Dunn L, Ritchie C, Yates P, Miaskowski C: Differences in the symptom experience of older versus younger oncology outpatients: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Cancer* 13:6, 2013.
20. Chang VT, Hwang SS, Feuerman M: Validation of the Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale. *Cancer* 88:2164–71, 2000.
21. Charlson M, Szatrowski TP, Peterson J, Gold J: Validation of a combined comorbidity index. *J Clin Epidemiol* 47:1245–51, 1994.
22. Chou P-L, Fang S-Y, Sun J-L, Rau K-M, Lee B-O: Gender Difference in Cancer Patients' Adherence to Analgesics and Related Outcomes of Pain Management. *Cancer Nurs* :1, 2017.
23. Chung KC, Barlev A, Braun AH, Qian Y, Zagari M, Development G, Oncology H/: Assessing Analgesic Use in Patients with Advanced Cancer: Development of a New Scale-The Analgesic Quantification Algorithm. *Pain Med* 15:225–32, 2014.
24. Cleeland C, Gonin R, Hatfield A, Edmonson J, Blum R, Stewart J, Pandya K: Pain and its treatment in outpatients with metastatic cancer. *N Engl J Med* 330:592–6, 1994.
25. Cleeland CS, Ryan KM: Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. *Ann Acad Med Singapore* 23:129–38, 1994.
26. Copenhaver DJ, Karvelas NB, Fishman SM: Risk Management for Opioid Prescribing in the Treatment of Patients With Pain From Cancer or Terminal Illness: Inadvertent Oversight or Taboo? *Anesth Analg* 125:1610–5, 2017.
27. Cronbach LJ: *Essentials of psychological testing*. New York: Harper & Row; 1984.
28. Damm M, Weniger M, Kölsch AK, Lampert C, Ceyhan GO, Beer S, Schorn S, Moir J, Michl P, Rosendahl J: The quality of pain management in pancreatic cancer: A

- prospective multi-center study. *Pancreatology* 20:1511–8, 2020.
29. Dasgupta N, Wang Y, Bae J, Kinlaw A, Chidgey BA, Cooper T, Delcher C: Inches, Centimeters, and Yards: Overlooked Definition Choices Inhibit Interpretation of Morphine Equivalence Running title: Clinical MME Definitions *The Clinical Journal of Pain* ePubh Ahead of Print. , 2021.
 30. Dawson R, Spross JA, Jablonski ES, Hoyer DR, Sellers DE, Solomon MZ: Probing the paradox of patients' satisfaction with inadequate pain management. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 23:211–20, 2002.
 31. Deandrea S, Montanari M, Moja L, Apolone G: Prevalence of undertreatment in cancer pain. A review of published literature. *Ann Oncol* 19:1985–91, 2008.
 32. Donovan BD: Patient attitudes to postoperative pain relief. *Anaesth Intensive Care* 11:125–9, 1983.
 33. Donovan KA, Taliaferro LA, Brock CW, Bazargan S: Sex Differences in the Adequacy of Pain Management Among Patients Referred to a Multidisciplinary Cancer Pain Clinic. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 36:167–72, 2008.
 34. Dworkin RH, Turk DC, McDermott MP, Peirce-Sandner S, Burke LB, Cowan P, Farrar JT, Hertz S, Raja SN, Rappaport BA, Rauschkolb C, Sampaio C: Interpreting the clinical importance of group differences in chronic pain clinical trials: IMMPACT recommendations. *Pain* 146:238–44, 2009.
 35. Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Revicki DA, Harding G, Coyne KS, Peirce-Sandner S, Bhagwat D, Everton D, Burke LB, Cowan P, Farrar JT, Hertz S, Max MB, Rappaport BA, Melzack R: Development and initial validation of an expanded and revised version of the Short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire (SF-MPQ-2). *Pain* 144:35–42, 2009.
 36. Fainsinger RL, Nekolaichuk C, Lawlor P, Hagen N, Bercovitch M, Fisch M, Galloway L, Kaye G, Landman W, Spruyt O, Zhukovsky D, Bruera E, Hanson J: An international multicentre validation study of a pain classification system for cancer patients. *Eur J Cancer* 46:2896–904, 2010.
