# IEHP Pain Management Clinical Practice Guideline

*(Last Updated February 2017)*
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1. **Patient Evaluation and Risk Stratification**

1. Carefully consider the potential therapeutic benefits, risks of harm, abuse, and misuse prior to initiating long-term use of opioids for chronic, non-cancer related pain.
2. Thorough patient assessment is critical, including but not limited to:
   a. Completing a medical history and physical examination
   b. Performing a psychological evaluation and opioid risk assessment
      i. PHQ-9 (Appendix 6)
      ii. Opioid Risk Tool (Appendix 4)
      iii. CAGE-AID Questionnaire (Appendix 5)
      iv. SOAPP-R (Appendix 7)
      v. DIRE Instrument (Appendix 8)
   c. Establishing a diagnosis and medical necessity
      i. Pain Intensity and Interference (Appendix 1)
   d. Exploring non-opioid therapeutic options
      i. Therapeutic Options for Pain Management (Appendix 2)
      ii. Non-Opioid Pain Management Tool (Appendix 3)
   e. Evaluating both potential benefits and risks of opioid therapy
   f. Being cognizant of aberrant or drug-seeking behaviors
   g. As a universal precaution, undertaking urine drug testing
   h. Reviewing the CURES/PDMP report for the patient
3. In some cases, opioids may not be appropriate or should be deferred until the comorbidity or history of substance abuse has been adequately addressed by specialists.

### Recommended Key Actions

- Conduct a careful and thorough patient assessment and evaluation
- Seek consultation from a pain, psychiatry, addiction, or mental health specialist as needed
- Perform opioid risk assessment
  - Opioid Risk Tool (Appendix 4)
  - CAGE-AID Questionnaire (Appendix 5)
  - SOAPP-R (Appendix 7)
  - DIRE Instrument (Appendix 8)
  - Urine drug testing, CURES/PDMP report

*Note: Although these assessment tools are well-established with proven effectiveness, providers must be aware that seasoned diverters know the right answers to these tools.*
2. Informed Consent and Opioid Management Plans

1. When starting chronic opioid therapy, obtain an informed consent, which addresses:
   a. Treatment goals and expectations
   b. Potential risks (e.g. side effects, risk of tolerance, dependence, opioid misuse)
   c. Anticipated therapeutic benefits
2. Establish a pain management agreement for patients:
   a. On short-acting opioids at time of third visit within two months
   b. On long-acting opioids
   c. Expected to require more than three months of opioid therapy
3. Develop treatment goals together with patients, including:
   a. Reasonably attainable improvement in pain and function
   b. Improve pain associated symptoms (e.g. sleep disturbance, depression, anxiety)
   c. Avoid unnecessary or excessive use of medication
   d. Continue opioid therapy only if there is clinically meaningful improvement in pain and function that outweighs risks to patient safety
   e. Opioid therapy will be discontinued if benefits do not outweigh risks
4. Treatment Plan should contain but not limited to the following:
   a. Information supporting the selection of therapies
   b. Pharmacologic intervention
   c. Non-pharmacologic interventions
   d. Pain and function assessment
   e. Further diagnostic evaluation
   f. Consultation, referral or additional therapies
   g. “Exit strategy” for discontinuing opioid therapy when opioid tapering becomes necessary
5. Clinicians should pursue consultations including interdisciplinary pain management when patients may benefit from additional skills or resources that they cannot provide.

**Recommended Key Actions**

- Obtain a patient consent and a pain management agreement
- Establish and document treatment plan and goals with patient, including realistic goals for pain and function, and should consider how opioid therapy will be discontinued if benefits do not outweigh risks.
- Counsel patients on potential risks of opioid therapy
- Samples of pain management agreements:
  - AAPM Sample Agreement (Appendix 9)
  - Suggested Patient Medication Agreement and Consent (Appendix 10)
  - Suggested Treatment Plan Using Prescription Opioids (Appendix 11)
3. Initiating Opioid Trial

1. Nonpharmacologic therapy and nonopioid pharmacologic therapy are preferred for chronic pain.
   a. Consider opioid therapy only if expected benefits outweigh risks for patient
   b. Opioid should be combined with nonpharmacologic therapy and nonopioid pharmacologic therapy, as appropriate
2. Avoid prescribing opioid pain medication and benzodiazepines concurrently whenever possible
3. Clinicians and patients should regard initial treatment with opioids as a therapeutic trial (usually no more than 45 days) to determine whether chronic opioid therapy (COT) is appropriate.
4. Individualize opioid selection, initial dosing, and titration according to the patient’s health status, previous exposure to opioids, attainment of therapeutics goals, and predicted or observed harms.
   a. Reference dosing recommendation for opioid naïve patients (Table II)
      i. Start at the lowest effective dosage and go slow
      ii. When starting opioid therapy, prescribe immediate-release opioids instead of extended-release/long-acting (ER/LA) opioids
      iii. For acute pain, prescribe no greater quantity than needed for the expected duration of pain. Three days or less will often be sufficient; more than seven days will rarely be needed
      iv. Caution in dosing for frail older persons or those with co-morbidities
5. Continuation of opioid therapy after an appropriate trial should be based on:
   a. Clinical outcomes (e.g. progress toward functional goals, pain status)
   b. Side effects
   c. Lack of medication misuse, abuse or diversion
6. Use of psychotherapeutic co-interventions
   a. Screen for depression and anxiety using validated tools (e.g. PHQ-9, GAD-7).
   b. As pain is often a complex biopsychosocial condition, consider integrating psychotherapeutic interventions, functional restoration, interdisciplinary therapy, and other adjunctive non-opioid therapies.
**Recommended Key Actions**

- Consider safer alternative treatment before initiating opioid therapy. Consider opioid therapy only if expected benefits outweigh risks for patient.
- When starting opioid therapy, prescribe immediate-release opioids instead of extended-release/long-acting (ER/LA) opioids.
- For acute pain, prescribe the lowest effective dose at no greater quantity than needed for the expected duration (i.e. three days or less).
- Start low and go slow.
- Combine with nonpharmacologic therapy (e.g. psychotherapeutic co-intervention) and nonopioid pharmacologic therapy, as appropriate.
- Avoid concurrent benzodiazepine and opioid prescribing.
4. Patient Education

1. Counsel patient on potential side effects and risks of opioid therapy (part of patient consent)
   a. Driving and work safety due to cognitive impairment as a result of COT
   b. Danger signs of respiratory depression which require immediate medical help
      i. Snoring heavily and cannot be awakened
      ii. Having trouble breathing
      iii. Extreme drowsiness and slow breathing
      iv. Blue skin/lips
      v. Non-responsiveness to painful stimulation
      vi. Feeling faint, very dizzy, confused or has heart palpitations

2. Educate patient and caregiver on naloxone use and administration
   a. Consider offering naloxone when factors that increase risk for opioid overdose, such as history of overdose, history of substance use disorder, higher opioid dosages (≥50 MME/day), or concurrent benzodiazepine use, are present

