# Development and Validation of The Activity-Based Checks (ABCs) of Pain: A Functional Pain Scale

Celina G. Virgen, MD, MPH<sup>1</sup>; Robert Wright, MPH<sup>1</sup>; Bryan Renslo, MD<sup>1</sup>; Tuleen Sawaf, MD<sup>1</sup>;

Hanna Moradi, BS<sup>2</sup>; Maria Edelen, Ph.D.<sup>3</sup>; Jennifer Villwock, MD<sup>1</sup>

1. University of Kansas Medical Center, Department of Otolaryngology- Head and Neck

Surgery

2. University of Kansas, School of Medicine

3. The Brigham and Women's Hospital, Department of Surgery

Short running title: ABCs of Pain: A Functional Pain Scale

Corresponding Author:

Celina G. Virgen, MD, MPH

University of Kansas Medical Center

3901 Rainbow Boulevard, Kansas City, KS 66160

E-mail: cgarcia11@kumc.edu

Authors conflict of interest: None

Source of Funding: NIH NCATS KL2, Parent award UL1TR002366

Data from this study is available upon request.

#### Abstract

The Activity-Based-Checks of Pain (ABCs) is a pain assessment tool incorporating activities of daily living and instrumental activities of daily living. Unlike widely used pain scales which are oftentimes unidimensional and highly subjective, the ABCs was designed to focus on function capabilities and limitations of patients due to pain. This study sought out to validate the factorial structure of the ABCs and assess its use in participants with chronic pain. Participants were recruited in two phases from Prolific – an online service designed to identify research participant recruitment based on study criteria. Phase one optimized the design of the ABCs, with 297 subjects selecting their preferred icon for each function and rating its understandability. The most preferred and understandable icons were then used in phase two, where 304 chronic pain participants completed the ABCs, PROMIS-29, additional PROMIS items that were analogous to the ABCs functions but not represented in the PROMIS-29, and the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI). Data was analyzed using exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis demonstrating four factor loadings: multi-planal activities, sitting/hip flexor pain, walking/ambulation, and pain interference with lightweight unilateral activities. High internal consistency was demonstrated with all four factor loadings. Correlations between items in the ABCs, PROMIS, and BPI resulted in moderate to strong correlations demonstrating strong evidence for the validity of the ABCs as a functional pain assessment tool.

Keywords: Chronic pain, Pain scale, Validation, Functional pain, ABCs

## Introduction

Pain is a unique experience that is personal, private, subjective, and can become a barrier to achieving an enjoyable quality of life [4]. Assessing pain can provide insight into the type of pain experienced by patients, if current treatment is adequate for pain control, or if additional interventions are merited [8]. Despite a number of pain assessment tools, poor pain assessment remains one of the major barriers to healthcare professionals appropriately treating pain [7].

There is an inherent disconnect between patient-clinician communication regarding pain intensity and management goals [11]. Patients have expressed preference and trust in clinicians who go beyond focusing on the physical pain [10]. Current tools limit the healthcare provider in obtaining objective measures and patient pain experience. Tools such as the Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) and Wong-Baker Faces Pain Rating Scale (FACES) are highly subjective which may misrepresent pain intensity score and tolerable pain while overshadowing function and patient progress [1,25]. Additionally, studies have suggested that recorded pain levels do not reliably predict subsequent treatment [12,26]. Widely accepted scales are unidimensional; error may be introduced when attempting to gauge the intensity of pain at different points in time, during activities, and movements [4,12]. The complexity of the pain experience is even greater for patients with chronic pain because so many aspects and activities of their lives are impacted [4].

Due to the multifaceted nature of chronic pain, adequately capturing pain's impact on a patient's life is challenging. Simple numeric rating scales lack the necessary nuance. More detailed, but lengthy, Likert-style questionnaires require significant cognitive energy to both complete and interpret. The Activity-Based-Checks of Pain – Functional Pain Scale (ABCs) is a visual/infographic pain assessment that was created to circumvent these issues. It uses simple

3

visual icons to represent activities and is comprised of various activities of daily living (ADL), instrumental activities of daily living (IADL), and other activities a patient may encounter in their daily life. This scale is meant to not only evaluate pain but also understand how pain interferes and limits activities. The objectives of this study are to (1) investigate and validate the factorial structure of the ABCs and (2) evaluate its use in chronic pain patients.

#### Methods

Institutional Review Board and ethical approval for this study was obtained from the University of Kansas Medical Center, study 00142379.

