Hip & Knee PROM

# **Pain Visual Analogue Scale (Pain VAS)**

Measures pain intensity at rest or with activity

#### **Phases**

Pre-op
Acute
Post-acute
Active living









## Quality



Validity

Construct validity: Knee/hip OA: Excellent, highly correlated with both verbal & numerical pain scales. Hip OA: Excellent correlation (> 0.995) with 5-point Likert scale<sup>4</sup>



Reliability

Test-retest: Knee OA: Excellent at/within 24 hr (ICC=0.97)3



Responsiveness

Knee/hip OA: More responsive than WOMAC pain subscale.5



Floor/ceiling effects

No evidence found



**Feasibility** 

Simple, quick to complete & score



#### **Instructions**

A continuous horizontal or vertical line, usually 100mm long, & anchored by 2 verbal descriptors (i.e., "no pain" & "worst imaginable pain").<sup>1,2</sup> Ask patient to rate "current" pain intensity or pain intensity "in the last 24 hr" by placing a single mark on the line. See 'Relevant Links' for detailed instructions.

Scoring: Use a ruler to measure the distance, in mm, from "no pain" anchor to mark on Pain VAS line. Record value between 0-100mm.



## Interpretation

**Direction:** Higher number = worse pain. For post-surgical pain: no pain (0-4mm), mild pain (5-44mm), moderate pain (45-74mm), & severe pain (75-100mm).<sup>1</sup>

SEM: Knee OA: 0.03mm which is considerably less than the numeric rating scale (0.48mm) & verbal rating scale (0.21mm).3

MDC: TKA: 16.1mm (acute hospital phase)<sup>6</sup>; THA: 14.9mm (acute hospital phase).<sup>6</sup> Knee OA: 0.08<sup>3</sup>

MCID: Differs by surgery & whether pain is improving or worsening; TKA: -18.6mm if pain improving; 29.1mm if pain worsening.<sup>6</sup> THA: -22.6mm if pain improving; 23.6mm if pain worsening.<sup>6</sup>

Cut points/Thresholds: No evidence found

PASS: Knee OA: 35.0mm (95% CI=32.8-37.4); Hip OA: 32.3mm (95% CI=30.1-34.7). Higher baseline VAS = higher PASS value. 7

Normative/Reference values: No evidence found



### **Other**

**Key messages:** Recommended. Widely used, easy to administer, score & interpret. Minimal difficulties with translation. To avoid interpretation errors, ensure the line measures 100mm after printing or photocopying. Not suitable for persons with visual or cognitive impairment, or for telephone administration.



## **Relevant Links**

<u>Print PDF (Yale University)</u>
<u>Summary & instructions (Physiopedia)</u>
<u>Online fillable PDF (orthopaadicscores.com)</u>



#### References

- 1. Hawker GA, Mian S, et al. Measures of adult pain: Visual Analog Scale for Pain (VAS Pain), Numeric Rating Scale for Pain (NRS Pain), McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ), Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire (SF-MPQ), Chronic Pain Grade Scale (CPGS), Short Form-36 Bodily Pain Scale (SF-36 BPS), and Measure of Intermittent and Constant Osteoarthritis Pain (ICOAP). Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2011;63 Suppl 11:S240-52. PMID: 22588748
- 2. Pagard V, Shreif K, Jackson K et al. Visual Analogue Scale. Physiopedia. Accessed January 26 2023. <a href="https://www.physio-pedia.com/Visual Analogue Scale">https://www.physio-pedia.com/Visual Analogue Scale</a>
- 3. Alghadir AH, Anwer S, et al. Test-retest reliability, validity, and minimum detectable change of visual analog, numerical rating, and verbal rating scales for measurement of osteoarthritic knee pain. J Pain Res. 2018; 26;11:851-6. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5927184/
- 4. Averbuch M, Katzper M. Assessment of visual analog versus categorical scale for measurement of osteoarthritis pain. J Clin Pharmacol. 2004;44(4):368-72. PMID: 15051743
- 5. da Costa BR, Saadat P, et al. Visual Analogue Scale has higher assay sensitivity than WOMAC pain in detecting between-group differences in treatment effects: a meta-epidemiological study. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2021;29(3):304-12. PMID: 33271331
- 6. Danoff JR, Goel R, et al. How much pain is significant? Defining the minimal clinically important difference for the Visual Analog Scale for pain after total joint arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty. 2018;33(7S):S71-5.e2. PMID: 29567002
- 7. Tubach F, Ravaud P, et al. Evaluation of clinically relevant states in patient reported outcomes in knee and hip osteoarthritis: the patient acceptable symptom state. Ann Rheum Dis. 2005;64(1):34-7. <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1755212/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1755212/</a>



