

1 **Title:** Exploring athlete pain assessment experiences and priorities; A two-part qualitative series of
2 athlete and physiotherapist interactions.

3 Part One. “Gauging and discerning” - Athlete & physiotherapist pain assessment experiences and
4 interactions.

5

6 **Authors**

7 Ciarán Purcell^{1,2,3,4,5,6} Caoimhe Barry Walsh³ Garrett Van Oirschot^{1,2} Brona M Fullen¹ Tomás Ward⁶
8 Brian M Caulfield^{1,2}

9 ¹*School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Sports Science, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland*

10 ²*Insight SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics, Dublin, Ireland*

11 ³*School of Allied Health, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

12 ⁴*Physical Activity for Health Research Cluster, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

13 ⁵*Sports and Human Performance Centre, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

14 ⁶*Ageing Research Centre, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 *Objectives:* To explore the content (subjective questions, objective tools and outcome measures) and
28 discuss the nature (qualitative elements and wider considerations) of the athlete pain assessment by
29 facilitating shared understandings of athlete and sports physiotherapists.

30 *Design:* Qualitative Research using a hermeneutic phenomenological approach.

31 *Methods:* We carried out focus groups comprising a deliberate criterion sample using a constructivist
32 perspective. We developed a topic guide and used reflexive thematic analysis. We developed codes,
33 candidate themes and finalised themes iteratively, and employed a critical friend to add depth to our
34 analysis. Our paper follows the consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ)
35 guidelines.

36 *Results:* We completed five focus groups comprising twelve athletes (five female, seven male) and
37 four sports physiotherapists (four male). Three final themes (and eight subthemes) were created; (i)
38 Measures, Scales and Dimensions (value and limitations of tools and scales, multidimensional
39 methods, making sense and interpreting), (ii) Connect, Listen and Learn (the pain interview and
40 athlete's story, forging the athlete-clinician connection), (iii) Lighthouse in the Storm: providing
41 direction for athletes in pain. (information overload and indecision, a beacon of direction; the role of
42 the physiotherapist, the burden of expectation; challenges for physiotherapists)

43 *Conclusion:* We described and explored the phenomena of pain assessment in sport including current
44 pain assessment strategies. Comprehensive multidimensional assessment methods that preserve the
45 athlete-clinician therapeutic relationship and facilitate optimal communication are priorities for future
46 research and practice.

47

48 **Keywords**

49 'Pain Measurement', 'Musculoskeletal Pain', 'Athletic Injuries' 'Athletic Performance' 'Focus
50 Groups', 'Pain Management'.

51 **Introduction**

52 A comprehensive biopsychosocial pain assessment that includes affective (emotional), cognitive
53 (understandings and appraisals) and socioenvironmental (sport, home, work/school, social, cultural
54 and environmental) as well as the more frequently used neurophysiological (pain characteristics and
55 qualities) and biomechanical (local and wider biomechanical considerations) aspects has been
56 proposed to capture the full extent of an athlete's pain experience.^{1 2} Understanding the impact of
57 these aspects on an athlete's sport and wider life facilitates the planning and delivery of more
58 effective management strategies.³ In a recent scoping review, we identified gaps in pain assessment
59 practice specifically around the affective, cognitive and socioenvironmental aspects of pain
60 assessment.⁴ Contemporary models outline the impact of wider aspects such as stress, sports
61 environment, support networks and coping strategies on athlete pain experience and injury
62 prevention.^{5 6} Clear and effective communication allows athletes to develop relationships with their
63 support network and to access coping strategies they may not be able to otherwise. This is in line with
64 contemporary research that highlights the importance of effective communication between all
65 members of the athlete support staff in injury prevention.⁷ In this series we explore one of the key
66 relationships and communication opportunities in an athlete's pain journey, the athlete-
67 physiotherapist pain assessment. To date, little has been published exploring athlete pain assessment,
68 and to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to combine both athlete and physiotherapist
69 experiences and perspectives. Our objectives were to explore the content (subjective questions,
70 objective tools and outcome measures) and discuss the nature (qualitative elements and wider
71 considerations) of an assessment for athletes with upper and lower limb pain

72

73

74 **Methods**

75 We conducted a qualitative study with mixed focus groups that combined athletes and sports
76 physiotherapists and followed the consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ)

77 guidelines.⁸ Ethical permission was granted for our study by the UCD Human Research Ethics
78 Committee (LS-22-40-Purcell-Caulfield).

79 **Positionality statement and team background.**

80 We viewed perceptions of athlete upper and lower limb pain and pain assessment from a
81 constructivist perspective taking a pragmatic approach and drawing on the relevant knowledge from
82 elements of empirico-analytical, interpretive and critical research paradigms.⁹ As the primary
83 interviewer I (CP) recognise that being a sports physiotherapist and PhD athlete pain researcher
84 influences the dynamic of discussions, I am unavoidably enmeshed, and I embrace this to understand
85 athlete and clinician upper and lower limb pain experiences with a reflexive approach.^{9 10}. GvO PhD
86 candidate and sports physiotherapist with seventeen years of experience acted as moderator for the
87 first two focus groups to ensure all voices were heard and took field notes of the setting and context
88 and IOC Athlete Pain domains discussed.¹ BC a Professor in physiotherapy with twenty years of
89 research experience acted as a neutral observer for the first session. CBW, Physiotherapist and PhD
90 researcher in the field of chronic conditions with experience in the conduct of focus groups, acted as a
91 critical friend for the qualitative analysis.