#### Target population and Recruitment

Participants were identified and recruited via Prolific, an online source used to identify volunteer research participants based on study criteria [23]. Two separate cohorts were recruited. The first cohort comprised a representative sample of United States adults and was used to determine the best-fit icons for each activity or function described in terms of icon comprehensibility and strength-of-association. The best-fit icons were incorporated into the next iteration of the ABCs. Arrow style to indicate where pain level was on the pain spectrum was also tested with subjects selecting between a black arrow, a colorful arrow, and arrows annotated with descriptors of mild, moderate, or severe pain. Field testing of the ABCs was done in the second cohort, who had all experienced chronic pain for at least 6 months. Participants in both cohorts were recruited without restrictions of race or sex, were age 18+, resided in the United States, and used English as their primary language.

#### *Content Validity – Cohort 1*

Participants were presented with the name of the function or activity of interest (e.g. preparing a meal) and four icons meant to represent it. They selected their preferred icon based

on relevance to the function (In your opinion, which of these images represents preparing a meal?), comprehensibility (Is it easy or difficult to understand that these images represent preparing a meal?), and strength-of-association (Which of the images best represents the ability to prepare a meal?). The most-selected and best-fit icon was then used in the ABCs presented to cohort two (chronic pain participants). Additionally, participants were able to provide their own opinion of a potential icon for such activity or function listed.

#### ABC's of Pain Functional Scale

Initial development of the ABCs included selection of icons representative of the activity or functions: walking, jogging/running, prolonged standing, prolonged sitting, sleeping, getting out of bed, sitting up, getting out of a chair, doing laundry, grocery shopping, walking a dog, playing with a child, bathing, housework, picking up 20 lbs, preparing a meal, eating, opening bottle to take medicine, walking upstairs, talking on the phone, getting dressed, personal care/grooming, driving, and toileting. Completion of the ABCs was done in a stepwise form. First, participants were asked if they are able to perform the given activity and select "yes", "no" or "not applicable" as an option (Image 1). If the participant responded "yes" to such activity, then they were able to indicate their level of pain on a bidirectional arrow from "no pain" to "worst pain". If they selected "no", a follow-up question asks why and participants were able to indicate on the bidirectional arrow how much pain they thought they would be in if the activity was attempted. The bidirectional arrow was scored with 0 being "no pain" to 10 being "worst pain".

Cohort 2 - Construct Validity

Participants were recruited to evaluate construct validity of the ABCs against the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) and the Patient Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS)-29, both of which are previously validated measures of pain. The BPI is meant to provide insight on the severity of pain experienced and the effect pain has on daily functioning in multiple domains as previously described [3]. Higher scores indicate worse pain and pain interference. Items in the BPI regarding everyday pain and percentage of pain relief with treatment are optional and are not included in the scoring. A score of 1 - 4 is considered overall mild pain, 5 - 6 is moderate pain, while a score average of 7 - 10 is severe pain. The PROMIS-29 was developed to measure various health aspects unrelated to any specific disease such as selfefficacy, fatigue, anxiety, depression, pain interference, sleep, and physical function [5]. Responses are on a 5-point Likert scale and scored from 1 - 5. The PROMIS-29 also includes a numeric rating scale which is scored from 0 - 10. A total score is based on the sum of all items producing a score between 4 - 20 which is then converted into a T-score with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10. The ABCs contained more functional items than the PROMIS-29. As such, the PROMIS item bank was searched so that items analogous to all the ABCs functions were included so that comparisons between ABCs and PROMIS items could be made. Twentythree items were added related to pain inference and physical function making the PROMIS a total of 52 questions. Time necessary to complete the BPI, PROMIS-29 plus additional items, and ABCs were also recorded.

Subjects were given the opportunity to provide open-ended narrative feedback on their experience with the different pain scales as well as salient experiences they had with the health care system as people with chronic pain. To assess for test-retest reliability, cohort two participants were invited to complete pain assessments two weeks after their initial participation.

6

#### Statistical Analysis

All study data were collected and managed using REDCap electronic data capture tools and exported to R (4.2.1) for analysis.

Responses from Cohort 1 were simply majority voting regarding the most understandable and representative item and arrow to use in the final version of the ABCs.