3. Effective January 1, 2015 California pharmacists are able to furnish naloxone under standardized procedures/protocols to family members or those who might be in contact with an individual at risk of overdose, or anyone who requests the drug without a prescription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Key Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Counsel patient on potential side effects, risks of opioid therapy, and danger signs of respiratory depression which require immediate medical attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educate patient and caregiver on naloxone, and consider offering naloxone when there is an increased risk for opioid overdose such as history of overdose, history of substance use disorder, higher opioid dosages (≥50 MME/day), or concurrent benzodiazepine use, are present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Ongoing Patient Assessment**

1. Conduct regular review and monitoring for the duration of opioid therapy
   a. Evaluate benefits and harms with patients within 1 to 4 weeks of starting opioid therapy for chronic pain or dose escalation
   b. Evaluate continued therapy every 3 months or more frequently
2. Continuation, modification or termination of opioid therapy for pain should be based on:
   a. Clinical progress (pain intensity, level of function and quality of life)
      i. Pain Assessment and Documentation Tool (PADT) (Appendix 12)
   b. Absence of adverse events such as overdose or diversion
   c. If benefits do not outweigh harms of continued opioid therapy, optimize other therapies and work with patient to taper opioids to lower dosages or to taper and discontinue opioids
   d. Strongly consider re-evaluation for those who do not follow the normal course of recovery
   e. Strongly consider tapering the patient off opioids as the acute pain episodes resolve. Taper opioids by 6 weeks if clinically meaningful improvement and pain has not occurred
3. Access and manage common opioid-associated adverse effects
   a. Opioid side effect summary (Appendix 18)
   b. Consider tapering dose for patient with signs of over-sedation or overdose risk
4. Regularly ensure and monitor compliance of pain management agreement
   a. Routine CURES/PDMP report, ranging from every prescription to every 3 months
   b. Routine Drug testing at least annually
      i. Urine Drug Testing Quick Reference (Appendix 13)
   c. Pill counting
5. If abuse is confirmed, immediately consult an addiction medicine specialist or mental health specialist trained in substance abuse disorders
6. Contact the police or Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) in event of prescription forgery, prescription theft or assaultive behaviors
   a. In some instances, may be necessary to taper opioid therapy and/or terminate the physician patient relationship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommended Key Actions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate benefits and harms with patients within 1 to 4 weeks of starting opioid therapy for chronic pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reassess patients on chronic opioid therapy regularly for clinical progress, absence of adverse events and compliance of pain management agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If benefits do not outweigh harms of continue opioid therapy, consider tapering opioids to lower dosages or to discontinue opioids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct routine CURES/PDMP reports, drug testing and pill counting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refer to addiction medicine specialist or substance use disorder specialist/program if abuse is confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contact police or DEA in event of prescription forgery and other criminal activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. High-Risk Patients

1. Screen and identify patients at risk of substance abuse by medical history review and screening assessment tool (e.g. Opioid Risk Tool, Appendix 4)

2. For patients at above-average risk of substance abuse, consider:
   a. Exhausting all non-opioid management interventions prior to considering opioid therapy
   b. Consulting with an addiction specialist
   c. Establishing a patient agreement, informed consent, and a written treatment plan by careful review with the patient
   d. Closely monitoring for side effects, efficacy, and warning signs
   e. Regular CURES/PDMP report and drug testing

3. Perform more frequent and intense monitoring for high risks patients and consider:
   a. Limiting prescription quantities
   b. Collaborating with a specialist in addiction medicine

4. If misuse or abuse of opioid is suspected or confirmed:
   a. Initiate a non-confrontational in-person meeting
   b. Present options for referral
   c. Offer or arrange evidence-based treatment (e.g. buprenorphine or methadone in combination with behavioral therapies)
   d. Opioid taper/discontinuation
   e. Switch to non-opioid treatment
   f. Avoid abandoning the patient or abruptly stopping opioid prescription

**Recommended Key Actions**

- Identify patients at risk of substance abuse with screening assessment tools such as:
  o Current Opioid Misuse Measure (COMM)- (potential substance abuse problem) (Appendix 14)
  o Opioid Risk Tool (Appendix 4)
  o CAGE-AID Questionnaire (Appendix 5)
  o SOAPP-R (Appendix 7)
  o DIRE Instrument (Appendix 8)
- For patients at above-average risk of substance abuse, consider:
  o Conducting frequent and intense monitoring including CURES/PDMP and drug testing
  o Limiting prescription quantities
  o Collaborating with addiction specialist
- Offer or arrange evidence-based treatment (e.g. buprenorphine or methadone in combination with behavioral therapies) for patients with opioid use disorder
7. Dose Escalations, High-Dose Opioid Therapy, Opioid Rotation, and Indications for Discontinuation of Therapy

1. Take caution once the morphine equivalent dose (MED) reaches 80 mg/day according to Medical Board guidance
   a. Consider referral to an appropriate specialist
   b. Closely monitor adverse effects and changes in health status
   c. Ensure compliance to patient agreement and treatment plan
2. If MED reaches 50 mg/day:
   a. Increase frequency of follow-up
   b. Consider offering naloxone
3. Evaluate potential causes and reassess benefits relative to harm when opioid dose escalations are repeated
4. Implement opioid rotation or tapering when patients on COT experience inadequate benefit despite dose increases (e.g. opioid insensitivity or hyperalgesia) and/or intolerable adverse effects
5. Tapering opioid therapy to cessation may be required for reasons below:
   a. Repeated aberrant drug related behaviors, drug abuse/diversion
   b. Intolerable side effects
   c. Failure to achieve anticipated pain relief or functional improvement
   d. Evidence of non-medical or inappropriate use
   e. Failure to comply with monitoring such as urine drug screening
   f. Failure to comply with pain management agreement
6. Establish a safely-structured tapering regimen or “exit strategy” when clinically indicated
   a. Slow 10% dose reduction per week to a more rapid 25-50% reduction every few days

Recommended Key Actions

- Take caution when MED exceeds 80 mg/day by consulting appropriate specialists and close monitoring
- When MED reaches 50mg/day, increase frequency of follow-up, and consider offering naloxone
- Implement opioid rotation when pain relief is inadequate despite dose increase (e.g. opioid insensitivity or hyperalgesia), or intolerable adverse effects
- Establish a safely-structured tapering regimen or “exit strategy” when clinically indicated
  o Exit Strategy Guide (Appendix 16)
  o Suggested Strategies for Tapering and Weaning (Appendix 17)
8. Medical Records