92 **Participants**

93 We recruited a deliberate criterion-based sample of: (i) athletes (of varying age, gender, sport, and
94 competition level) through university and local sports clubs and (ii) sports physiotherapists (with a
95 minimum of three years of postgraduate experience working with athletes as part of their weekly
96 caseload from a variety of sports and clinical settings) through the Irish Society of Chartered
97 Physiotherapists in Sports and Exercise Medicine group via email and other communication channels
98 and networks. All athletes had been assessed for pain in the upper or lower limb in the past year, and
99 all sports physiotherapists had assessed such patients also. To facilitate engagement we offered
100 participants their preference of face-to-face and online (zoom) focus group settings (which were run
101 separately). We used a reflexive sampling strategy with data collection and analysis following each
102 focus group informing the total sample size. We ceased sampling and recruitment when sufficient

103 depth of information on athlete pain experience and athlete-physiotherapist pain assessment
104 experience was gathered rather than seeking objective data saturation in line with our active
105 constructivist approach.¹¹

106 **Protocol**

107 We sent participants a pre-participation questionnaire to capture demographic information including
108 their sports background and previous pain and injury history. We asked physiotherapists about their
109 experience working in sports, additional qualifications and any current or prior sports participation.
110 We developed a topic guide (Appendix A) using an established step-by-step approach; brainstorming,
111 ordering, timing and phrasing of questions, obtaining feedback from peers, revising and piloting.¹²
112 The topic guide moved from broad questions concerning athlete pain understandings and experiences
113 to reflections on current pain assessment practice before identifying priorities for an athlete upper and
114 lower limb pain assessment framework. We altered the sequencing of questions slightly in subsequent
115 focus groups in line with an iterative and reflexive approach.¹⁰ We allocated two hours for the
116 sessions to ensure enough time for all components. We set ground rules establishing confidentiality,
117 equity and respect for diverse views and opinions before each group. We moderated the power
118 imbalance between physiotherapists and athletes by emphasising the importance of the athlete's voice
119 asking for athletes' opinions to be shared before clinicians. Where possible we ensured athletes and
120 physiotherapists who previously worked together were separated. Our initial successful pilot focus
121 group of two athletes was followed up with four focus groups combining athletes and physiotherapists
122 in line with methodological recommendations to facilitate interaction through dialogue and capture
123 various perspectives in a shared space.¹³

124 **Analysis**

125 We completed the transcription verbatim and transcripts were checked against the audio recordings
126 for accuracy. The full, uncoded and anonymised set of transcripts has been published in an online data
127 repository (10.17632/t47tw94mzd). We chose reflexive thematic analysis as it was congruent with
128 both our data collection and epistemological position.¹⁰ Following initial observations and notes CP

129 carried out initial coding of the entire transcripts (both semantic and latent). During the data analysis
130 process, we assigned athletes alphanumeric participant IDs beginning with the letter “A” and
131 physiotherapists alphanumeric IDs beginning with “P”. Athletes and physiotherapists were talking
132 about and experiencing the same concepts so we merged the data for coding and analysis. Participant
133 IDs were known only to CP, the lead researcher. Once participant IDs were allocated and analysis was
134 complete all records of participant information were deleted ensuring anonymity Athlete and
135 physiotherapist data were merged for coding and analysis. Subsequent analysis was completed to
136 identify codes that were present in (i) athletes only, (ii) physiotherapists only and (iii) codes that were
137 present in both athletes and physiotherapists. One-third of the transcripts were given to CBW to code
138 independently and we discussed, compared and refined initial codes using a critical friend approach to
139 incorporate breadth and variation in experiences and perspectives.¹⁴ We updated coding where
140 necessary, with similar codes being highlighted and grouped to form rough clusters of candidate
141 themes. The team reviewed candidate themes in the context of the research question with
142 consideration given to the data available to support each theme. We merged some themes and
143 adjusted others at this refinement stage. We developed an initial thematic map of the refined themes
144 before we applied titles and created a final thematic map. (Appendix B) In this paper, Part One of this
145 series, we report on data primarily from questions focused on athlete pain assessment experience.

146 **Results and Discussion**

147 **Table 1 – Participant Demographics inserted here**

148 Participant demographics are summarised in Table 1. All final themes exploring athlete pain
149 assessment included a mixture of codes from all three categories (i, ii and iii in the data analysis
150 section above). Figure 1 displays the finalised themes and codes. Figure 2 is a thematic map of the
151 themes and subthemes relevant to athlete pain assessment.