To evaluate the construct validity of the ABCs, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to examine the structure underlying responses to the items. The factor analysis results were used to determine the number of latent factors and their relationship to theory. We conducted a maximum likelihood analysis with oblique rotation. The appropriate number of factors was determined based on the number of eigenvalues greater than one, the scree plot, parallel analysis, and the interpretability of the factors. The factor loadings were examined to identify items that loaded on each factor.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to confirm the factor structure identified through EFA. The analysis was conducted using maximum likelihood estimation to account for possible correlation amongst the factor components. Model fit was assessed using the chi-square test, comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). The chi-square statistic is very sensitive to sample size and frequently rejects valid models due to large samples (n > 100). Modification indices were examined to identify areas of misfit and to refine the model.

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each factor identified through EFA and confirmed with CFA. A coefficient alpha of  $\geq 0.70$  was considered acceptable [24]. Test-retest reliability was assessed using the intraclass correlation coefficient

(ICC). A minimum acceptable value for intraclass correlations for multi-item scales was set at  $\geq$  0.70 [17].

Convergent validity was assessed by examining the correlation between the new pain scale and other measures of pain intensity. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to assess the correlation between the ABCs, BPI, and PROMIS. The strength of the correlation will be interpreted using the following guidelines: r < 0.3 = weak correlation, r = 0.3-0.6 = moderate correlation, r > 0.7 = strong correlation [2].

#### Results

#### Participant Demographics

Electronic online consent was provided and collected for 297 participants in cohort one and 304 in cohort two. In cohort one, 55% were females with 70.1% identifying as White with a mean age of 34. Participants in cohort two were 51% male and 80% White with a mean age of 41 years with over half reporting chronic pain issues of at least 5 years or more. (Table 1). Table 2 details descriptive statistics for the ABCs of pain subscales along with the PROMIS-29 pain interference, BPI pain interference, SF-20 pain severity, and the NRS.

The score distribution and pattern response for the ABCs of each activity is reported in Table 3. "Talking on the phone" and "Opening a bottle of medicine" show evidence of a floor effect with 62% and 57% respectively selecting "0" while there was no ceiling effect for any items. The average time to take the BPI, PROMIS-29, and ABCs was 2.4 minutes, 3.8 minutes, and 3.9 minutes respectively.

#### Factor Structure and Analysis

EFA was conducted to examine the underlying structure of the ABCs. A maximum likelihood analysis with oblique rotation was used. Oblique rotations were used with the

hypothesis that different factors of pain would be correlated with each other. The factor analysis revealed a four-factor solution, explaining 69% of the total variance. The first factor consisted of six items and had loadings of 0.623 to 0.879 for items 1 to 6 with 24% of the variance explained. The second factor consisted of four items and had loadings of 0.577 to 0.824 for items 6 to 10 with 17% of the variance explained. The third factor consisted of four items and had loadings of 0.512 to 0.841 for items 11 to 14 with 16% of the variance explained. The fourth factor consisted of four items and had loadings of 0.519 to 0.817 from items 15 to 18 with 13% of the variance explained. The factor loadings suggest that the first factor measures pain interference with sitting/hip flexor pain. The third is pain interference with walking/ambulation and the fourth factor is pain interference with lightweight unilateral activities.

CFA was conducted to confirm the factor structure identified through EFA (Table 4). The results of the CFA supported the four-factor structure. The chi-square test  $\chi 2 = 318.8$ , df = 129, p = <0.001. The comparative fit index (CFI) was 0.93, the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) was 0.91, and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was 0.08, which all indicate a moderate fit.

#### Reliability

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each factor identified through EFA and CFA. The alpha coefficients for pain interference with complex multi-planal activities, sitting/hip flexor pain, walking/ambulation and lightweight unilateral activities were 0.93, 0.86, 0.91, and 0.82 respectively, indicating high internal consistency. All participants who initially completed the survey were invited for test-retest at two weeks after initial responses. As shown in Table 1, 194 participants completed all assessments. Test-retest

reliability was assessed using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). The ICC for the total scale was 0.74, indicating moderate test-retest reliability.

#### Convergent Validity

Convergent validity was assessed by examining the correlation between the ABCs subscales and other measures of pain interference (Table 5). Correlations between analogous items from pain scales are shown on Table 6. All correlations were found to be moderate to strong.