 37. Fairchild A: Under-treatment of cancer pain. *Curr Opin Support Palliat Care* 4:11–5, 2010.
 38. Ferrell BR, Grant M, Borneman T, Juarez G, ter Veer A: Family caregiving in cancer pain management. *J Palliat Med* 2:185–95, 1999.
 39. Fortner B, Demarco G, Irving G, Ashley J, Keppler G, Chavez J, Munk J: Description and predictors of direct and indirect costs of pain reported by cancer patients. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 25:9–18, 2003.
 40. Fujii A, Yamada Y, Takayama K, Nakano T, Kishimoto J, Morita T, Nakanishi Y: Longitudinal assessment of pain management with the pain management index in cancer outpatients receiving chemotherapy. *Support Care Cancer* 25:925–32, 2017.

41. Gagliese L: Aging and the management of cancer pain. *Ann Oncol* 20:1752, 2009.
42. Gagliese L, Gauthier LR, Rodin G: Cancer pain and depression: a systematic review of age-related patterns. *Pain Res Manag United States*; 12:205–11, 2007.
43. Gauthier L, Young A, Dworkin RH, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Warr D, Librach SL, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Pillai Riddell R, Macpherson A, Melzack R, Gagliese L: Validation of the Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire-2 in younger and older people with cancer pain. *J Pain* 15:756–70, 2014.
44. Gauthier LR, Dworkin RH, Warr D, Pillai Riddell R, Macpherson A, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Lawrence Librach S, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Gagliese L: Age-Related Patterns in Cancer Pain and Its Psychosocial Impact : Investigating the Role of Variability in Physical and Mental Health Quality of Life. *Pain Med* 19:658–76, 2018.
45. Gauthier LR, Dworkin RH, Warr D, Pillai Riddell R, Macpherson AK, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Lawrence Librach S, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Gagliese L: Age-related patterns in cancer pain and its psychosocial impact: Investigating the role of variability in physical and mental health quality of life. *Pain Med* 19:, 2018.
46. Gauthier LR, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Warr D, Librach SL, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Gagliese L: The communal coping model and cancer pain: the roles of catastrophizing and attachment style. *J Pain* 13:1258–68, 2012.
47. Gauthier LR, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Warr D, Moore M, Shepherd F, Gagliese L: Acceptance of pain: a study in patients with advanced cancer. *Pain* 143:147–54, 2009.
48. Gauthier LR, Young A, Dworkin RH, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Warr D, Librach SL, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Pillai Riddell R, Macpherson A, Melzack R, Gagliese L: Validation of the short-form mcgill pain questionnaire-2 in younger and older people with cancer pain. *J Pain* 15:, 2014.
49. Glover J, Dibble SL, Dodd MJ, Miaskowski C: Mood states of oncology outpatients: Does pain make a difference? *J Pain Symptom Manage* , 1995.
50. Greco MT, Roberto A, Corli O, Deandrea S, Bandieri E, Cavuto S, Apolone G: Quality of Cancer Pain Management : An Update of a Systematic Review of Undertreatment of Patients With Cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 32:4149–54, 2014.
51. Grond S, Zech D, Diefenbach C, Radbruch L, Lehmann KA: Assessment of cancer pain: a prospective evaluation in 2266 cancer patients referred to a pain service. *Pain* 64:107–14, 1996.
52. Hales S, Chiu A, Husain A, Braun M, Rydall A, Gagliese L, Zimmermann C: The Quality of Dying and Death in Cancer and Its Relationship to Palliative Care and Place of Death. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 48:839–51, 2019.
53. Hales S, Gagliese L, Nissim R, Zimmermann C, Rodin G: Understanding bereaved caregiver evaluations of the quality of dying and death: An application of cognitive interviewing methodology to the quality of dying and death questionnaire. *J Pain*

- Symptom Manage 43:195–204, 2012.
54. Harden RN, Weinland SR, Remble TA, Houle TT, Colio S, Steedman S, Kee WG, American Pain Society P: Medication Quantification Scale Version III: update in medication classes and revised detriment weights by survey of American Pain Society Physicians. *J Pain* 6:364–71, 2005.