152

153 **Figures 1 – Themes (Measures, Scales & Dimensions; Connect Listen & Learn; Lighthouse in**
154 **the Storm: providing direction for athletes in pain) and codes inserted here.**

155

156

157

158 **Figure 2 – Themes & Subthemes (and thematic map) inserted here.**

159

160

161 **Theme 1. Measures Scales and Dimensions**

162 Theme 1 includes three subthemes; 1.1 – value and limitations of tools and scales, 1.2 –
163 multidimensional methods, and 1.3 – making sense and interpreting. Despite positive advances in
164 identifying and managing sports-related pain the nebulous nature of pain experience proves
165 challenging when it comes to accurate and comprehensive assessment.³ Participants in this study
166 contrasted the value of tangible measures and scales which add a level of objectivity to the subjective
167 experience of pain with the limitations of currently available tools and scales for assessing athlete
168 pain. Additionally, the need for wider biopsychosocial and multidimensional pain assessment
169 strategies is firmly established in the literature, something with which participants concurred but
170 rarely encountered.^{2,4}

171 *1.1 Value and limitations of tools and scales*

172 Participants discussed aspects of a standard physiotherapy pain assessment when recalling previous
173 experiences, including observation of the athlete and measures of physical function such as range of
174 motion, strength and performance markers. Physiotherapists and athletes alike noted the importance
175 of pain provocation and localisation to identify the “athlete’s pain” to validate the athlete’s specific
176 pain experience which is promoted by contemporary pain standards.¹⁵ Physiotherapists acknowledged

177 how criteria-based rehabilitation and pain management, guided by objective indicators can provide
178 clear goals for athletes and preferred this strategy to focusing on timelines which can be difficult to
179 predict. Additionally, athletes appreciated having tangible measures to both represent their pain and
180 gauge progress, a concept that is firmly established in sports-related injury and can also be applied to
181 the assessment of pain.¹⁶

182 *“Mobility, and kind of, my range..strength on both legs, that would have been tested, and then*
183 *pinpointing the pain, physically.” – A11*

184 *“I do a lot of like single leg hopping and stuff like that as I often say to a runner if you can’t*
185 *single leg hop, you can’t run, you kind of set your parameters early.” – P01*

186 *“ I appreciated that like there was an objective outcome .. (Physiotherapist) being able to see*
187 *if pain is actually affecting me. There was something that was tangible...I was quite happy*
188 *that meant he was going to take my pain serious(ly).” – A08*

189 However, in cases where pain was more diffuse or difficult to pinpoint, the limitations of representing
190 pain in a clinical setting were a source of frustration for athletes. Additionally, some athletes
191 experienced negative consequences from pain provocation testing or repeatedly being asked about
192 symptoms, highlighting the need for the selective use of certain pain assessment tools. Choosing the
193 right time to assess pain response and ask about symptoms is an important aspect that has been
194 previously discussed by established pain clinician-researchers.¹⁷

195 *“I couldn’t tell where it was I couldn’t point to it, I couldn’t palpate it they couldn’t locate*
196 *where it was .. which kind of frustrated me.” – A03*

197 *“When I single leg hopped I then had seven out of ten pain for the next two days when I could*
198 *have told them that ‘this is going to be really sore’.” – A03*

199 The development of technology in sport science and medicine has facilitated additional means for
200 capturing data that can be helpful in the assessment of pain in athletes including wearable devices for

201 physical performance and physiologic data, as well as smartphones and applications for assisting with
202 subjective health and wellness monitoring.¹⁸ Athletes reported familiarity with physiological markers
203 such as heart rate metrics however, effective use requires planning, implementation and reporting and
204 at times athletes felt overwhelmed with the amount of information.

205 *“I’m like a real techy person like I’m always on Garmin and Whoop and Auras and all the*
206 *different things...I went back to physios, went back to Doctors, because my resting heart rate*
207 *would have been normally you know low forties.. and then for a good two months, it was mid-*
208 *sixties.” – A10*

209 *“Maybe it was a bad thing that I was keeping such a close eye on you know the data I was*
210 *collecting yes because I was probably forming some sort of psychological response.”– A10*

211 Questionnaires and pain diaries can be enlisted as a method to add a layer of objectivity to the
212 retrospective subjective reporting of pain.¹⁹ Athletes, describing the individual nature of preferences
213 for communicating pain, noted how written diaries allow pain to be reported at multiple time points
214 throughout the day addressing the limitations of the once-off point-in-time assessments.
215 Physiotherapists also noted that written methods add an opportunity for athlete reflection. Conversely,
216 the time taken to complete them was seen as burdensome. Athletes felt they were repeating what had
217 already been expressed through conversation, and physiotherapists acknowledged that they are often
218 not appropriately analysed and utilised, citing time restrictions, and instead placed higher value on
219 objective measures.

220 *“..where you kind of pull out a sheet and describe the pain and it kind of gets the flow of*
221 *thought going and you’re better able to communicate it then to the physio.” – A11*

222 *“Sometimes there’s a period of time where like pain diaries and you know getting patients to*
223 *write down every day what the pain was and what they were doing.” – P01*

224 *“ A pain diary ..., that takes persistence that I didn’t have.” –A08*

225

226 Various pain scales are used to gauge the severity of pain an athlete feels during the clinical encounter
227 including during pain provocation tests, at specific time points throughout the day, and following
228 certain activities.²⁰ The numerical pain rating scale (NPRS), or 0-10 pain scale, was most frequently
229 encountered by participants who found it may be effective for repeated use with an athlete particularly
230 when tracking large changes in pain over time. However, both athletes and physiotherapists advised
231 comparisons between athletes should not be made. The benefits (simplicity, ability to track large
232 changes in pain in an athlete and widespread use) and drawbacks (once-off measure not representing
233 the 24-hour pain experience, floor/ceiling effects, subjective interpretation of scale) of the NPRS
234 described by participants are closely aligned with established pain measurement literature.²⁰