1. Provider must maintain adequate and accurate medical records
2. Medical records for treating a patient with chronic opioid use, according to Medical Board guidance, should include but is not limited to:
   a. Patient’s medical history
   b. Results of physical examination and laboratory tests
   c. Patient consent
   d. Pain management agreement
   e. Results of risk assessment tool
   f. Treatment provided, including all medications prescribed or administered
   g. Patient education including discussion of risks and benefits
   h. Monitoring of patient progress, pain assessment and functional improvement
   i. Notes on evaluation by specialists
   j. Information that support the initiation, continuation, modification and termination of treatment
   k. Intervention in response to any aberrant drug use behaviors
   l. Results of CURES/PDMP report and drug testing
   m. All prescription orders for opioid and other controlled substance

Recommended Key Actions

- Maintain adequate and accurate medical records, including thorough patient evaluation, opioid risk assessment, patient consent, pain management agreement, patient education, supporting documentation for opioid therapy, ongoing patient assessment, regular compliance monitoring, and prescription orders for controlled substance
9. Special Patient Populations

1. Acute Pain
   a. Clinicians should only prescribe opioid medications when the severity of the pain warrants the use and other non-opioid medications or therapies have been deemed unlikely to provide adequate pain relief.
   b. Opioid medications should only be dispensed with a quantity sufficient for a short duration of use.
   c. Long, intermediate, and extended-release/long-acting opioids should not be prescribed for the treatment of acute pain, except in scenarios where close monitoring for potential adverse effects can be implemented.

2. Emergency Department
   a. Clinicians treating patients in emergency departments or urgent care environments face challenges with initiating opioid treatment due to lack of patient history and unavailability of the primary physician, potentially leading to situations of controlled substance abuse.
   b. For patients presenting with acute low back pain
      i. Clinicians should assess the need for opioid medications by determining if non-opioid medications or non-pharmacological treatments will provide adequate pain relief.
      ii. Clinicians should reserve opioid medications for more severe pain or pain not relieved by previous analgesic therapy.
      iii. Clinicians should consider the risk of opioid medication abuse, misuse, or diversion before prescribing, and only prescribe the lowest practical dose for a restricted duration of time.
   c. For patients presenting with acute exacerbation of non-cancer chronic pain
      i. Clinicians should not routinely prescribe outpatient opioid medications for these patients seen in the emergency department.
      ii. Clinicians should only prescribe opioid medications at the lowest practical dose for a restricted duration of time when deemed necessary after taking into consideration risk of abuse, misuse or diversion.
      iii. Clinicians should when applicable, honor existing pain contracts/treatment agreements and utilize sources such as prescription drug monitoring programs to help drive therapy.
   d. Clinicians should utilize prescription monitoring programs to identify patients at risk of opioid medication diversion or doctor shopping.
   e. Tools:
      i. Clinical Policy (Appendix 15)
3. End-of-Life Pain
   a. Clinicians should individualize opioid therapy for pain management at the end of life, as certain patient priorities may result in the need for lower doses of medication and subsequently higher levels of pain in exchange for meaningful interactions with loved ones.
   b. Clinicians should consult a specialist in palliative medicine when necessary to prevent under-prescribing of opioids due to provider or patient fear of respiratory depression.

4. Cancer Pain
   a. Clinicians should understand that although opioid therapy is the accepted treatment for cancer pain management, some cancer patients may experience benefits from non-opioid therapy, surgeries, radiation therapy, or other procedures.
   b. Clinicians should not only recognize the range of medications available for adjuvant treatment of cancer pain, but also the increased risk for side effects as most patients are on a complex pharmacological regimen.

5. Older Adults
   a. Clinicians initiating opioid therapy for older adults should prescribe lower starting doses with slow titration, longer dosing intervals, and frequent monitoring.
   b. Older adults currently taking benzodiazepines should be tapered off slowly (if possible) to decrease the risk of respiratory depression.

6. Psychiatric Patients
   a. Clinicians should recognize the higher risk for side effects associated with opioid treatment for patients with psychiatric disorders and therefore prescribe opioids only for well-defined somatic/neuropathic pain conditions with slow titration, frequent monitoring, and consultation from specialists.

7. Patients Prescribed Benzodiazepines
   a. Clinicians should assess the need for benzodiazepine tapering in patients on opioid therapy or other medications that cause respiratory depression.
   b. Patients who are not candidates for or cannot tolerate benzodiazepine tapering should undergo slow titration of opioids with lower doses.

---

**Recommended Key Actions**

- Individualize opioid therapy based on patient medical history, presentation of symptoms, and concurrent pharmacological therapy
10. Compliance with Controlled Substances Laws

1. Clinicians should be aware of current federal and state laws, regulatory guidelines and policy statements that govern the use of COT, including a pharmacist’s corresponding responsibility regarding the dispensing of controlled substances

**Recommended Key Actions**

- Refer to the following sources to ensure legal use of COT in California
  - California laws regarding controlled substances
    - Health and Safety Code Section 11000-11033 (Reference 4)
  - Guide to the Laws Governing the Practice of Medicine by Physicians and Surgeons by the Medical Board of California (Reference 5)
  - Federal laws regarding controlled substances (Reference 6)
    - Title 21 United States Code (USC) Controlled Substances Act
  - Pharmacist corresponding responsibility (Reference 7)
11. IEHP Narcotic Drug Treatment Authorization Requirement

1. Please submit IEHP Prescription Prior Authorization (RX PA) for exceeding quantity limit, morphine equivalent daily dosage (MED) of 200mg or greater, and/or non-formulary narcotic drug request
2. Provide medical justification and document required for Rx PA clinical review as indicated below (see section I)

I. IEHP Requirement for Opioid Analgesic Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Rx PA Requests</th>
<th>Required Medical Documentation for Rx PA Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED &lt; 200mg</td>
<td>1. Pain assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Treatment plan and goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pain Contract was signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Current and past analgesic drug regimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Any additional medical justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevant to Rx PA request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED ≥ 200mg</td>
<td>All items on the IEHP Pain Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Treatment Plan Form must be submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the Rx PA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Current and past analgesic drug regimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pain contract was signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Documentation that risks and benefits of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opioid therapy was discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Documentation of opioid titration process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to current pain regimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Adequate trial of optimal non-opioid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>analgesic drug regimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Recent CURES report was reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Recent urine drug screen result(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Pain assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Treatment plan and goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Plan for opioid discontinuation if benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do not outweigh the risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. History of substance abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Any additional medical justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevant to Rx PA request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# II. IEHP Formulary Quantity Limit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Name</th>
<th>Generic Name</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Quantity Limit / 30 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tylenol W/Codeine</td>
<td>codeine/apap</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norco</td>
<td>hydrocodone/apap</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duragesic</td>
<td>fentanyl</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Contin, Avinza, Kadian</td>
<td>morphine</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percocet</td>
<td>oxycodone/apap</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultram</td>
<td>tramadol</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# III. Equianalgesic Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MED for Selected Opioids</th>
<th>Approximate Equianalgesic Dose (oral &amp; transdermal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morphine oral (chronic po)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeine oral</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fentanyl transdermal</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocodone</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydromorphone oral</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methadone</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxycodone</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxymorphone oral</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# IV. Recommended Dosage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opioid</th>
<th>Recommended starting dose for opioid-naïve patients</th>
<th>Recommended dose threshold for pain consult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fentanyl</td>
<td>Not recommended for opioid naïve patients</td>
<td>50 mcg/h (q72h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocodone</td>
<td>5-10 mg q4-6h</td>
<td>80 mg per 24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydromorphone</td>
<td>2 mg q4-6h</td>
<td>20 mg per 24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methadone</td>
<td>2.5-5 mg bid-tid</td>
<td>20 mg per 24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphine</td>
<td>IR: 10 mg q4h SR: 15 mg q12h</td>
<td>80 mg per 24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxycodone</td>
<td>IR: 5 mg q4-6h SR: 10 mg q12h</td>
<td>55 mg per 24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxymorphone</td>
<td>IR: 5-10 mg q4-6h SR: 10 mg q12h</td>
<td>30 mg per 24 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IEHP Pain Assessment & Treatment Plan