 55. Harting B, Johnson T, Abrams R, Odwazny R, Hasler S, McNutt R: An exploratory analysis of the correlation of pain scores, patient satisfaction with relief from pain, and a new measure of pain control on the total dose of opioids in pain care. *Qual Manag Health Care* 22:322–6, 2013.
 56. Hershman DL, Lacchetti C, Dworkin RH, Lavoie Smith EM, Bleeker J, Cavaletti G, Chauhan C, Gavin P, Lavino A, Lustberg MB, Paice J, Schneider B, Smith ML, Smith T, Terstriep S, Wagner-Johnston N, Bak K, Loprinzi CL: Prevention and Management of Chemotherapy-Induced Peripheral Neuropathy in Survivors of Adult Cancers: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline. *J Clin Oncol* 32:1941–67, 2014.
 57. Jacobsen R, Samsanaviciene J, Liuabarskiene Z, Sciupokas A: Barriers to Pain Management among Lithuanian Cancer Patients. *Pain Pract* 10:145–57, 2010.
 58. Jadad AR, Browman GP: The WHO analgesic ladder for cancer pain management. *JAMA* 274:1870, 1995.
 59. Katzman R, Brown T, Fuld P, Peck A, Schechter R, Schimmel H: Validation of a short Orientation-Memory-Concentration Test of cognitive impairment. *Am J Psychiatry* 140:734–9, 1983.
 60. Kerns RD, Turk DC, Rudy TE: The West Haven-Yale Multidimensional Pain Inventory (WHYMPI). *Pain* 23:345–56, 1985.
 61. Khan MI, Walsh D, Brito-Dellan N: Opioid and adjuvant analgesics: compared and contrasted. *Am J Hosp Palliat Med* 28:378–83, 2011.
 62. Kuposov RA, Ruchkin V V, Eisemann M, Sidorov PI: Alcohol abuse in Russian delinquent adolescents: Associations with comorbid psychopathology, personality and parenting. *Eur Child.and Adolesc Psychiatry* 14:254–61, 2005.
 63. Krashin D, Murinova N, Jumelle P, Ballantyne J: Opioid risk assessment in palliative medicine. *Expert Opin Drug Saf* 14:1023–33, 2015.
 64. Kwekkeboom K, Serlin RC, Ward SE, LeBlanc TW, Ogunseitan A, Cleary J: Revisiting patient-related barriers to cancer pain management in the context of the US opioid crisis. *Pain* 00:1–8, 2021.
 65. Landis JR, Koch GG: The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics* 33:159, 1977.
 66. Leppert W: Pain management in patients with cancer: focus on opioid analgesics. *Curr Pain Headache Rep* 15:271–9, 2011.

67. Lim SN, Han HS, Lee KH, Lee SC, Kim JH, Yun JN, Park SG, Park MJ, Choe YH, Ryoo HM, Lee KH, Cho DY, Zang DY, Choi JH: A satisfaction survey on cancer pain management using a self-reporting pain assessment tool. *J Palliat Med* 18:225–31, 2015.
68. Lin CC, Lai YL, Ward SE: Effect of cancer pain on performance status, mood states, and level of hope among Taiwanese cancer patients. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 25:29–37, 2003.
69. Little RJA: A test of missing completely at random for multivariate data with missing values. *J Am Stat Assoc* 83:1198–202, 1988.
70. Loprinzi CL, Lacchetti C, Bleeker J, Cavaletti G, Chauhan C, Hertz DL, Kelley MR, Lavino A, Lustberg MB, Paice JA, Schneider BP, Lavoie Smith EM, Smith M Lou, Smith TJ, Wagner-Johnston N, Hershman DL: Prevention and Management of Chemotherapy-Induced Peripheral Neuropathy in Survivors of Adult Cancers: ASCO Guideline Update. *J Clin Oncol* JCO.20.01399, 2020. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.20.01399>
71. Mah K, Tran KT, Gauthier LR, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Warr D, Librach SL, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Gagliese L: Do Correlates of Pain-Related Stoicism and Cautiousness Differ in Younger and Older People With Advanced Cancer? *J Pain* 19:301–16, 2018.