235 *“I often find with the 0-to-10 scale, someone can say a 5, doesn’t really mean a whole lot. If*
236 *someone says a 9, it probably does, but if someone says a 3 or 4 that could be very different*
237 *to someone else’s 3 or 4, ., I think it certainly gives me an insight into just that person, and if*
238 *your pain goes from a 6 to a 2, I know that that’s an improvement for you.” – P04*

239 *“So usually I get asked to describe it from nought to ten but I don’t really get the opportunity*
240 *to describe the twenty-four-hour cycle of the pain, which I think is probably something maybe*
241 *more relevant ...” – A08*

242 Athletes often struggled to represent their pain as a number and preferred descriptions that they could
243 attribute greater meaning to. Physiotherapists also used alternative pain scales offering different
244 means of measuring and interpreting pain severity including the traffic light system which indicates
245 when athletes must stop activities (red), proceed with caution (amber) or continue unabated (green),
246 an option that has been adopted widely in managing tendon pain.²¹ Grading pain as mild, moderate or
247 severe was another option participants encountered.

248 *“I find it very hard to say nought to ten so she would say mild, moderate or severe on the*
249 *pain scale like something that took it away from me giving it a number.” – A08*

250

251 ***1.2 Multidimensional methods***

252 Athletes emphasised the importance of accurately representing the psychological/emotional aspects
253 (e.g. feelings and emotions related to pain and sport), wider biological and lifestyle factors (e.g. stress,
254 sleep and nutrition, age and time of a female athlete’s menstrual cycle), and environmental factors
255 (e.g. pain culture within the sport, time of the competitive season, weather and playing conditions).
256 Athletes highlighted the profound impact these aspects have on pain perception, yet despite best
257 practice guidance, were rarely encountered.²⁴ Physiotherapists, acknowledging that their inclusion is
258 best practice, shared that some formal assessments of psychological and emotional aspects can be
259 lengthy and interrupt the flow of assessment in time-pressured sports settings where athletes may not
260 appreciate them. Instead, physiotherapists described how these aspects tend to be addressed more
261 informally as part of the pain interview. Techniques such as motivational interviewing and
262 psychologically informed practice are becoming standard practice for physiotherapists in the
263 general population and likely inform the assessment process for physiotherapists working in
264 sports also.²²

265 It is worth highlighting how athletes in this study felt these aspects were often ignored and so
266 there may be a case for explicitly discussing these wider aspects to ensure athlete’s pain
267 experience is validated. *“I know personally if my cortisol levels are higher, so if I’m stressed or
268 lacking sleep that I nearly feel pain more and as a woman actually at different parts of your cycle.”* –
269 A08

270 *“I think people probably didn’t ask enough about the mental effects of injury until you are
271 visibly in a bad mood or something”* – A05

272 *“On the psychological stuff, I suppose the way I would normally do it is you kind of a little
273 more informal so you kind of be having a chat with them.”* – P02

274 ***1.3 Making sense and interpreting***

275 Prior research has noted how physiotherapists can sometimes feel underequipped when assessing
276 pain, particularly with more complex and chronic presentations which has led to the recent
277 publication of pain education curricula at undergraduate and postgraduate levels by the European Pain
278 Federation.^{22 23} Drawing on their experience of prior pain assessments, athletes highlighted the need to
279 go beyond the available pain scales and search for better ways to describe and represent pain
280 intensity. Physiotherapists also acknowledged how in their experience objective findings must be
281 correlated with athletes' subjective reports of pain to complete a comprehensive pain assessment that
282 is in line with best practice guidance and the recent pain education curricula.^{2 23}

283 *“Instead of like tell me what your pain is from nought to ten it's like tell me how it impacted*
284 *your ability to train, your ability to race... to live a normal life.” – A08*

285 *“The outcome measures .. like handheld dynamometry and force plates .. you're trying to*
286 *correlate that with their own.. feedback on pain.” — P01*

287

288 **Theme 2. Connect, Listen & Learn**

289 Theme 2 includes two subthemes; 2.1 – the pain interview and athlete's story and 2.2 – forging the
290 athlete-clinician connection. Every athlete has their own unique “pain story” and effectively
291 facilitating an athlete to describe the meaning their pain experiences holds for them is a cornerstone of
292 pain assessment.¹⁷ This aspect of assessment was seen by athletes and physiotherapists as an
293 opportunity to develop a rapport and relationship with characteristics such as trust, authenticity and
294 empathy woven into the process. A well-conducted pain interview allowed athletes to feel listened to,
295 understood and validated, as prioritised in pain assessment guidelines.¹⁵ In contrast, assessments in
296 sports settings are often time-pressured with establishing injury diagnosis being prioritised meaning
297 comprehensive pain assessment and optimal management cannot be achieved.²⁴

298 ***2.1 The pain interview and athlete's story.***

299 The pain interview allows the athlete and physiotherapist to explore the sensory and emotional aspects
300 of pain and their wider impact.² Athletes discussed being asked about aggravating and easing factors,
301 severity, irritability and nature of the pain and to describe it using various adjectives. The onset,
302 duration and preceding history of the pain experience were commonly explored. Athletes and
303 physiotherapists emphasized how the pain interview is an interactive process that is enhanced by the
304 physiotherapist exploring the context and history behind an athlete’s pain experience. Athletes
305 gathered pain and injury experiences from their support network and teammates adding them to their
306 interpretations. Physiotherapists used the pain interview to guide the generation of hypotheses and the
307 selection of objective tests and measures.

