

**Table 1. Key clinical features and classification of pain**

Categories of pain	Summary	Interventions-Drug	Interventions-Medical devices
Nociceptive pain	Somatic or visceral pain arises from actual or threatened damage to non-neural tissue and is due to the activation of nociceptors.	Physical therapy, Medications, Injection, Treatment of the underlying cause NSAID,	Injection, Treatment of the underlying cause
Inflammatory pain	Cardinal feature of an inflammatory state of hypersensitivity where innocuous stimuli induce pain. This is regulated by prostaglandin receptors EP1, EP2, EP3 and EP4.	Anti-inflammatory medicine such as Aspirin, Ibuprofen, Diclofenac, Flurbiprofen, Mefenamic acid, Nabumetone, Piroxicam and Naproxen	Laser therapy systems, electrotherapy device, non-invasive heat therapy, infrared light therapy, pulsed electromagnetic field therapy and electrode induced pain blocker.
Dysfunctional/Functional Pain	Pain without obvious organic cause.	Physical Therapy, Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT)	TENS, External Neuromodulation
Neuropathic pain	Pain caused by a lesion or disease of the somatosensory nervous system.	Anti-neuropathic medication	Neuromodulation, Nerve blocks

**Table 2. Description of Regulatory Guidelines by Organisation**

Organisation/Regulator	Data published	Guidelines/Regulations	Description
MHRA (Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency)	2020	Medical Device Regulations (MDR)	The medical device directive was amended to the MDR to accommodate artificial intelligence applications that provide medical advice or act as a clinician aid. In addition, the UK conformity assessed (UKCA) marking that is equivalent to CE marking. The UKCA marking is a standard required for goods placed on the market in Great Britain
Code of conduct for data-driven health and care technology	2019	A policy document with 10 principles to evaluate digital health solutions	There is an associated code of conduct within the United Kingdom
NICE (National Institute of Health and Care Excellence) evidence standards framework	2019	The evidence tiers are cumulative therefore, the framework aims to assess digital health technologies (DHT) from a specific risk and best practice perspective.	The framework demonstrates the standards required for the evidence developed or available about digital health technologies that may or may not fall within the remit of medical devices, including those associated with artificial intelligence. This framework includes evidence associated with effectiveness specific to the intended purposes and user. This also includes evidence associated with the economic impact affiliated with financial risk.
FDA (Food and Drug Administration)	2016	Benefit-risk framework for medical devices	A generic framework to evaluate medical devices risks and benefits. For example, this framework can assess dimensions such as risk serenity and the likelihood of risk as well as false positive or false-negative results.
WHO (World Health Organisation)	2016	WHO monitoring and evaluating digital health interventions	A generic framework to evaluate and validate digital solutions throughout the life-cycle of the innovation.
IMDRF (International Medical Device Regulation Forum)	2017	Multiple definitions are included and developed by the International Medical Device Regulators to manage these across multiple countries	The scope of this framework is a foundational approach to address unique challenges which include common vocabulary to identify specific information to support healthcare decision making

			and/or healthcare conditions with core functions
MEDDEV 2.1 (Medical Device Regulations)	2016	Guidelines on the quantification and classification of standalone software with a medical purpose and are associated within the regulatory framework of medical devices. These aspects are part of the European Union	These guidelines describe any medical tool when they do not fall within the remit of software, or in vitro diagnostic devices or a medical device
FDA (Food and Drug Administration) pre-certification program	2019	This is a software pre-certification program developed as a pilot	This program includes a test plan designed to evaluate the Excellence Appraisal and Streamlined Review composites that would formulate quality assurance for the safety and effectiveness of the software prior to implementation clinically.
FDA (Food and Drug Administration)-SaMD (Proposed regulatory framework for modifications to artificial intelligence/machine learning such as software as a medical device)	2019	SaMD demonstrates a risk categorisation framework inclusive of a risk-based approach to categorise intended use	This framework assesses 2 key descriptions of intended use; state of the healthcare situation or clinical condition and the patient population it is intended for in terms of risk (critical; serious, or non-serious healthcare situation/condition; and the information provided by the SaMD to formulate the decision for the intended user to diagnose or treat or clinically manage the condition.
FDA (Food and Drug Administration) Medical mobile application guidance	2018	The purpose of this guidance is for mobile platform as defined as a commercial computer platform with or without wireless connectivity that could be hand handled such as a platform downloadable to a smart phone or tablet.	This guidelines document is relevant to assess mobile applications where it is a software that is tailored to a mobile platform. This also includes device software functions defined under section 201(h) of the FD&C Act which could be conformed as an accessory to an existing regulated medical device or to transform a mobile platform into a regulated medical device.