#### Narrative Feedback on Pain Assessment

All participants had the opportunity to provide feedback on the ABCs as compared to the BPI and PROMIS. Comments from participants that indicated preference towards the ABCs, were: "[ABCs] Makes me feel like I am not comparing myself to others", "More rounded out picture of how my pain is limiting my life... then simply saying it's an 8", "My 4 may be someone else's 7", and "it gives the best idea of what my day to day is like". Participants commonly mentioned being able to communicate more detailed information about their pain especially when discussing with a healthcare provider. For participants that did not prefer the ABCs, comments included "[0-10 scale] is easier to follow", "Other scales give a definite number", and "The [0-10] scale is what I grew up with and has always gotten the point across for me".

#### Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate and validate the factorial structure of the ABCs – a novel functional pain scale that utilizes a visual/icon-based format and assesses pain in the context of its impact on ability to perform activities of interest – and evaluate its use in chronic pain patients. Our results indicate the scale functions well at measuring pain interference. Our multidimensional scale measures pain interference with (1) complex multi-planal activities, (2)

sitting/hip flexor pain, (3) walking/ambulation, and (4) lightweight unilateral activities. Testretest reliability was moderate to strong with an ICC of 0.74. Fit indices from the CFA support the construct validity and the Cronbach's alpha supports the internal consistency of the ABCs. The results confirm the use of the ABCs in chronic pain patients as a valid and reliable tool for assessing pain's impact on function.

Confirmatory factor analysis with four-factor structure supported the validity of the ABCs. Among the four factors, similarities were noted creating the constructs of complex multiplanal activities, sitting/hip flexor pain, walking/ambulation, and lightweight unilateral activities. There were cross loadings for items such as "Walking a dog" with the walking/ambulation group of items. While this intuitively makes sense the item remained within the multiplanar subscale since walking a dog is an activity that will involve more than simply walking. Similarly, we see housework, getting out of bed, eating, and personal care/grooming show similar signs of cross loading onto factors that incorporate some of the aspects of the activity.

In the current study, the ABCs were found to correlate with the BPI and PROMIS scales demonstrating high external validity. Previous studies comparing results between the BPI and PROMIS when assessing pain have found variable results. Kean et al., evaluated persistent musculoskeletal pain in 250 patients before and after interventions using the BPI, PROMIS pain interference measures, the 2-item Bodily Pain subscale of the Medical Outcomes Study SF-36 bodily pain subscale, and the 3-item Pain Intensity, Enjoyment of Life, General Activity (PEG) Scale [15]. Compared to the BPI, the PROMIS was less sensitive in re-evaluating pain and detecting changes or improvements after intervention. In contrast, Chen et al., found no significant difference in 759 patients between the BPI and PROMIS in being able to assess pain at baseline and at 3 – 6 month follow-up [6]. Variability in responses to pain assessment can be

11

highly context specific – for example, complex nature of pain, pain location, personal perceptions of pain, timing of pain evaluations – which may explain both consistency in results and lack thereof depending on study design [4,16]. In spite of this, the ABCs were able to capture tolerable and intolerable activities as reported by participants while having a moderately strong test re-test reliability. The ability of the ABCs scale to assess pain with activities may add value for physicians and health care team members who are trying to assess specific functional outcomes related to pain management interventions.

The ABCs employs a straightforward 0-10 pain scale as a heuristic, making it easily comprehensible and applicable for both practitioners and patients. It builds on this concept with subscales created from items grouped based on similar movements and body parts, thus allowing for more nuance when evaluating pain. The capturing of this more nuanced data can help facilitate better communication of pain between physicians and patients as well as among pain management teams. Tracking and understanding pain with specific activities can help with understanding and improving pain treatments and interventions.

Narrative feedback from participants highlighted several positive aspects of the ABCs, most notably its ability to provide comprehensive information about their lived experience and reducing pain's subjectivity. While the ABCs did not appear to be the best tool for all participants, many preferred a detailed personalized scale to describe their experience with pain. In a study by van Dijk et al., inconsistencies regarding interpretation of a reported score on the commonly used 0-10 Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) were found [25]. The same numeric score did not mean the same thing to different patients. Depending on the individual, reporting a pain score of 4 could be described as "bearable" or "unbearable." This was also the case for a 6 on the NRS. In a study investigating pain sensitivity and lower back pain, the threshold for pain did not

equate to disability or functional impact [13]. Miscommunication of pain may be further influenced by bias, the perception of pain by the healthcare provider, and cultural factors that determine what a patient feels is appropriate to share with their care teams [20,21]. For example, in some cultures, discussing pain may be considered to be inappropriate complaining or rude due to an implication that the pain is related to provision of poor care [18,19]. A personalized pain scale like the ABCs that is linked to the objective metric of being able to perform an activity, may be a useful tool to reduce biases and inconsistencies in pain communication for chronic pain patients.

