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RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. What is the comparative reliability and validity of the Abbey Pain Scale and the Pain Assessment Checklist for Seniors with Limited Ability to Communicate (PACSLAC) for pain assessment in elderly patients?

2. What is the reliability and validity of the PACSLAC for pain assessment in elderly patients?

3. What is the clinical evidence that the use of the Non-Communicative Patient’s Pain Assessment Instrument (NOPPAIN) leads to improved pain management in elderly patients?

4. What are the guidelines for the use of pain assessment tools for elderly patients in long term care?

KEY MESSAGE

Two systematic reviews, five observational studies and four guidelines were identified looking at the reliability, validity and guidelines for use of the Abbey Pain Scale, the PACSLAC and the NOPPAIN in elderly patients.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key health technology assessment resources, including PubMed, the Cochrane Library (Issue 12, 2010), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, ECRI (Health Devices Gold), EuroScan, international health technology agencies, and a focused Internet search. The search was limited to English language articles published between January 1, 2005 and December 17, 2010. No filters were
used to limit the retrieval for Questions 1, 2, or 3. A filter was used to limit retrieval to guidelines for Question 4. Internet links were provided, where available.

RESULTS

HTIS reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and evidence-based guidelines.

Two Systematic reviews, five observational studies and four guidelines were identified. No health technology assessments or randomized controlled trials were indentified. Additional articles on alternate pain assessment tools are located in the appendix.

Health technology assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic reviews and meta-analyses


Randomized controlled trials
No literature identified.

Non-randomized studies


Guidelines and recommendations

See: 2. Subjective measures; 3. Objective measures; appendix 1
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Review articles


Additional references