**Table 3. Summary table of current uses of digital applications within clinical medicine**

<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Application examples</b>
Improved access	Use of smart-devices intra-connected linking various streams together	Apple watch gathering step-count data as part of their exercise app
Effective data collection	Self-reported data gathering is useful in particular for healthcare professionals	Healthy; The self-care App which acts as diary cards for anyone with a health condition
Efficient data processing	Processing big data is useful to better understand the disease profile and potential treatment avenues	NHS Weight Loss Plan App acts as a support tool to anyone attempting to lose weight
Early diagnosis	Using data to make an early diagnosis through symptom tracking and/or identification of pattern inferences within gathered data is useful for healthcare systems, patients and clinicians	Sleepio App is used currently to support those with sleep-related issues. The app allows data to be gathered to personalise strategies to help improve sleep quality
Personalised treatment	Using data with patient preferences would aid development of personalised treatment	Various applications are currently available within a research context and are yet to be implemented clinically

**Table 4 Characteristics of the systematically included studies**

Author	Diagnosis/Treatment method	Digital application and method of application delivery	Study type	Sample size	Country	Exposure
Bossen et al (2013)	Intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	199	Netherlands	osteoarthritis pain
Hedman-Lagerlöf, et al (2018)	Intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	140	Sweden	fibromyalgia
Krein et al (2013)	Intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	229	USA	chronic low back pain
Rini et al (2015)	Intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	113	USA	osteoarthritis pain
Williams et al (2010)	Intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	118	USA	fibromyalgia
Wilson et al (2015)	Intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	92	USA	chronic non-cancer pain
Raj et al (2017)	Intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	214	Norway	cancer-related pain
Guillory et al (2015)	Chatbots	Text message and mobile app	RCT-Feasibility	68	USA	chronic non-cancer pain
Berman et al (2009)	Chatbots	Web-based intervention	RCT	78	USA	chronic pain
Carpenter et al (2012)	Chatbots-Cognitive behavioral therapy with chapters	Web-based intervention	RCT-Pilot	141	USA	chronic low back pain
Menga et al (2014)	Chatbots-Cognitive behavioral therapy with chapters	Web-based intervention	RCT	44	USA	Fibromyalgia
O'moore et al (2018)	Chatbots-Cognitive behavioral therapy with chapters	Web-based intervention	RCT	69	USA	osteoarthritis pain
Gentili et al (2020)	Mobile app based acceptance therapy	Mobile based intervention	RCT-pilot	31	Sweden	chronic pain
Minen et al (2019)	Mobile app based behavioral therapy	Mobile based intervention	Cross-sectional - Feasibility	51	USA	migraine
Toelle et al (2019)	Mobile app based therapy	Mobile based intervention	RCT	94	Germany	Chronic non-specific low back pain
Blödt et al (2018)	Mobile app based self-acupressure	Mobile based intervention	RCT-Pragmatic	221	Germany	menstrual pain
Irvine et al (2015)	Mobile app based self-management	Mobile based intervention	RCT	597	USA	chronic low back pain
Schatz et al (2015)	Mobile app based coping, pain and activity	Mobile based intervention	RCT	46	USA	chronic pain for paediatric sickle cell
Nebojsa et al (2017)	Mobile app and an wearable activity monitor	Mobile based intervention	RCT	211	USA	osteoarthritis pain
Sun et al (2017)	Mobile app for pain management	Mobile based intervention	RCT	46	China	cancer related pain
Guétin et al (2016)	Mobile app delivering music therapy for pain	Mobile based intervention	RCT	106	France	chronic pain