The ABCs is intended to provide meaningful information that will visually and efficiently reflect pain and the impact on daily function. When comparing time to completion among the three scales, the ABCs completion time was similar to the PROMIS items, 3.9 minutes vs 3.8 minutes, respectively. However, compared to the BPI (2.4 minutes), the ABCs was approximately 1.5 minutes longer to complete. A future intent of the ABCs is to create an adaptable scale that is personalized to each patient's functional priorities. Not every activity or function in the current ABCs scale is applicable to all patients. The PROMIS has become a well-recognized scale with numerous bank items that can be added or removed from the scale based on clinician preference and purpose for its use. Time to completion for adaptations of the PROMIS have been previously reported to range from 3.3 minutes to 6.4 minutes [14,22]. In comparison, the BPI has been reported to take up to 5 minutes [9]. Time to completion for the BPI and PROMIS varies depending on the target population and the version of the scales being implemented. Future adaptations of the ABCs, with the ability to select pertinent activities, may further decrease time to completion.

#### Limitations

13

Although the results of the study indicate validity of the ABCs, the study was not without limitations. First, participants were recruited to participate via a survey distribution site based on self-reported chronic pain. This limited researchers from confirming chronic pain as a medical diagnosis. Second, test-retest was conducted, however, given the complexity of pain and individual lifestyles, levels of pain and location may fluctuate. Despite this, test-retest results do not appear to have been affected. We acknowledge that there is variability within the chronic pain patient population and that included subjects could have chronic pain from differing etiologies. However, we do not believe this to have significantly influenced our results, particularly in comparison between assessments as each individual served as their own control. While the four subscales cover a broad range of activities, there are certainly more activities that could be included in the ABCs depending on priorities of a particular patient population or recovery following certain procedures. Additional studies will address such patient- and procedure-specific outcomes.

#### Conclusion

This study successfully validated the ABCs, a novel functional pain scale that employs a visual/icon-based format to assess pain interference in chronic pain patients. The scale's multidimensional structure, as identified through EFA and confirmed through CFA, measures pain interference in four distinct areas: complex multi-planar activities, sitting/hip flexor pain, walking/ambulation, and lightweight unilateral activities. The ABCs demonstrated moderate to strong test-retest reliability and fit indices from the CFA supported its construct validity and internal consistency. The scale's correlation with the BPI and PROMIS scales further supports its external validity. The ABCs offers a nuanced and functional approach to evaluating pain with evidence for its validity in chronic pain patients.

14

## Acknowledgements

This project was funded by the National Institute of Health as a part of the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences KL2 Mentored Clinical Research Scholars Award, Parent

award UL1TR002366. The authors have no conflict of interest.

### **References**:

[1] Adeboye A, Hart R, Senapathi SH, Ali N, Holman L, Thomas HW. Assessment of Functional Pain Score by Comparing to Traditional Pain Scores. *Cureus*. 2021;13(8):e16847.
Published 2021 Aug 3. doi:10.7759/cureus.16847

[2] Akoglu H. User's guide to correlation coefficients. Turk J Emerg Med. 2018;18(3):91-93.

doi:10.1016/j.tjem.2018.08.001

[3] Atkinson TM, Rosenfeld BD, Sit L, Mendoza TR, Fruscione M, Lavene D, Shaw M, Li

Y, Hay J, Cleeland CS, Scher HI, Breitbart WS, Basch E. Using confirmatory factor analysis

to evaluate construct validity of the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI). J Pain Symptom Manage.

2011;41(3):558-565. doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2010.05.008

[4] Breivik H, Borchgrevink PC, Allen SM, Rosseland LA, Romundstad L, Hals EK,

Kvarstein G, Stubhaug A. Assessment of pain. Br J Anaesth. 2008;101(1):17-24.

doi:10.1093/bja/aen103

[5] Cella D, Yount S, Rothrock N, Gershon R, Cook K, Reeve B, Ader D, Fries JF, Bruce B, Rose M; PROMIS Cooperative Group. The Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS): progress of an NIH Roadmap cooperative group during its first two years. *Med Care*. 2007;45(5 Suppl 1):S3-S11.

doi:10.1097/01.mlr.0000258615.42478.55

[6] Chen CX, Kroenke K, Stump T, Kean J, Krebs EE, Bair MJ, Damush T, Monahan PO. Comparative Responsiveness of the PROMIS Pain Interference Short Forms With Legacy Pain Measures: Results From Three Randomized Clinical Trials. *J Pain*. 2019;20(6):664-675. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2018.11.010