308

309 “Because everyone has pain, no one goes through life without pain, and then it’s individual to
310 that person so maybe help give them a bit of context to their own pain; this feels .. similar to
311 what I had before, .. to what this person told me they had, or...” – P04

312

313 “If we don’t have an idea before they’re on .. the treatment table, .. of two or three things that
314 might be going on here well then we either haven’t asked the right question or we haven’t
315 listened to them.” –P01

316 Open-ended discussions allowed the athlete to go beyond the sensory or physical manifestations of
317 pain and begin to explore the emotional and multidimensional aspects. Open-ended questions aided
318 the clinician in gathering the necessary information needed to develop accurate hypotheses and
319 diagnoses in line with research findings of question styles used in other pain cohorts.²⁵ Conversely
320 participants found the judicious use of closed questions were helpful to focus on specific aspects of
321 the pain experience.

322 *“Just letting someone talk to me about what their pain is, you learn a bit about the physical*
323 *side of it but then, you know, what does their pain means to them .. the emotion side of it and*
324 *the mental side of it as well, you get a bit more information out of it., , .. a lot of the time*
325 *people will tell you exactly what’s wrong with them” –P04*

326

327 **2.2 Forging the athlete-clinician connection**

328 Athletes valued having an opportunity to give their unique and full perspective which lay the
329 foundation for a strong relationship with their physiotherapist. Listening to an athlete with empathy
330 provides validation and reassurance that they are being heard and understood enabling effective
331 therapeutic alliance and an effective working relationship.¹⁵ Participants shared how truly
332 understanding an athlete's pain experience requires an investment of time and energy.

333 *"I think it really matters how you talk to someone about their own pain you know if they think*
334 *that it's really important to them, it's really important."* – A03

335 *"This is the first time someone's actually listened to what's been going on and like. I think ..*
336 *you tend to get a little more insight into their pain."* – P01

337 Athletes and physiotherapists alike stressed the importance of seeing the athlete as a whole person,
338 prioritising human interaction and connection and understanding their emotions, motivations and
339 behaviours. Trust plays an integral role in fostering the athlete-physiotherapist relationship and an
340 athlete's confidence in the diagnosis, pain explanation and prognosis they have received.²⁶ The
341 ambiguous nature of pain and the pressure to decide on whether or not to play and/or train through
342 pain in high-stakes sports settings can create barriers around forming strong relationships. This may
343 be due to sports physiotherapists' disclosure obligations to the management team or due to the
344 unwillingness of athletes to disclose the full extent of their pain. The athlete pain assessment was
345 described as a delicate balance between capturing sufficient objective data to structure the assessment
346 and management and dedicating time to nurture relationships and forge connections.

347 *"I think it's all just about understanding people really and then obviously you have to have*
348 *the rationale to back up what you're going to do etc.."* – P02

372 Whilst it is important to seek support from other members of the interdisciplinary team when
373 appropriate, physiotherapists are core members of the pain team with expertise in exercise
374 prescription and psychologically informed care who are optimally positioned to guide the pain
375 management journey for athletes.

376

377 ***3.1 Information overload and indecision***

378 Athletes described their frustration to accurately represent their pain during the assessment process.
379 Additionally, addressing the potential for pain hypervigilance, athletes noted that too much attention
380 amplified pain experiences and ruminating thoughts intruded. In line with previous findings, athletes
381 and physiotherapists noted the assessment of pain can be further complicated by cognitive overload
382 through an abundance of information gleaned from social media, support networks and various
383 clinicians that can leave an athlete feeling confused and frozen in indecision.²⁹

384 *“You kind of have that feeling of, you know, is that pain or is that, you know, your mind,*
385 *because you’re overthinking when you’re coming back ..that’s something that I definitely*
386 *struggle with.” – A12*

387 *“Like Instagram and people influencing .. I was changing exercises every single day trying to*
388 *solve my pains and everything .. the stress and the thought process and then doubting other*
389 *therapists was another huge thing so like ..there’s a lot of therapists that clash and it just*
390 *doesn’t help at all.” – A07*

391

392 ***3.2 A beacon of direction – the role of the physiotherapist***

393 Athletes highlighted how a clear explanation of their pain presentation provides clarity and
394 reassurance helping them to accept their current situation and begin to plan their next steps. The pain
395 assessment is an opportunity to educate athletes about the causes and contributors to their pain

396 perception which can have a positive effect on pain experience and management and sports
397 performance.^{3 5}

398 *“I know exactly what it is, and I nearly come to terms with it an awful lot quicker whereas if it’s an*
399 *injury that I’m not sure what it is sometimes I feel like my interpretation of that is worse. I feel like my*
400 *education around it has a huge impact so therefore that knowledge aspect is a drawback if I’m not*
401 *asked about it”*. – A08