Jamison et al (2017)	Mobile app based daily assessment and treatment	Mobile based intervention	RCT-pilot	90	USA	chronic pain
Jibb et al (2017)	Mobile apps	Mobile based intervention	RCT-pragmatic	40	Canada	cancer-related chronic pain among the adolescent
Lee et al (2017)	Mobile app based exercise program	Mobile based intervention	Cross-section single group repeated measure	23	Korea	neck pain
Oldenmenger et al (2016)	Mobile apps	Web-based intervention	quantitative	48	Netherlands	cancer-related pain
Huber et al (2017)	Mobile app and EHR	Mobile based intervention	Retrospective RCT	180	Germany	chronic low back pain
Calner et al (2017)	Intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	109	Sweden	musculoskeletal pain
Chiauzzi et al (2010)	Intervention-self management	Web-based intervention	RCT	199	USA	chronic pain
Davis et al (2013)	Intervention of mindfulness	Web-based intervention	RCT	79	USA	fibromyalgia
Dowd et al (2015)	Online mindfulness based cognitive therapy intervention	Web-based intervention	RCT	124	Ireland	chronic pain
Lin et al (2020)	Mobile apps	Web-based intervention	RCT	302	Germany	multimodal pain
Nordin et al (2016)	Intervention for web behaviour change	Web-based intervention	RCT	109	Sweden	Multimodal pain
Ruehlmana et al (2012)	Intervention-self management	Web-based intervention	RCT	305	USA	chronic pain
Ström et al (2000)	Intervention-self management	Web-based intervention	RCT	45	Sweden	recurrent headache
Anderson et al (2004)	Intervention-video and booklet	Web-based intervention	RCT	97	USA	Cancer related pain
Lovell et al (2010)	Intervention-video and booklet	Web-based intervention	RCT	217	Australia	Cancer related pain
Guétin et al (2018)	Smart phone based intervention	Mobile based intervention	RCT	62	France	chronic painful conditions
Oldenmenger et al (2018)	Intervention-internet applications	Web-based intervention	cohort study	84	Netherlands	Cancer related pain

\*EHR: Electronic Health Records RCT-Randomised clinical trial

**Table 5 Studies included within the meta-analysis**

Study ID	Author	Digital applications	Study type	Sample size	Country	Exposure	P-value
1	Bossen et al (2013)	web-application	RCT	199	Netherlands	osteoarthritis pain	0.33(pain intensity) 0.09(depression) 0.007(anxiety)
2	Hedman-Lagerlöf et al (2018)	web-application	RCT	140	Sweden	fibromyalgia	<0.001(depression) <0.001(anxiety)



Carpenter et al (2012)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Menga et al (2014)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
O'moore et al (2018)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Gentili et al (2020)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Minen et al (2019)	high risk**	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	high risk
Toelle et al (2019)	some concerns***	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	some concerns
Blödt et al (2018)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Irvine et al (2015)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Schatz et al (2015)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Nebojsa et al (2017)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Sun et al (2017)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Guétin et al (2016)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Jamison et al (2017)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Jibb et al (2017)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Lee et al (2017)	high risk**	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	high risk
Oldenmenger et al (2016)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Huber et al (2017)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Calner et al (2017)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Chiauzzi et al (2010)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Davis et al (2013)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Dowd et al (2015)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Lin et al (2020)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Nordin et al (2016)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Ruehlmana et al (2012)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Ström et al (2000)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Anderson et al (2004)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Lovell et al (2010)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Guétin et al (2018)	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
Oldenmenger et al (2018)	high risk**	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	high risk

\* Some concerns due to missing information regarding the allocation concealment.\*\*High risk because of lack of randomisation.

\*\*\* Some concerns due to deviation from the protocol resulting in a 53:48 distribution of participants.