[7] Fink R. Pain assessment: the cornerstone to optimal pain management. *Proc (Bayl Univ Med Cent)*. 2000;13(3):236-239. doi:10.1080/08998280.2000.11927681

[8] Gordon DB. Acute pain assessment tools: let us move beyond simple pain ratings. Curr

Opin Anaesthesiol. 2015;28(5):565-569. doi:10.1097/ACO.0000000000225

[9] Hassett AL, Whibley D, Kratz A, Williams DA. Measures for the Assessment of Pain in

Adults. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2020;72 Suppl 10:342-357. doi:10.1002/acr.24222

[10] Haverfield MC, Giannitrapani K, Timko C, Lorenz K. Patient-Centered Pain

Management Communication from the Patient Perspective. J Gen Intern Med.

2018;33(8):1374-1380. doi:10.1007/s11606-018-4490-y

[11] Henry SG, Bell RA, Fenton JJ, Kravitz RL. Goals of Chronic Pain Management: Do

Patients and Primary Care Physicians Agree and Does it Matter?. Clin J Pain.

2017;33(11):955-961. doi:10.1097/AJP.000000000000488

[12] Ho BV, Beatty S, Warnky D, Sykes K, Villwock J. Activity-Based Checks (ABCs) of

Pain: A Functional Pain Scale Used by Surgical Patients. Kans J Med. 2022;15:82-85.

Published 2022 Mar 15. doi:10.17161/kjm.vol15.15831

[13] Hübscher M, Moloney N, Leaver A, Rebbeck T, McAuley JH, Refshauge KM.

Relationship between quantitative sensory testing and pain or disability in people with spinal

pain-a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pain. 2013;154(9):1497-1504.

doi:10.1016/j.pain.2013.05.031

[14] Kadri O, Jildeh TR, Meldau JE, Blanchett J, Borowsky P, Muh S, Moutzouros V,

Makhni EC. How Long Does It Take for Patients to Complete PROMIS Scores?: An

Assessment of PROMIS CAT Questionnaires Administered at an Ambulatory Sports

Medicine Clinic. *Orthop J Sports Med.* 2018;6(8):2325967118791180. Published 2018 Aug 14. doi:10.1177/2325967118791180

[15] Kean J, Monahan PO, Kroenke K, Wu J, Yu Z, Stump TE, Krebs EE. Comparative Responsiveness of the PROMIS Pain Interference Short Forms, Brief Pain Inventory, PEG, and SF-36 Bodily Pain Subscale. *Med Care*. 2016;54(4):414-421.

doi:10.1097/MLR.000000000000497

[16] Khanom S, McDonagh JE, Briggs M, Bakir E, McBeth J. Adolescents' experiences of fluctuating pain in musculoskeletal disorders: a qualitative systematic review and thematic synthesis. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2020;21(1):645. Published 2020 Oct 2.

doi:10.1186/s12891-020-03627-1

[17] Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation

Coefficients for Reliability Research. J Chiropr Med. 2016;15(2):155-163.

doi:10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012

[18] Lasch KE. Culture, pain, and culturally sensitive pain care. Pain Manag Nurs. 2000Sep;1(3 Suppl 1):16-22. doi: 10.1053/jpmn.2000.9761. PMID: 11710145.

[19] Narayan MC. Culture's effects on pain assessment and management. Am J Nurs. 2010 Apr;110(4):38-47; quiz 48-9. doi: 10.1097/01.NAJ.0000370157.33223.6d. PMID: 20335689.
[20] Phelan SM, van Ryn M, Wall M, Burgess D. Understanding primary care physicians' treatment of chronic low back pain: the role of physician and practice factors. *Pain Med*. 2009;10(7):1270-1279. doi:10.1111/j.1526-4637.2009.00717.x

[21] Phillips DM. JCAHO pain management standards are unveiled. Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations. *JAMA*. 2000;284(4):428-429.

doi:10.1001/jama.284.4.423b

[22] Porter RS, Holt K, Ramchandran RS. Implementation of PROMIS® in an Optometry Clinic. *Patient Relat Outcome Meas*. 2021;12:307-312. Published 2021 Oct 7.
doi:10.2147/PROM.S329345

[23] Prolific. Updated 2023. Accessed April 07, 2023. https://www.prolific.com

[24] Taber KS. The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research

Instruments in Science Education. Res Sci Educ. 2018;48(6):1273-1296. doi:10.1007/s11165-

016-9602-2

[25] van Dijk JF, van Wijck AJ, Kappen TH, Peelen LM, Kalkman CJ, Schuurmans MJ.