**Patient Name:**  
**Member ID:**

**Date of Birth:**  
**Diagnosis**

***Please complete ALL sections of this form for further consideration. Incomplete forms will not be taken.***

#### Section A: Member Medication Regimen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Analgesic Regimen:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Analgesic Regimen (within last 6 months):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section B: Supporting documents for current treatment plan.

___ Chart notes documenting titration up to current dose.

___ Documentation indicating that the risk and benefits of opioid therapy have been discussed with the patient.

___ Documentation indicating treatment plan for discontinuation if benefits do not outweigh the risks.

___ Documentation indicating a Prescription Drug Monitoring Report (CURES) has been reviewed within the past 30 days.  
**Date CURES report was accessed:** __________

___ Pain Contract signed and dated within the past 12 months.  
**Date Pain Contract was signed:** __________

___ Urine Drug Screen within the past 6 months.

Last Updated on 01/05/2017
IEHP Pain Assessment & Treatment Plan

Patient Name:                                                                      Member ID:
Date of Birth:                                                                        Diagnosis

Date Urine Drug Screen was taken: ______
Results of test: ______

Section C:
Treatment Assessment Questions

Has the patient tried the most optimal non-opioid containing analgesic drug regimen? Yes __ No__

Does the patient have any history of substance abuse? Yes __ No__
If yes, please identify the substance and past treatment

Please provide any additional medical justification relevant to adding this medication to the patient’s pain regimen. Yes __ No__

Section D:
Pain Assessment (0 = no pain, 10 = worst pain)

Current Pain:
On a scale of 0-10, how would you assess patient’s current pain.
Please circle one: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Comments:______________________________________________________

Treatment Goal:
On a scale of 0-10, what is the pain scale goal for this patient.
Please circle one: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Comments:______________________________________________________

Last Updated on 01/05/2017
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Appendix 10 - Therapeutic Options for Pain Management

In treating pain, clinicians can avail themselves of five basic modalities of pain-management tools:

1. Cognitive-behavioral approaches
2. Rehabilitative approaches
3. Complementary and alternative therapies
4. Interventional approaches
5. Pharmacotherapy

Not all of these options are necessary or appropriate for every patient, but clinical guidelines suggest that all options should be considered every time a health care provider decides to treat a patient with chronic pain. These options can be used alone or in combinations to maximize pain control and functional gains. Only one of these options involves medications and opioids are only one of many types of medications with potential analgesic utility. Which options are used in a given patient depends on factors such as the type of pain, the duration and severity of pain, patient preferences, co-occurring disease states or illnesses, patient life expectancy, cost and the local availability of the treatment option.

Cognitive-behavioral Approaches

The brain plays a vitally important role in pain perception and in recovery from injury, illness or other conditions involving pain. Psychological therapies of all kinds, therefore, may be a key element in pain management. At the most basic level, such therapy involves patient education about disease states, treatment options or interventions, and methods of assessing and managing pain. Cognitive therapy techniques may help patients monitor and evaluate negative or inaccurate thoughts and beliefs about their pain. For example, some patients engage in an exaggeration of their condition called “catastrophizing” or they may have an overly passive attitude toward their recovery which leads them to inappropriately expect a physician to “fix” their pain with little or no work or responsibility on their part. Another way to frame this is to assess whether a patient has an internal or external “locus of control” relative to their pain. Someone with an external locus of control attributes the cause/relief of pain to external causes and they expect that the relief comes from someone else. Someone with an internal locus of control believes that they are responsible for their own well being; they own the experience of pain and recognize they have the ability and obligation to undertake remediation, with the help of others.

Some chronic pain patients have a strong external locus of control, and successful management of their pain hinges, in part, on the use of cognitive or other types of
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therapy to shift the locus from external to internal. Individual, group or family psychotherapy may be extremely helpful for addressing this and other psychological issues, depending on the specific needs of a patient.

In general, psychological interventions may be best suited for patients who express interest in such approaches, who feel anxious or fearful about their condition, or whose personal relationships are suffering as a result of chronic or recurrent pain. Unfortunately, the use of psychological approaches to pain management can be hampered by such barriers as provider time constraints, unsupportive provider reimbursement policies, lack of access to skilled and trained providers, or a lack of awareness on the part of patients and/or physicians about the utility of such approaches for improving pain relief and overall function.

Rehabilitative Approaches

In addition to relieving pain, a range of rehabilitative therapies can improve physical function, alter physiological responses to pain and help reduce fear and anxiety. Treatments used in physical rehabilitation include exercises to improve strength, endurance, and flexibility; gait and posture training; stretching; and education about ergonomics and body mechanics. Exercise programs that incorporate Tai Chi, swimming, yoga or core-training may also be useful. Other noninvasive physical treatments for pain include thermotherapy (application of heat), cryotherapy (application of cold), counter-irritation and electroanalgesia (e.g., transcutaneous electrical stimulation). Other types of rehabilitative therapies, such as occupational and social therapies, may be valuable for selected patients.

Complementary and Alternative Therapies

Complementary and alternative therapies (CAT) of various types are used by many patients in pain, both at home and in comprehensive pain clinics, hospitals or other facilities. These therapies seek to reduce pain, induce relaxation and enhance a sense of control over the pain or the underlying disease. Meditation, acupuncture, relaxation, imagery, biofeedback and hypnosis are some of the therapies shown to be potentially helpful to some patients. CAT therapies can be combined with other pain treatment modalities and generally have few, if any, risks or attendant adverse effects. Such therapies can be an important and effective component of an integrated program of pain management.

Interventional Approaches

Although beyond the scope of this paper, a wide range of surgical and other interventional approaches to pain management exist, including trigger point injections, epidural injections, facet blocks, spinal cord stimulators, laminectomy, spinal fusion, deep brain implants and neuro-augmentative or neuroablative surgeries. Many of these approaches involve some significant risks, which must be weighed carefully against the potential benefits of the therapy.
Pharmacotherapy

Many types of medications can be used to alleviate pain, some that act directly on pain signals or receptors, and others that contribute indirectly to either reduce pain or improve function. For patients with persistent pain, medications may be used concurrently in an effort to target various aspects of the pain experience.