72. Mah K, Tran KT, Gauthier LR, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Warr D, Librach SL, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Gagliese L: Do Correlates of Pain-Related Stoicism and Cautiousness Differ in Younger and Older People With Advanced Cancer? *J Pain* 19:, 2018.
73. Mah K, Tran KT, Gauthier LR, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Warr D, Librach SL, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Gagliese L: Psychometric evaluation of the Pain Attitudes Questionnaire-Revised for people with advanced cancer. *J Pain* 18:811–24, 2017.
74. Mah K, Tran KT, Gauthier LR, Rodin G, Zimmermann C, Warr D, Librach SL, Moore M, Shepherd FA, Gagliese L: Psychometric Evaluation of the Pain Attitudes Questionnaire-Revised for People With Advanced Cancer. *J Pain* 18:, 2017.
75. Massimino M, Pecori E, Schiavello E, Biassoni V, Pignoli E, Diletto B, Spreafico F, Casanova M, Luksch R, Ferrari A, Terenziani M, Podda M, Meazza C, Catania S, Chiaravalli S, Puma N, Bergamaschi S, De Cecco L, Anichini A, Antonelli M, Modena P, Buttarelli F, Giangaspero F, Gandola L: RE-IRRADIATION (RE-RT) FOR CHILDREN WITH RELAPSING DIFFUSE INTRINSIC PONTINE GLIOMA (DIPG): BETTER SURVIVAL AND BETTER TIME. *Neuro Oncol* 18:48–77, 2016.
76. McDowell I: *Measuring Health: A Guide to Rating Scales and Questionnaires*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 2006.
77. Mercadante S, Bruera E: Good. . .but bad news. *J Clin Oncol* 33:2119, 2015.
78. Mercadante S, Porzio G, Adile C, Aielli F, Cortegiani A, Caruselli A, Casuccio A: Pain Intensity as Prognostic Factor in Cancer Pain Management. *Pain Pract* 15:E1–8, 2015.
79. Mishara BL: Synthesis of Research and Evidence on Factors Affecting the Desire of Terminally Ill or Seriously Chronically Ill Persons to Hasten Death. *OMEGA - J Death Dying* 39:1–70, 1999.

80. Mitera G, Fairchild A, DeAngelis C, Emmenegger U, Zurawel-Balaura L, Zhang L, Bezjak A, Levin W, Mclean M, Zeiadin N, Pang J, Nguyen J, Sinclair E, Chow E, Wong R: A multicenter assessment of the adequacy of cancer pain treatment using the pain management index. *J Palliat Med* 13:589–93, 2010.
81. Moore A, McQuay H, Gavaghan D: Deriving dichotomous outcome measures from continuous data in randomised controlled trials of analgesics. *Pain* 66:229–37, 1996.
82. Mor V, Laliberte L, Morris JN, Wiemann M: The Karnofsky Performance Status Scale. An examination of its reliability and validity in a research setting. *Cancer* 53:2002–7, 1984.
83. Morrow RL, Bassett K, Wright JM, Carney G, Dormuth CR: Influence of opioid prescribing standards on drug use among patients with long-term opioid use: a longitudinal cohort study. *C Open* 7:E484-491, 2019.
84. Moye J, June A, Martin LA, Gosian J, Herman LI, Naik AD: Pain is prevalent and persisting in cancer survivors: Differential factors across age groups. *J Geriatr Oncol* 5:190–6, 2014.
85. Nersesyan H, Slavin K V: Current approach to cancer pain management: Availability and implications of different treatment options. *Ther Clin Risk Manag* 3:381–400, 2007.
86. Novy D, Aigner C: The biopsychosocial model in cancer pain. *Curr Opin Support Palliat Care* 8:117–23, 2014.
87. Paice JA: Cancer pain management: Strategies for safe and effective opioid prescribing. *J Natl Compr Cancer Netw* 14:695–7, 2016.
88. Paice JA: Cancer pain management and the opioid crisis in America: How to preserve hard-earned gains in improving the quality of cancer pain management. *Cancer* 124:2491–7, 2018.
89. Paice JA, Von Roenn JH: Under- or overtreatment of pain in the patient with cancer: How to achieve proper balance. *J Clin Oncol* 32:1721–6, 2014.
