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Prior to the Outcome Measures in Rheumatology (OMERACT) 12 meeting in Budapest, Hungary, a workshop was held bringing together individuals from a number of international outcome measure organizations to assess how best to further develop consensus on how pain is conceptualized and measured in trials of musculoskeletal conditions, and how the trials should be reported in systematic reviews. (J Rheumatol First Release Feb 1 2015; doi:10.3899/jrheum.141430)

ABSTRACT. Prior to the Outcome Measures in Rheumatology (OMERACT) 12 meeting in Budapest, Hungary, a workshop was held bringing together individuals from a number of international outcome measure organizations to assess how best to further develop consensus on how pain is conceptualized and measured in trials of musculoskeletal conditions, and how the trials should be reported in systematic reviews. The workshop included clinicians, patients, and researchers from 9 countries in the Americas, Australasia, and Europe, from 7 organizations representing the Cochrane Collaboration (6 Cochrane subgroups/entities), COMET (Core Outcome Measures in Effectiveness Trials), COSMIN (Consensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement Instruments), GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation), IMMPACT/ACTTION (Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials/Analgesic, Anesthetic, and Addiction Clinical Trial Translations, Innovations, Opportunities, and Networks), OMERACT, and VAPAIN (Validation and Application of a core set of patient-relevant outcome domains to assess the effectiveness of multimodal pain therapy).

David Tovey, editor-in-chief of The Cochrane Library, noted that Cochrane Systematic Reviews aim to provide trustworthy and interpretable estimates of what works in health and healthcare. Identifying the proper research question using a formulation based on the P (Population), I (Intervention), C (Comparator), and O (Outcomes) framework is a critical first step. The aim of a review focused on treatment is to determine whether, for a given comparison and outcome, there is any effect/difference, the direction of any effect, and the degree of certainty that the calculated
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The first thematic working group on Pain Domains addressed the challenge of achieving consensus on measurement property criteria for deciding whether a pain measurement instrument meets the OMERACT Filter 2.0 requirements and those of other approval agencies, such as the US Food and Drug Administration. The flow chart of OMERACT Filter 2.0 was endorsed with a stepwise approach to selecting the concept first and considering the content validity of potential instruments for the intended context of use, then addressing practical and feasibility issues, and only then moving to a detailed assessment of the measurement properties of the instrument (methodological quality, and potential risk of bias) using an approach such as that developed by COSMIN. If this stepwise approach identifies gaps in the required evidence, additional studies should be proposed to ensure all necessary evidence is available. The research agenda brought forward by this group will complete the last phase of applying the OMERACT Filter 2.0 and provide core outcome developers with a template to ensure that major risk of bias is avoided and an evidence-based decision can be made on choice of instrument.

The third theme of “Thresholds for Presenting Results” was reviewed in the next article in the series. Patient responder analysis, rather than mean results, was strongly recommended, in particular because of the finding, by the Pain, Palliative, and Supportive Care group, that patients in their systematic reviews tended to respond either by a relatively large amount or not at all, so that a mean change is not informative. Provisional consensus was reached: Options for individual trials should include reporting of the proportion of patients achieving 1 or more thresholds of improvement from baseline pain (e.g., ≥ 20%, ≥ 30%, ≥ 50%), achievement of a desirable pain state (e.g., no worse than mild pain), and/or a combination of change and state. The research agenda includes (1) evaluating the proposal that when pooling data for metaanalysis, authors should...
consider converting all continuous measures for pain to a 10 cm/100 mm visual analog scale (VAS) for pain and use the minimally important difference (MID) of 1 cm/10 mm, and the conventionally used appreciably important differences of 2 cm/20 mm, 3 cm/30 mm, and 5 cm/50 mm, to facilitate interpretation; (2) assessing the loss of discrimination tradeoff with ease of interpretation from the growing practice of combining 20% and 30% improvement from baseline in systematic reviews; (3) assessing whether there is consensus that effect sizes of ≤ 0.5 MID units suggest a small or very small effect, and effects ≥ 2.0 MID units suggest a large effect; (4) assessing whether increased interpretability is achieved by transforming the pooled estimate on the VAS/numerical rating scale to a binary outcome and expressed as a relative risk and risk difference.

A fourth theme, presented in the article by Christensen, et al, describes approaches to using a hierarchy for selecting different outcomes to combine in a metaanalysis. Predefining such a hierarchy avoids selective outcome reporting bias in studies with more than 1 pain scale, where the temptation is to use the one (“cherry picking”) with the largest effect size. Use of a predefined hierarchy set, initiated by Juni, et al and developed by the Cochrane Musculoskeletal Editors, is proving to be popular with the Cochrane Musculoskeletal systematic review authors. Juhl, et al proposed using a combination of criteria of frequency of use and effect size. There was agreement on a research agenda, including the need to develop methodology for generation of hierarchical lists of outcome instruments measuring pain to guide metaanalyses. Tools that could be used to steer development of such a prioritized list are the COSMIN checklist and the OMERACT Filter 2.0.

Regarding the topic of Pain Outcomes, Measurement, and Systematic Reviews, the pre-OMERACT meeting provided an important opportunity for representatives from a broad range of groups and organizations to discuss issues face-to-face while using the OMERACT process. Not all individuals participate in more than 1 organization. Different organizations have realized the importance of these issues and have addressed them to different degrees (done in isolation, this may be inefficient, not to mention the danger of competitive ownership). As well, there is too much to be done for any single organization. Our hope is that the participating organizations continue this partnership, while others who wish to participate will join in to address those parts of the research agenda that interest them.
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