NSAIDs and Acetaminophen

Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), which include aspirin and other salicylic acid derivatives, and acetaminophen, are categorized as non-opioid pain relievers. They are used in the management of both acute and chronic pain such as that arising from injury, arthritis, dental procedures, swelling or surgical procedures. Although they are weaker analgesics than opioids, acetaminophen and NSAIDs do not produce tolerance, physical dependence or addiction. Acetaminophen and NSAIDs are also frequently added to an opioid regimen for their opioid-sparing effect. Since non-opioids and opioids relieve pain via different mechanisms, combination therapy can provide improved relief with fewer side effects.

These agents are not without risk, however. Adverse effects of NSAIDs as a class include gastrointestinal problems (e.g., stomach upset, ulcers, perforation, bleeding, liver dysfunction), bleeding (i.e., antiplatelet effects), kidney dysfunction, hypersensitivity reactions and cardiovascular concerns, particularly in the elderly. The threshold dose for acetaminophen liver toxicity has not been established, although the FDA recommends that the total adult daily dose should not exceed 4,000 mg in patients without liver disease (although the ceiling may be lower for older adults).

In 2009, the FDA required manufacturers of products containing acetaminophen to revise their product labeling to include warnings of the risk of severe liver damage associated with its use. In 2014, new FDA rules went into effect that set a maximum limit of 325 mg of acetaminophen in prescription combination products (e.g. Vicodin and Percocet) in an attempt to limit liver damage and other ill effects from the use of these products. Of note, aspirin (> 325 mg/d), ibuprofen, ketoprofen, naproxen and other non-cyclooxygenase-selective NSAIDs, are listed as “potentially inappropriate medications” for use in older adults in the American Geriatrics Society 2012 Beers Criteria because of the range of adverse effects they can have at higher doses.

Nonetheless, with careful monitoring, and in selected patients, NSAIDs and acetaminophen can be safe and effective for long-term management of persistent pain.

Opioids

Opioids can be effective pain relievers because, at a molecular level, they resemble compounds, such as endorphins, which are produced naturally in the human central nervous system. Opioid analgesics work by binding to one or more of the three major types of opioid receptors in the brain and body: mu, kappa and delta receptors. The
The most common opioid pain medications are called “mu agonists” because they bind to and activate mu opioid receptors. The binding of mu agonist opioids to receptors in various body regions results in both therapeutic effects (such as pain relief) and side effects (such as constipation).

Physical tolerance develops for some effects of opioids, but not others. For example, tolerance develops to respiratory suppressant effects within 5-7 days of continuous use, whereas tolerance to constipating effects is unlikely to occur. Tolerance to analgesia may develop early, requiring an escalation of dose, but tolerance may lessen once an effective dose is identified and administered regularly, as long as the associated pathology or condition remains stable.

Opioids, as a class, comprise many specific agents available in a wide range of formulations and routes of administration. Short-acting, orally-administered opioids typically have rapid onset of action (10-60 minutes) and a relatively short duration of action (2-4 hours). They are typically used for acute or intermittent pain, or breakthrough pain that occurs against a background of persistent low-level pain. Extended-release/long-acting (ER/LA) opioids have a relatively slow onset of action (typically between 30 and 90 minutes) and a relatively long duration of action (4 to 72 hours). The FDA states that such drugs are “indicated for the management of pain severe enough to require daily, around-the-clock, long-term opioid treatment and for which alternative treatment options are inadequate.”

These agents achieve their extended activity in various ways. Some have intrinsic pharmacokinetic properties that make their effects more enduring than short-acting opioids, while others are modified to slow their absorption or to slow the release of the active ingredient. A given patient might be appropriate for ER/LA therapy only, short-acting only or a combination of an ER/LA opioid with a short-acting opioid. Note that patients may respond in very different ways to any given medication or combination of medications. One size does not fit all, and treatment is best optimized by titrating a given regimen on an individual basis. Combination products that join an opioid with a non-opioid analgesic entail the risk of increasing adverse effects from the non-opioid co-analgesic as doses are escalated, even if an increase of the opioid dose is appropriate.

In response to concerns about opioid misuse and abuse, abuse-deterrent and tamper-resistant opioid formulations have been developed. One class of deterrent formulation incorporates an opioid antagonist into a separate compartment within a capsule; crushing the capsule releases the antagonist and neutralizes the opioid effect. Another strategy is to modify the physical structure of tablets or incorporate compounds that make it difficult or impossible to liquefy, concentrate, or otherwise transform the tablets. Although abuse-deterrent opioid formulations do not prevent users from simply consuming too much of a medication, they may help reduce the public health burden of prescription opioid abuse.

Patients who receive opioids on a long-term basis to treat pain are considered to be receiving long-term opioid analgesic therapy, which is differentiated from opioid use by
patients who have an established opioid use disorder who use an opioid (e.g. methadone) as part of their treatment program.

Potential Adverse Effects of Opioids

Although opioid analgesics (of all formulations) may provide effective relief from moderate-to-severe pain, they also entail the following significant risks:

- Overdose
- Misuse and diversion
- Addiction
- Physical dependence and tolerance
- Potentially grave interactions with other medications or substances
- Death

At the heart of much of the current controversy over the use of opioid analgesics for chronic pain are beliefs about the degree to which these pain medications are potentially addicting. Unfortunately, it is difficult to quantify the degree of addictive risk associated with opioid analgesics, either for an individual patient or the population of pain patients in general.

In this context, it is critical to differentiate addiction from tolerance and physical dependence which are common physiological responses to a wide range of medications and even to widely-consumed non-prescription drugs (e.g. caffeine). Physical dependence and tolerance alone are not synonymous with addiction. Addiction is a complex disease state that severely impairs health and overall functioning. Opioid analgesics may, indeed, be addicting, but they share this potential with a wide range of other drugs such as sedatives, alcohol, tobacco, stimulants and anti-anxiety medications.

Rigorous, long-term studies of both the potential effectiveness and potential addictive risks of opioid analgesics for patients who do not have co-existing substance-use disorders have not been conducted. The few surveys conducted in community practice settings estimate rates of prescription opioid abuse of between 4% to 26%. A 2011 study of a random sample of 705 patients undergoing long-term opioid therapy for non-cancer pain found a lifetime prevalence rate of opioid-use disorder of 35%.41 The variability in results reflect differences in opioid treatment duration, the short-term nature of most studies and disparate study populations and measures used to assess abuse or addiction. Although precise quantification of the risks of abuse and addiction among patients prescribed opioids is not currently possible, the risks are large enough to underscore the importance of stratifying patients by risk and providing proper monitoring and screening when using opioid analgesic therapy.