90. Paice JA, Von Roenn JH: Under- or overtreatment of pain in the patient with cancer: How to achieve proper balance. *J Clin Oncol* 32:1721–6, 2014.
91. Peterman AH, Fitchett G, Brady MJ, Hernandez L, Cella D: Measuring spiritual well-being in people with cancer: The functional assessment of chronic illness therapy-Spiritual Well-being Scale (FACIT-Sp). *Ann Behav Med* 24:49–58, 2002.
92. Phillips JL, Currow DC: Cancer as a chronic disease. *Collegian* 17:47–50, 2010.
93. Porter LS, Keefe FJ: Psychosocial issues in cancer pain. *Curr Pain Headache Reports* 15:263–70, 2011.
94. Qian Y, Haider A, Lu Z, Naqvi S, Zhuang A, Nguyen K, Reddy A, Arthur J, Tanco K, Williams J, Wu J, Liu D, Naberhuis J, Bruera E: Factors Associated with Improvement in

- Uncontrolled Cancer Pain without Increasing the Opioid Daily Dose among Patients Seen by an Inpatient Palliative Care Team. *J Palliat Med* 23:483–8, 2020.
95. Raptis E, Vadalouca A, Stavropoulou E, Argyra E, Melemenis A, Siafaka I: Pregabalin vs. Opioids for the treatment of neuropathic cancer pain: A prospective, head-to-head, randomized, open-label study. *Pain Pract* 14:32–42, 2014.
 96. Reis-Pina P, Lawlor PG, Barbosa A: Adequacy of cancer-related pain management and predictors of undertreatment at referral to a pain clinic. *J Pain Res* 10:2097–107, 2017.
 97. Roelofs J, McCracken L, Peters ML, Crombez G, van Breukelen G, Vlaeyen JW: Psychometric evaluation of the Pain Anxiety Symptoms Scale (PASS) in chronic pain patients. *J Behav Med* 27:167–83, 2004.
 98. Russell PB, Aveyard SC, Oxenham DR: An assessment of methods used to evaluate the adequacy of cancer pain management. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 32:581–8, 2006.
 99. Russell PB, Aveyard SC, Oxenham DR: An Assessment of Methods Used to Evaluate the Adequacy of Cancer Pain Management. *J Pain Symptom Manage* , 2006.
 100. Sakakibara N, Higashi T, Yamashita I, Yoshimoto T, Matoba M: Negative pain management index scores do not necessarily indicate inadequate pain management: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Palliat Care BMC Palliative Care*; 17:1–7, 2018.
 101. Shen WC, Chen JS, Shao YY, Lee K Der, Chiou TJ, Sung YC, Rau KM, Yen CJ, Liao YM, Liu TC, Wu MF, Lee MY, Yu MS, Hwang WL, Lai PY, Chang CS, Chou WC, Hsieh RK: Impact of Undertreatment of Cancer Pain With Analgesic Drugs on Patient Outcomes: A Nationwide Survey of Outpatient Cancer Patient Care in Taiwan. *J Pain Symptom Manage Elsevier Inc.*; 54:55-65.e1, 2017.
 102. Shen WC, Chen JS, Shao YY, Lee K Der, Chiou TJ, Sung YC, Rau KM, Yen CJ, Liao YM, Liu TC, Wu MF, Lee MY, Yu MS, Hwang WL, Lai PY, Chang CS, Chou WC, Hsieh RK: Impact of Undertreatment of Cancer Pain With Analgesic Drugs on Patient Outcomes: A Nationwide Survey of Outpatient Cancer Patient Care in Taiwan. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 54:55-65.e1, 2017. A
 103. Sherbourne CD, Stewart AL: The MOS social support survey. *Soc Sci Med* [32:705–14, 1991.
 104. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A: Cancer Statistics, 2017. *CA Cancer J Clin* 67:7–30, 2017.
 105. Singh H, Banipal R, Singh B: Assessment of Adequacy of Pain Management and Analgesic Use in Patients With Advanced Cancer Using the Brief Pain Inventory and Pain Management Index Calculation. *J Glob Oncol* 3:235–41, 2016.
 106. Singh H, Banipal RPS, Singh B: Assessment of adequacy of pain management and analgesic use in patients with advanced cancer using the brief pain inventory and pain management index calculation. *J Glob Oncol* 3:235–41, 2017.