402 *“As a kind of full-circle to the person .. “this is what the pain is” or “this is what I think it is*
403 *and this is why I think it is” and “this is what we’re going to do about it” and then if you understand*
404 *the first two then the third becomes a lot easier for the person to actually continue on because they*
405 *understand, you know”* – P04

406

407 ***3.3 The burden of expectation – challenges for physiotherapists***

408 Physiotherapists acknowledged the challenging nature of assessing and understanding pain and the
409 difficulty of choosing the appropriate pain assessment tools and measures. During the clinical
410 reasoning process, physiotherapists must be mindful of their communication strategy with athletes.
411 With due regard to the “information overload” described by athletes, physiotherapists highlighted
412 how they were conscious not to cause further confusion in the pain assessment process, which can be
413 a challenge.

414 *“Sometimes you come away from it and you wanted, why didn’t I do that, why did I do this,*
415 *we should assess this, I didn’t actually. You know, it can be hard.”* – P03

416 Striking the balance between assessment tools and diagnosis is a fine art, when not satisfied with the
417 pain explanation, diagnosis or prognosis provided by one clinician, athletes may seek additional
418 assessment, something clinicians were acutely aware of. Taking a health literacy-sensitive approach
419 is essential to ensure patients can be actively involved in the decision-making about their own

420 care. Health literacy impacts a variety of health outcomes in patients with chronic pain and
421 should also be prioritised with athlete cohorts to ensure optimal management.³⁰

422 *“All I can remember is I can’t run for six weeks so that’s not going to happen so I’ll go to*
423 *somebody else and find the answer I want” – P01*

424

425 Physiotherapists also described the challenges of completing pain assessments pitch side or in other
426 sports settings with conditions often less than optimal to conduct a thorough assessment. The timing
427 of the assessment is a key consideration with early and repeated assessments recommended in
428 musculoskeletal physiotherapy standards of practice.³⁰ This gives a clearer and more comprehensive
429 picture of pain. In contrast to these standards, the pain assessment practice described by athletes was
430 challenged by the lack of time available in both private practice and sports physiotherapy setting.
431 Additionally, the pressure to return to performance and minimise time out of sport was highlighted, an
432 aspect that has been previously discussed by sports physiotherapists.²⁸ Physiotherapists acknowledged
433 the difficulties of completing a thorough assessment and providing a diagnosis from the initial
434 assessment.

435 *“Like if you’re working with an athlete day-to-day then it’s a lot easier to gauge pain versus*
436 *if I have someone that comes in off the street into the clinic that I’ve never met before, and you don’t*
437 *know their tendencies or you don’t know their history.” – A12*

438 *“I think it’s like, putting the pressure on yourself to know exactly what’s wrong with someone*
439 *the first time you see them is unrealistic” –P04*

440

441

442

443 **Conclusion**

444

445 We described and explored the phenomena of pain assessment in sport. Athletes and physiotherapists
446 described and critiqued the routine methods and measures used. We highlighted the value of the pain
447 interview and athlete's story and we discussed how combining objective findings with the athlete's
448 pain experience requires consideration and skill. Athletes shared their desire for direction in
449 understanding and managing pain and we highlighted the challenges this poses, particularly for
450 physiotherapists. Whilst every effort was made to collect experiences from a diverse range of athletes
451 and physiotherapists and variety was achieved in sport, competition level and practice setting the
452 experiences gathered from these focus groups may not apply to all athlete pain assessment settings.
453 Notably, participants were all recruited from Ireland and whilst some of the female athletes also had a
454 physiotherapy background, no female sports physiotherapists were available to participate.
455 Better, more comprehensive and multidimensional means to describe and assess pain are priorities for
456 research and practice. Additionally, improved communication strategies that facilitate more timely
457 and relevant pain information whilst preserving an effective athlete-physiotherapist relationship are
458 needed. Priorities and directions for pain assessment will be explored further in Part Two.

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469 **Practical Implications**

- 470 - Objective assessment tools offer value in supporting the subjective nature of pain
471 experience and as indicators of progress.
- 472 - Some commonly used objective tools and scales have their limitations when it
473 comes to comprehensively assessing pain. The overuse of objective measures that
474 may not be relevant or helpful should be avoided.
- 475 - Multidimensional psychosocial assessment tools are underused and
476 Physiotherapists should consider integrating them into their athlete pain assessment
477 practice.
- 478 - Physiotherapists must place a high value on a well-conducted pain interview to (i)
479 facilitate the athlete to tell their pain story, (ii) educate the athlete regarding their
480 pain and (iii) as an opportunity to develop the therapeutic relationship.
- 481 - Physiotherapists must include multidimensional pain assessment measures and take
482 an individualised approach when interpreting pain assessment findings.