Particular caution should be exercised when prescribing opioids to patients with conditions that may be complicated by adverse effects from opioids, including chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), congestive heart failure, sleep apnea, current
or past alcohol or substance misuse, mental illness, advanced age or patients with a history of kidney or liver dysfunction.

In addition, opioids generally should not be combined with other respiratory depressants, such as alcohol or sedative-hypnotics (benzodiazepines or barbiturates) unless these agents have been demonstrated to provide important clinical benefits, since unexpected opioid fatalities can occur in these combination situations at relatively low opioid doses.

In addition to the potential risks just described, opioids may induce a wide range of side effects including respiratory depression, sedation, mental clouding or confusion, hypogonadism, nausea, vomiting, constipation, itching and urinary retention. With the exception of constipation and hypogonadism, many of these side effects tend to diminish with time. Constipation requires prophylaxis that is prescribed at the time of treatment initiation and modified as needed in response to frequent monitoring. With the exception of constipation, uncomfortable or unpleasant side effects may potentially be reduced by switching to another opioid or route of administration (such side effects may also be alleviated with adjunctive medications). Although constipation is rarely a limiting side effect, other side effects may be intolerable. Because it is impossible to predict which side effects a patient may experience, it is appropriate to inquire about them on a regular basis.

Patients should be fully informed about the risk of respiratory depression with opioids, signs of respiratory depression and about steps to take in an emergency. Patients and their caregivers should be counseled to immediately call 911 or an emergency service if they observe any of these warning signs.

As of January 2014, a California physician may issue standing orders for the distribution of an opioid antagonist to a person at risk of an opioid-related overdose or to a family member, friend, or other person in a position to assist a person at risk of an opioid-related overdose. A physician may also issue a standing order for the administration of an opioid antagonist to a person at risk of an opioid-related overdose to a family member, friend, or other person in a position to assist a person experiencing or reasonably suspected of experiencing an opioid overdose.

The potential of adverse effects and the lack of data about the addictive risks posed by opioids do not mean these medications should not be used. Common clinical experience and extensive literature document that some patients benefit from the use of opioids on a short or long term basis. Existing guidelines from many sources, including physician specialty societies (American Academy of Pain Medicine, The American Pain Society), various states (Washington, Colorado, Utah), other countries (Canada) and federal agencies (Department of Defense, Veterans Administration), reflect this potential clinical utility.

Recommendations from authoritative consensus documents have been summarized in concise, user-friendly formats such as: Responsible Opiate Prescribing: A Clinician's
Guide for the Federation of State Medical Boards; the 2013 Washington State Labor and Industries Guideline for Prescribing Opioids to Treat Pain in Injured Workers; and the Agency Medical Directors’ Group 2010 Opioid Dosing Guideline for Chronic Non-Cancer Pain.

*Methadone*

Particular care must be taken when prescribing methadone. Although known primarily as a drug used to help patients recovering from heroin addiction, methadone can be an effective opioid treatment for some pain conditions. Methadone is a focus of current debate because it is frequently involved in unintentional overdose deaths. These deaths have escalated as methadone has increasingly been used to treat chronic pain.

Methadone must be prescribed even more cautiously than other opioids and with full knowledge of its highly variable pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. Of critical importance is the fact that methadone’s analgesic half-life is much shorter than its elimination half-life. This can lead to an accumulation of the drug in the body. In addition, methadone is metabolized by a different group of liver enzymes than most other opioids, which can lead to unexpected drug interactions.

When rotating from another opioid to methadone, extreme caution must be used when referring to equianalgesic conversion tables. Consensus recommendations suggest a 75 to 90% decrement in the equianalgesic dose from conventional conversion tables when a switch is made from another opioid to methadone.

Because the risk of overdose is particularly acute with methadone, patients should be educated about these risks and counseled to use methadone exactly as prescribed. They should also be warned about the dangers of mixing unauthorized substances, especially alcohol and other sedatives, with their medication. This should be explicitly stated in any controlled substance agreement that the patient receives, reads and signs before the initiation of treatment […].

Although uncommon, potentially lethal cardiac arrhythmias can be induced by methadone. The cardiac health of patients who are candidates for methadone should be assessed, with particular attention paid to a history of heart disease or arrhythmias. An initial ECG may be advisable prior to starting methadone, particularly if a patient has a specific cardiac disease or cardiac risk factors or is taking agents that may interact with methadone. In addition, it is important that an ECG be repeated periodically, because QT interval prolongation has been demonstrated to be a function of methadone blood levels and/or in response to a variety of other medications.

*Adjuvant Pain Medications*

Although opioid medications are powerful pain relievers, in the treatment of neuropathic pain and some other centralized pain disorders such as fibromyalgia, they are of limited effectiveness and are not preferred. Other
classes of medications, however, may provide relief for pain types or conditions that do not respond well to opioids. Some of these adjuvant medications exert a direct analgesic effect mediated by non-opioid receptors centrally or peripherally. Others have no direct analgesic qualities but may provide pain relief indirectly via central or peripheral affects.