Postoperative pain assessment based on numeric ratings is not the same for patients and

professionals: a cross-sectional study. Int J Nurs Stud. 2012;49(1):65-71.

doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.07.009

[26] Villwock JA, Villwock MR, New J, Ator G. The false vital sign: When pain levels are not predictive of discharge opioid prescriptions. *Int J Med Inform*. 2019;129:69-74.

doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.05.005

	Icon selection	All participants	Re-test participants
Characteristic	participants	$N = 304^{1}$	$N = 194^{1}$
	$N = 297^{1}$		
Age	34 (12)	41 (14)	43 (14)
Sex			
Female	164 (55%)	144 (48%)	95 (51%)
Male	132 (44%)	152 (51%)	90 (49%)
Prefer not to say	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.7%)	0 (0%)
Race			
Asian	18 (6.1%)	10 (3.4%)	6 (3.2%)
African American/Black	26 (8.8%)	19 (6.4%)	11 (5.9%)
White	210 (70.7%)	238 (80%)	148 (80%)
Mixed	29 (9.8%)	21 (7.0%)	13 (7.0%)
Other	13 (4.4%)	10 (3.4%)	7 (3.8%)
Pain Duration			
6-12 months	-	22 (7.4%)	10 (5.4%)
1-2 years	-	16 (5.4%)	9 (4.9%)
2-5 years	-	76 (26%)	47 (25%)
5-10 years	-	106 (36%)	68 (37%)
10-20 years	-	78 (26%)	51 (28%)

## Table 1. Participant Characteristics

<sup>1</sup> Mean (SD); n (%)

					Cronbach's
Subscale	Ν	Mean	SD	Range	Alpha
Complex Multi-					
Planal	303	3.49	2.14	0.0 - 9.2	0.93
Sitting/Hip Flexor	301	2.68	2.12	0.0 - 9.0	0.86
Standing/Ambulation	301	4.04	2.42	0.0 - 9.5	0.91
Lightweight					
Unilateral	298	1.28	1.49	0.0 - 8.5	0.82

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and internal consistency reliability for ABCs of Pain subscales

Activities/Functions	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean (SD)
Walking	43	43	38	48	41	13	31	20	10	3	2	3.24 (2.44)
Jogging/Running	21	20	20	30	19	22	53	28	29	12	21	5.08 (2.91)
Sleeping	53	50	39	52	25	26	24	13	6	2	3	2.88 (2.37)
Getting out of bed	62	54	55	45	26	12	17	15	6	3	0	2.53 (2.25)
Sitting up	76	62	43	41	24	16	17	9	3	4	0	2.28 (2.2)
Doing laundry	62	50	53	39	28	20	18	10	6	3	0	2.55 (2.24)
Grocery shopping	51	39	54	41	30	21	26	16	12	3	1	3.05 (2.43)
Walking a dog	30	21	32	41	21	22	14	12	10	3	4	3.41 (2.52)
Playing with a child	19	30	33	23	24	19	23	17	7	2	4	3.62 (2.52)
Bathing	80	57	47	46	25	19	12	8	5	0	0	2.18 (2.05)
Housework	26	30	42	49	32	28	33	32	17	9	1	3.94 (2.51)
Picking up 20 lbs	15	33	32	31	30	41	34	37	15	11	9	4.47 (2.63)
Preparing a meal	63	52	51	49	22	15	19	13	7	0	0	2.49 (2.19)
Walking up stairs	39	51	41	43	19	23	14	25	18	10	4	3.44 (2.76)
Driving	57	51	48	45	14	19	9	12	6	1	0	2.40 (2.16)
Toileting	109	67	46	22	17	18	6	6	4	1	0	1.7 (1.99)
Prolonged standing	31	22	28	44	27	18	34	40	24	14	7	4.43 (2.82)
Prolonged sitting	66	37	43	35	15	23	33	22	10	2	5	3.1 (2.69)
Getting out of a chair	61	55	47	48	23	17	25	15	6	0	0	2.6 (2.23)
Talking on the phone	177	44	27	15	8	5	3	2	3	1	1	0.96 (1.73)
Eating	130	68	33	30	10	10	4	6	3	0	1	1.4 (1.87)
Opening a bottle of medicine	166	52	23	21	13	6	3	0	4	0	1	1.05 (1.71)
Getting dressed	91	70	41	34	20	18	12	5	6	2	0	2.0 (2.12)
Personal care/Grooming	114	66	41	38	13	11	5	5	1	2	0	1.55 (1.83)

Table 3. Score distributions, response frequencies and averages for the ABCs.

CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
0.92	0.91	0.09	0.05

Table 4. Final CFA of the ABCs scales

Tables 5. ABCs subscale correlations with BPI, PROMIS-29 and NRS

	AB	Cs of Pain Subsc	ales	
	Complex Multi- Planal	Sitting/Hip Flexor	Standing/Ambul ation	Lightweight Unilateral
NRS	0.43	0.39	0.41	0.37
SF-20 (pain severity)	0.59	0.50	0.59	0.37
BPI (pain interference)	0.58	0.51	0.59	0.48
PROMIS-29 (pain interference)	0.70	0.52	0.60	0.49

*Note: all values were significant (P<0.001)* 

ABCs vs PROMIS items	rho
ABC walking pain v. BPI walking ability	0.66
ABC walking pain v. PROMIS "Are you able to walk at a normal speed?"	-0.73
ABC prolonged standing v PROMIS "How much did pain prevent you from standing for more than 30 minutes?"	0.68
ABC prolonged standing v PROMIS "How much did pain prevent you from sitting for more than 30 minutes?"	0.63
ABC getting out of bed v PROMIS Are you able to sit down in and stand up from a low, soft couch?	-0.57
ABC getting out of a chair v PROMIS Are you able to stand from an armless straight chair?	-0.59
ABC grocery shopping v PROMIS How much did pain interfere with doing your tasks away from home (e.g., getting groceries, running	
errands)?	0.62
ABC housework v BPI housework	0.49
ABC housework v PROMIS How much did pain interfere with work around the home?	0.65
ABC picking up 20 lbs v PROMIS Are you able to carry a heavy object (over 10 pounds/5kg)?	-0.63
ABC eating v PROMIS Are you able to cut your food using eating utensils?	-0.23
ABC opening a bottle of medicine V PROMIS Are you able to open a tight or new jar?	-0.54
ABC walking upstairs v PROMIS Are you able to go up and down stairs at a normal pace?	-0.71
ABC personal care/grooming v PROMIS Are you able to shave your face or apply makeup?	-0.44
ABC sitting up v PROMIS Are you able to sit on the edge of a bed?	-0.45
ABC laundry v PROMIS How much did pain interfere with your	
household chores?	0.61

Table 6. Spearman's correlation coefficients for analogous variables

		Four factor	loadings	
Activities/Functions	Multi-planal movement	Sitting/Hip flexor	Walking/Ambu lation	Light weight unilateral
Walking	0.219	-	0.714	-
Jogging/Running	-	0.112	0.841	-
Getting out of bed	0.191	0.577	-	-
Sitting up	-	0.824	-	-
Doing laundry	0.704	0.231	-	-
Grocery shopping	0.879	-	0.131	-
Walking a dog	0.692	-	0.248	-
Housework	0.283	-	0.512	-
Picking up 20 lbs.	0.732	0.127	-	-
Preparing a meal	0.623	0.19	-	-
Walking up stairs	0.643	-	-	0.132
Prolonged standing	-	-	0.739	0.147
Prolonged sitting	-	0.748	-	-
Getting out of a chair	-	0.738	0.152	-
Talking on the phone	-	-0.109	-	0.817
Eating	-	0.239	-	0.519
Opening a bottle of medicine	-0.143	-	0.126	0.771
Personal care/Grooming	0.267	-	-	0.707

## Table 7. Maximum likelihood factor bases loadings for the retained 18 items of the ABCs.

Image 1. Activities Based Checks of Pain – Example

## Activities Based Checks of Pain (ABCs) - EXAMPLE

Select Yes, No, or Not Applicable (N/A) if you are able to perform each activity

o No o N/A Indicate your level of pain for the activity		Preparing a r	<b>neal</b> o	Yes	
o N/A Indicate your level of pain for the activity			0	No	
Indicate your level of pain for the activity	<b>ت</b> م م		0	N/A	
Indicate your level of pain for the activity					
	Indicate you	r level of pain	for the activity		
		-			
		-			•