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492 **References**

493

- 494 1. Hainline B, Derman W, Vernec A, et al. International Olympic Committee consensus statement on
495 pain management in elite athletes. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(17):1245-58. doi:
496 10.1136/bjsports-2017-097884 [published Online First: 2017/08/23]
- 497 2. Hainline B, Turner JA, Caneiro JP, et al. Pain in elite athletes-neurophysiological, biomechanical
498 and psychosocial considerations: a narrative review. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(17):1259-64.
499 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-097890 [published Online First: 2017/08/23]
- 500 3. Hoegh M, Stanton T, George S, et al. Infographic. Pain or injury? Why differentiation
501 matters in exercise and sports medicine. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2022;56(5):299-
502 300. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2021-104633
- 503 4. Purcell C, Duignan C, Fullen BM, et al. Comprehensive assessment and classification of upper and
504 lower limb pain in athletes: a scoping review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*
505 2023;bjsports-2022-106380. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2022-106380
- 506 5. Wouw Avd. Advocating a holistic approach for sport injury prevention and rehabilitation. *British*
507 *Journal of Sports Medicine* 2023;57(14):895-96. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2022-105695
- 508 6. Titze C, Fett D, Trompeter K, et al. Psychosocial subgroups in high-performance athletes with low
509 back pain: eustress-endurance is most frequent, distress-endurance most problematic!
510 *Scand J Pain* 2021;21(1):59-69. doi: 10.1515/sjpain-2020-0053 [published Online First:
511 2020/09/07]
- 512 7. Tabben M, Verhagen E, Warsen M, et al. Obstacles and opportunities for injury prevention in
513 professional football in Qatar: exploring the implementation reality. *BMJ Open Sport &
514 Exercise Medicine* 2023;9(1):e001370. doi: 10.1136/bmjsem-2022-001370

- 515 8. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-
516 item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health*
517 *Care* 2007;19(6):349-57. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
- 518 9. Korstjens I, Moser A. Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 2: Context, research
519 questions and designs. *European Journal of General Practice* 2017;23(1):274-79. doi:
520 10.1080/13814788.2017.1375090
- 521 10. Braun V, Clarke V. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport,*
522 *Exercise and Health* 2019;11(4):589-97. doi: 10.1080/2159676x.2019.1628806
- 523
- 524 11. Braun V, Clarke V. To saturate or not to saturate? Questioning data saturation as a useful
525 concept for thematic analysis and sample-size rationales. *Qualitative Research in Sport,*
526 *Exercise and Health* 2021;13(2):201-16. doi: 10.1080/2159676x.2019.1704846
- 527 12. Kallio H, Pietilä AM, Johnson M, et al. Systematic methodological review: developing a
528 framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *J Adv Nurs* 2016;72(12):2954-
529 65. doi: 10.1111/jan.13031 [published Online First: 2016/05/26]
- 530 13. Tausch AP, Menold N. Methodological Aspects of Focus Groups in Health Research. *Global*
531 *Qualitative Nursing Research* 2016;3(0):233339361663046. doi:
532 10.1177/2333393616630466
- 533 14. Smith B, McGannon KR. Developing rigor in qualitative research: problems and opportunities
534 within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*
535 2018;11(1):101-21. doi: 10.1080/1750984x.2017.1317357
- 536 15. Raja SN, Carr DB, Cohen M, et al. The revised International Association for the Study of Pain
537 definition of pain: concepts, challenges, and compromises. *Pain* 2020;161(9):1976-82. doi:
538 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001939 [published Online First: 2020/07/23]

- 539 16 Mendiguchia J, Martinez-Ruiz E, Edouard P, et al. A Multifactorial, Criteria-based Progressive
540 Algorithm for Hamstring Injury Treatment. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2017;49(7):1482-92. doi:
541 10.1249/MSS.0000000000001241 [published Online First: 2017/03/10]
- 542 17 Wilson D, Williams M, Butler D. Language and the pain experience. *Physiother Res Int*
543 2009;14(1):56-65. doi: 10.1002/pri.424 [published Online First: 2008/11/15]
- 544 18 Seçkin AÇ, Ateş B, Seçkin M. Review on Wearable Technology in Sports: Concepts, Challenges and
545 Opportunities. *Applied Sciences* 2023;13(18):10399.
- 546 19. Haase I. Accuracy of retrospective pain measurement in patients with chronic pain. *Med Int*
547 (*Lond*) 2023;3(4):35. doi: 10.3892/mi.2023.95 [published Online First: 2023/07/14]
- 548 20. Correll DJ. Chapter 22 - The Measurement of Pain: Objectifying the Subjective. In: Waldman SD,
549 ed. Pain Management (Second Edition). Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders 2011:191-201.
- 550 21. Silbernagel KG, Thomeé R, Eriksson BI, et al. Continued sports activity, using a pain-monitoring
551 model, during rehabilitation in patients with Achilles tendinopathy: a randomized controlled
552 study. *Am J Sports Med* 2007;35(6):897-906. doi: 10.1177/0363546506298279 [published
553 Online First: 2007/02/20]
- 554 22. Cowell I, McGregor A, O’Sullivan P, et al. Physiotherapists’ Approaches to Patients’ Concerns in
555 Back Pain Consultations Following a Psychologically Informed Training Program. *Qualitative*
556 *Health Research* 2021;31(13):2486-501. doi: 10.1177/10497323211037651
- 557 23. European Pain Federation (EFIC). Core Pain Curriculum for Bachelor/ Pre Registration
558 Physiotherapy Programmes. 2023. Available online at:
559 <https://europeanpainfederation.eu/education/pain-curricula/> Last Accessed 22.02.2024
- 560 24. Thorborg K, Rathleff MS, Petersen P, et al. Prevalence and severity of hip and groin pain in sub-
561 elite male football: a cross-sectional cohort study of 695 players. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*
562 2017;27(1):107-14. doi: 10.1111/sms.12623 [published Online First: 2015/12/09]