Commonly-used non-opioid adjuvant analgesics include antiepileptic drugs (AEDs), tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs) and local anesthetics (LAs). AEDs, such as gabapentin and pregabalin, are used to treat neuropathic pain, especially shooting, stabbing or knife-like pain from peripheral nerve syndromes. TCAs and some newer types of antidepressants may be valuable in treating a variety of types of chronic and neuropathic pain, including post-herpetic neuralgia and diabetic neuropathy. LAs are used to manage both acute and chronic pain. Topical application provides localized analgesia for painful procedures or conditions with minimal systemic absorption or side effects. Topical LAs are also used to treat neuropathic pain. Epidural blocks with LAs, with or without opioids, play an important role in managing postoperative and obstetrical pain.
## Non-Opioid Pain Management Tool by Jeremy Biggs MD MSPH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Type of Pain</th>
<th>Treatment Options</th>
<th>When to Initiate</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Duration/Indication of Treatment</th>
<th>Cautions/MISC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back Pain &lt;4 weeks</td>
<td>Directed Exercise Program 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, Controlled Weight Loss 2, Ice/Heat 2, 4, 6, 7, Acetaminophen up to 4 g/day 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, Physical therapy 4, 6, 10, 11, NSAIDs 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, Muscle relaxers 4, 9, 13, Cox-2 inhibitors 1, 2, Back School 14, 15, Tramadol/acetaminophen 2, Tramadol 2, Manipulation 1, 4, 6, 16, 17, 18, 19</td>
<td>Within 7-10 days of injury, Immediately, During the first 1-4 days, Immediately, After 3 weeks of conservative therapy, Immediately, (recommended to try Acetaminophen first), Immediately, If unable to tolerate NSAIDs and failed Acetaminophen therapy, After 1-2 weeks of conservative therapy, After failing acetaminophen for 1-2 weeks, After initial acetaminophen trial, Most effective when used for pain &lt;6 weeks of duration without radiculopathy</td>
<td>All ages, All ages, All ages, Adults, Younger adults, without any CV, Renal or GI risk factors, Adults, not to be used in people with any CV risk factors, Adults, Adults</td>
<td>Life long, Life long, Most effective in first 1-3 days, 1-2 visits, Short term treatment, Significant side effects profile, use cautions in prescribing, For length of program, Can be long term, Consider co morbidities, not shown to be better than other therapies. Not to be used with herniated disks</td>
<td>Consider co morbidities, Consider co morbidities, Consider co morbidities, Consider co morbidities, Significant side effects profile, use cautions in prescribing, Consider co morbidities, no CV, renal or GI risk factors, Consider co morbidities, no CV risk factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Pain &gt;4 weeks</td>
<td>Directed Exercise Program 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 18, 19, Yoga exercises (viniyoga) 20, Controlled Weight Loss 2, Acetaminophen up to 4 g/day 1, 2, 4, 8, NSAIDs 2, 4, 12</td>
<td>Immediately, Immediately, Immediately, Immediately, Immediately,</td>
<td>Adults, Adults, Adults, Adults</td>
<td>Life Long, Life Long, for 12 weekly sessions, Life Long, with acetaminophen in chronic low back pain</td>
<td>Consider co morbidities, Has been shown to be as or more beneficial than exercise in some studies, Consider co morbidities, Consider co morbidities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Type</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscle Relaxers 4, 13</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Short term treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant side effects profile, use cautions in prescribing, some studies did not show any benefit after 3-4 weeks of injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox-2 Inhibitors 1, 2</td>
<td>If unable to tolerate NSAIDs and no CV risk factors</td>
<td>Adults with no CV risk factors</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Consider co-morbidities, no CV risk factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back School 14, 15, 18</td>
<td>After 1-2 weeks of conservative therapy</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>For length of program</td>
<td>This has shown to speed return to work, but not any significance in lowering of pain scores or duration of pain. Swedish Back School program was studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricyclic antidepressants 9, 23</td>
<td>After 3-4 weeks and failing conservative therapy, acetaminophen</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>As long as deemed beneficial</td>
<td>Have significant side effects profile, consider co-morbidities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tramadol/acetaminophen 2</td>
<td>After failing acetaminophen for 1-2 weeks</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
<td>Consider co-morbidities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tramadol 2</td>
<td>After failing acetaminophen trial, co administration with acetaminophen has been shown to have more favorable results</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
<td>Consider co-morbidities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injections, epidural/facet joints 24, 25</td>
<td>After failing conservative treatment</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>As long as beneficial, if effective often last 1-4 months in duration, can be used to help diagnosis and evaluate for additional treatment options</td>
<td>Choose population according to guidelines. There are conflicting opinions on efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy 10, 11</td>
<td>Recommend starting immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1-2 visits</td>
<td>Consider co-morbidities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Therapy 26, 27, 28</td>
<td>Recommended in conjunction exercise and education</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>As long as beneficial has been shown to effective for up to one year, &gt;5 visits shows better results, most studies showed results in 6-10 treatments</td>
<td>Some disagreement in literature, but done by licensed therapist found to be more effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroreflexotherapy 29</td>
<td>Only in Chronic LBP</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Preliminarily this has shown some effect. Requires lengthy training of practitioner to be considered effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck Pain</td>
<td>Directed Exercise Program 1, 2, 3, 6, 30</td>
<td>Within 7-10 days of injury</td>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>Life long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acetaminophen 4g/day maximum 2, 6, 31</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Therapy</th>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSAIDs 6, 12, 31</strong></td>
<td>Immediately (recommended to try Acetaminophen first)</td>
<td>Younger adults, without any CV, Renal or GI risk factors</td>
<td>Short term treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Therapy 6</strong></td>
<td>After 2 weeks of conservative treatment</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1-2 visits for education, counseling of home exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manipulation 6</strong></td>
<td>Once more conservative measures fail</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Best when combined with exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV methylprednisolone 31</strong></td>
<td>Within 8 hours of injury for acute whiplash</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>One time treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IM Lidocaine 31</strong></td>
<td>Chronic neck pain with arm symptoms</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Only a few treatments indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muscle Relaxers 31</strong></td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acupuncture 32</strong></td>
<td>After failing exercise and/or acetaminophen/NSAIDs</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Ideally 6 or more treatments, effects have been shown for short-term pain relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directed exercise program 33</strong></td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>When the HA is a result of a mechanical neck disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acetaminophen 4g/day maximum 34</strong></td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Long term, has not been shown to be effective in migraines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSAIDs 12, 35, 36</strong></td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Short term, shown to be effective in both migraine and non-migraine HAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triptans 36, 37</strong></td>
<td>Use if unable to control HA with NSAIDs and or acetaminophen</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Beneficial for migraine headaches. IM has been shown to be more effective than oral, but both are superior to placebo. Sumatriptan most studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excedrin 36</strong></td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Shown to be beneficial in Acute migraines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amitriptyline 35</strong></td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Best for migraine headaches, can be started immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antidepressants (other TCAs, SNRIs, SSRIs) 38, 39</strong></td>
<td>After failing conservative therapy</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Migraine, tension, and mixed. Studies lasted 4-27 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antiemetics 36</strong></td>
<td>With migraine associated nausea</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Has been shown to help with pain and nausea with migraines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticonvulsants 40</strong></td>
<td>After failing other therapies, for prevention</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>For prevention of migraine headache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSAIDS combined with metoclopramide 41</strong></td>
<td>After failing acetaminophen</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Migraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHE IM/SC/IV 36</strong></td>
<td>After failing more conservative therapies</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Have shown to help migraines, more effective in combination with antiemetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isometheptene 36</strong></td>
<td>After failing more conservative therapies</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Found effective for mild-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Therapies</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Moderate Migraine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal barometric oxygen therapy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acupuncture</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>As adjuvant treatment</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed Exercise Program</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6, 44</td>
<td>Within 7-10 days of injury</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Weight Loss</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen 4g/day max 2, 8</td>
<td>Immediately first line</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAIDs 2, 12</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Younger adults, without any CV, Renal or GI risk factors</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen 4g/day max 2, 8</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen 4g/day max 2, 8</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen 4g/day max 2, 8</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-acetylated salicylates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical capsaicin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-articular steroid injection 2, 45</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox-2 Inhibitors 1, 2</td>
<td>If unable to tolerate NSAIDs and failed Acetaminophen therapy</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Studies lasted 2 months to 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diacerein 46, 47</td>
<td>After failing other therapeutics</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Consider co morbidities, shown to have minimal pain relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Sports Injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice/Heat 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen 4g/day max 2</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAIDs 2, 12</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Recommended to try acetaminophen first</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuropathic Pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen 4g/day max 48</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticonvulsants 49, 50</td>
<td>After failing acetaminophen</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Do not use in patients with pacemakers, cardiac conduction abnormalities, or over the carotid body or sinus.
- Choose population according to literature.
- This should be considered first-line therapeutic intervention if OA is confined to a single joint.
- Have a side effect profile that must be monitored. Carbamezapine and gabapentin found to be most effective, some showing carbamezapine to be more effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure/Intervention</th>
<th>Time Post-Intervention</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systemic administration of local anesthetics</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>After failing acetaminophen</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants v34, 52</td>
<td></td>
<td>After failing acetaminophen.</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Can be long term, TCAs (amitriptyline) and Venlafaxine shown to be most effective. Not shown to be effective in HIV neuropathies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Herpetic Pain</td>
<td>Anticonvulsants 49</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While symptoms last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibromyalgia</td>
<td>Supervised Aerobic/Strength training exercise 53, 54, 55</td>
<td>Immediately, for at least 20 minutes a day 3 times a week</td>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>Life long, most studies were conducted on average for 12 weeks, 3-24 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Therapy 54, 56</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Data showed results from 6-30 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amitriptyline 54, 57, 58</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyclobenzaprine 54, 57</td>
<td>Typically is after exercise, acetaminophen and amitriptyline</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acupuncture 54, 59, 60</td>
<td>After exercise and amitriptyline</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deep tissue message 54</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluoxetine 54</td>
<td>Typically start with exercise, acetaminophen, and amitriptyline first</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual-reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs): 54</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabapentin 61</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial, studied over a 12 week period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pregabalin 54, 62, 63</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Pain</td>
<td>Acetaminophen 64, 65</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSAIDs 65</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acupuncture 57, 66</td>
<td>Immediately postop</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1-4 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelvic Pain (dysmenorrheal)</td>
<td>Directed exercise program 67</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>Life long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acetaminophen 68</td>
<td>During first 3 days of menstruation</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSAIDs 68, 69</td>
<td>During first 3 days of menstruation</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral contraceptives 70</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults/Adolescents</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acupuncture 71</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>10 visits over 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese herbal medication 72</td>
<td>After other interventions</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pelvic Pain (chronic pelvic pain) | Directed exercise program | Immediately | All ages | Life long | with other medications
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|--------------------------|
| Medroxyprogesterone acetate 73   | Immediately              | Adults      | Not found to be effected after 9 months | Consider co morbidities
| Gosere lin 73                   | After failing more conservative therapies | Adults | As long as beneficial, cannot be taken longer than six months | Consider co morbidities, extensive side effects