 107. Sokoloff C, Daoust R, Paquet J, Chauny J-M: Is adequate pain relief and time to analgesia

- associated with emergency department length of stay? A retrospective study. *BMJ Open* 4:e004288, 2014.
108. Soltow D, Given BA, Given CW: Relationship between age and symptoms of pain and fatigue in adults undergoing treatment for cancer. *Cancer Nurs* 33:296–303, 2010. Available from:
 109. Sullivan MJL, Bishop SR, Pivik J: The Pain Catastrophizing Scale: Development and Validation. *Psychol Assess* 7:524–32, 1995.
 110. Syrjala KL, Chapko ME: Evidence for a biopsychosocial model of cancer treatment-related pain. *Pain* 61:69–79, 1995.
 111. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS: *Using Multivariate Statistics*. New Jersey: Pearson; 2012.
 112. Thronæs M, Balstad TR, Brunelli C, Løhre ET, Klepstad P, Vagnildhaug OM, Kaasa S, Knudsen AK, Solheim TS: Pain management index (PMI)—does it reflect cancer patients' wish for focus on pain? *Support Care Cancer* 28:1675–84, 2020.
 113. Turk DC, Dworkin RH, Revicki D, Harding G, Burke LB, Cella D, Cleeland CS, Cowan P, Farrar JT, Hertz S, Max MB, Rappaport BA: Identifying important outcome domains for chronic pain clinical trials: an IMMPACT survey of people with pain. *Pain* 137:276–85, 2008.
 114. Vadalouca A, Raptis E, Moka E, Zis P, Sykioti P, Siafaka I: Pharmacological treatment of neuropathic cancer pain: a comprehensive review of the current literature. *Pain Pract* 12:219–51, 2012.
 115. Vargas-Schaffer G: Is the WHO analgesic ladder still valid? Twenty-four years of experience. *Can Fam Physician* 56:514–7, e202–5, 2010.
 116. Vowles KE, McCracken LM, McLeod C, Eccleston C: The Chronic Pain Acceptance Questionnaire: confirmatory factor analysis and identification of patient subgroups. *Pain C* 140:284–91, 2008.
 117. Vuong S, Pulezas N, DeAngelis C, Torabi S, Ahrari S, Tsao M, Danjoux C, Barnes T, Chow E: Inadequate pain management in cancer patients attending an outpatient palliative radiotherapy clinic. *Support Care Cancer* 24:887–92, 2016.
 118. Ware Jr. JE, Sherbourne CD: The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36): I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care* 30:473–83, 1992.
 119. Weissman DE, Haddox JD: Opioid pseudoaddiction - an iatrogenic syndrome. *Pain* 36:363–6, 1989.
 120. de Wit R, van Dam F, Abu-Saad HH, Loonstra S, Zandbelt L, van Buuren A, van der Heijden K, Leenhouts G: Empirical Comparison of Commonly Used Measures to Evaluate Pain Treatment in Cancer Patients With Chronic Pain. *J Clin Oncol* 17:1280–1280, 1999.

121. de Wit R, van Dam F, Loonstra S, Zandbelt L, van Buuren A, van der Heijden K, Leenhouts G, Abu-Saad HH: The Amsterdam Pain Management Index compared to eight frequently used outcome measures to evaluate the adequacy of pain treatment in cancer patients with chronic pain. *Pain* 91:339–49, 2001.
122. World Health Organization: WHO’s cancer pain ladder for adults:1–2, 2009. Available from: <http://www.who.int/cancer/palliative/painladder/en/>
123. World Health Organization: WHO guidelines for the pharmacological and radiotherapeutic management of cancer pain in adults and adolescents.
124. Yong HH, Bell R, Workman B, Gibson SJ: Psychometric properties of the Pain Attitudes Questionnaire (revised) in adult patients with chronic pain. *Pain* 104:673–81, 2003.
125. Yong HH, Gibson SJ, Horne DJ, Helme RD: Development of a pain attitudes questionnaire to assess stoicism and cautiousness for possible age differences. *Journals Gerontol Ser B-Psychological Sci Soc Sci* 56:P279-84, 2001.