- 563 25. McDonald DD, M S, Rose L, et al. The effect of pain question phrasing on older adult pain
564 information. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2009;37(6):1050-60. doi:
565 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2008.06.008
- 566 26. David S, Hitchcock J. Understanding Patient Trust in the Athletic Setting through Interviews.
567 *Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice* 2018 doi: 10.46743/1540-
568 580x/2018.1683
- 569 27. UK NGC. Evidence review for communication between healthcare professionals and people with
570 chronic pain (chronic primary pain and chronic secondary pain): Chronic pain (primary and
571 secondary) in over 16s: assessment of all chronic pain and management of chronic primary
572 pain: Evidence review B. . London National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)
573 2021.
- 574 28. Morgan N. Practical tips for a future in sports physiotherapy: Association of Chartered
575 Physiotherapists in Sport and Exercise Medicine blog series. In: *Medicine BJoS*, ed.: BMJ,
576 2023.
- 577 29. Gould D, Nalepa J, Mignano M. Coaching Generation Z Athletes. *Journal of Applied Sport*
578 *Psychology* 2020;32(1):104-20. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2019.1581856
- 579 30. Mackey LM, Blake C, Casey MB, et al. The impact of health literacy on health outcomes in
580 individuals with chronic pain: a cross-sectional study. *Physiotherapy* 2019(1873-1465
581 (Electronic)) doi: 10.1016/j.physio.2018.11.006. [published Online First: 2018]
- 582 31. Bishop A, Blackburn, J., Hallam, F., McComiskie, E., Rankin, G. Musculoskeletal
583 physiotherapy service standards; The delivery of musculoskeletal (MSK) physiotherapy
584 services in the UK for adults of 16 years and over. In: *Physiotherapy TCSO*, ed. London 2021.
585
586
587

588 **Table 1 – Participant Demographics**

PARTICIPANTS	N	FEMALE	MALE	SPORT (N)	COMPETITION LEVEL	PHYSIOTHERAPY BACKGROUND (N)	ATHLETE BACKGROU ND
ATHLETES	12	5	7	Athletics (5) Tag Ruby (1) Field Hockey (1) Soccer (2), Cycling (1) Mixed Martial Arts (1) Gaelic Football & Basketball (1)	Professional/Inter national (1) Semi- Professional (2) Elite Amateur (9)	Yes (5) No (7)	NA
PHYSIOTHERAPIS TS	4	-	4	Athletics (1), Rugby (1), Gaelic Football & Hurling (2), Mixed Sports in Private Practice (3)	Professional/Inter national (2) Mixed Competition level in Private Practice (3)	NA	Current Athletes (2) Retired Athletes (2)

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597


598

599 **Figure Captions**

600 **Figure 1. Themes (Measures, Scales and Dimensions; Connect, Listen and Learn; Lighthouse in**
601 **the Storm: providing direction for athletes in pain) and codes.** Dark shading – indicates codes
602 that were present in athletes and physiotherapists. Light shading – indicates codes that were present in
603 athletes only, No shading – indicates codes that were present in physiotherapists only

604

605 **Figure 2. Athlete pain assessment experience themes and subthemes.** The themes for each part of
606 this series represent a row in the priorities for the pain assessment pyramid, this paper presents the
607 bottom or foundation row of the pyramid. This comprises the three themes that describe the “athlete
608 pain assessment” experience alongside the constituent subthemes. In the top row, the “priorities and
609 directions for athlete pain assessment” themes and subthemes will be presented in Part Two and will
610 therefore build on the themes from this paper.





Describing and representing pain

Better communication

Providing direction and setting the pace

Broadering the pain assessment toolkit

The role of technology

Enhanced Communication & Pain Descriptions

Integrating Sport Specific & Multidimensional Assessments

Measures, Scales & Dimensions

Connect, Listen & Learn

Lighthouse in the storm

Measures, Scales & Dimensions

Value and limitations of tools and scales

Multidimensional methods

Making sense and interpreting

Connect, Listen & Learn

The pain interview and athlete's story

Forging the athlete-clinician connection

Lighthouse in the storm

Information overload and indecision

A beacon of direction - the role of the physiotherapist

The burden of expectation - challenges for physiotherapists

PARTICIPANTS	N	FEMALE	MALE	SPORT (N)	COMPETITION LEVEL	PHYSIOTHERAPY BACKGROUND (N)	ATHLETE BACKGROUND
ATHLETES	12	5	7	Athletics (5) Tag Ruby (1) Field Hockey (1) Soccer (2), Cycling (1) Mixed Martial Arts (1) Gaelic Football & Basketball (1)	Professional/International (1) Semi-Professional (2) Elite Amateur (9)	Yes (5) No (7)	NA
PHYSIOTHERAPISTS	4	-	4	Athletics (1), Rugby (1), Gaelic Football & Hurling (2), Mixed Sports in Private Practice (3)	Professional/International (2) Mixed Competition level in Private Practice (3)	NA	Current Athletes (2) Retired Athletes (2)