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RESEARCH QUESTION

What is the validity and accuracy of standard visual or verbal pain assessment tools when used for Aboriginal populations?

KEY FINDINGS

One non-randomized study was identified regarding the validity and accuracy of standard visual or verbal pain assessment tools when used for Aboriginal populations.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including OVID MEDLINE, PubMed, The Cochrane Library, University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2005 and July 2, 2015. Internet links were provided, where available.

SELECTION CRITERIA

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.
### Table 1: Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal populations of any age experiencing any kind of pain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>Verbal or visual pain assessment tools examples (do not limit to these alone):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Face scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Edmonton Symptom Assessment System (ESAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Patient Reported Functional Status (PRFS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators (CNPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong></td>
<td>Validity in other populations; No comparator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Validity and accuracy of Western diagnostic/assessment tools for Aboriginal populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Designs</strong></td>
<td>Health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results

Rapid Response 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 and non-randomized studies.

One non-randomized study was identified regarding the validity and accuracy of standard visual or verbal pain assessment tools when used for Aboriginal populations. No relevant health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, or randomized controlled trials were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

**Health Technology Assessments**
No literature identified.

**Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses**
No literature identified.

**Randomized Controlled Trials**
No literature identified.

**Non-Randomized Studies**
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Non-Randomized Studies

Pain Processing and Beliefs Regarding Pain


Qualitative Studies


Additional References