### Pelvic Pain (Endometriosis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danazol 74</th>
<th>After failing conservative therapy</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>For up to 6 months</th>
<th>Consider co morbidities, extensive side effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCPs 75</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial</td>
<td>Consider co morbidities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosere lin 75</td>
<td>After failing more conservative therapies</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>While beneficial, cannot be taken for longer than six months</td>
<td>Consider co morbidities, extensive side effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


# Opioid Risk Tool (ORT)

## Patient Form

Name __________________________________________  Date __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark each box that applies</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family history of substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alcohol</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Illegal drugs</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prescription drugs</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal history of substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alcohol</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Illegal drugs</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prescription drugs</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age (mark box if 16-45 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. History of preadolescent sexual abuse</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Psychological disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Depression</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copyright © Lynn R. Webster, MD. Used with permission.
Appendix 6 - CAGE-AID

CAGE-AID Questionnaire

CAGE-AID Questionnaire

Patient Name ________________________ Date of Visit ___________________

When thinking about drug use, include illegal drug use and the use of prescription drug other than prescribed.

Questions: YES NO

1. Have you ever felt that you ought to cut down on your drinking or drug use? □ □

2. Have people annoyed you by criticizing your drinking or drug use? □ □

3. Have you ever felt bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use? □ □

4. Have you ever had a drink or used drugs first thing in the morning to steady your nerves or to get rid of a hangover? □ □

Scoring
Regard one or more positive responses to the CAGE-AID as a positive screen.

Psychometric Properties
The CAGE-AID exhibited:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One or more Yes responses</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Yes responses</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Brown 1995)
Appendix 7 - PHQ-9 Nine Symptom Checklist

PHQ-9 — Nine Symptom Checklist

Patient Name ___________________________ Date ______________________

1. Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems? Read each item carefully, and circle your response.

   a. Little interest or pleasure in doing things
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

   b. Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

   c. Trouble falling asleep, staying asleep, or sleeping too much
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

   d. Feeling tired or having little energy
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

   e. Poor appetite or overeating
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

   f. Feeling bad about yourself, feeling that you are a failure, or feeling that you have let yourself or your family down
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

   g. Trouble concentrating on things such as reading the newspaper or watching television
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

   h. Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed. Or being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

   i. Thinking that you would be better off dead or that you want to hurt yourself in some way
      Not at all    Several days    More than half the days    Nearly every day

2. If you checked off any problem on this questionnaire so far, how difficult have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?

   Not Difficult at All    Somewhat Difficult    Very Difficult    Extremely Difficult

Copyright held by Pfizer Inc, but may be photocopied ad libitum
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PHQ-9 — Scoring Tally Sheet

Patient Name ___________________________ Date __________

1. Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems? Read each item carefully, and circle your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Several days</th>
<th>More than half the days</th>
<th>Nearly every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Little interest or pleasure in doing things</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Trouble falling asleep, staying asleep, or sleeping too much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Feeling tired or having little energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Poor appetite or overeating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Feeling bad about yourself, feeling that you are a failure, or feeling that you have let yourself or your family down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Trouble concentrating on things such as reading the newspaper or watching television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed. Or being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Thinking that you would be better off dead or that you want to hurt yourself in some way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If you checked off any problem on this questionnaire so far, how difficult have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Difficult At All</th>
<th>Somewhat Difficult</th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Extremely Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copyright held by Pfizer Inc, but may be photocopied ad libitum
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How to Score PHQ-9

**Scoring Method For Diagnosis**

Major Depressive Syndrome is suggested if:
- Of the 9 items, 5 or more are circled as at least "More than half the days"
- Either item 1a or 1b is positive, that is, at least "More than half the days"

Minor Depressive Syndrome is suggested if:
- Of the 9 items, b, c, or d are circled as at least "More than half the days"
- Either item 1a or 1b is positive, that is, at least "More than half the days"

**Scoring Method For Planning And Monitoring Treatment**

Question One

- To score the first question, tally each response by the number value of each response:
  - Not at all = 0
  - Several days = 1
  - More than half the days = 2
  - Nearly every day = 3
- Add the numbers together to total the score.
- Interpret the score by using the guide listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤4</td>
<td>The score suggests the patient may not need depression treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5-14</td>
<td>Physician uses clinical judgment about treatment, based on patient’s duration of symptoms and functional impairment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥15</td>
<td>Warrants treatment for depression, using antidepressant, psychotherapy and/or a combination of treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Two

In question two the patient responses can be one of four: not difficult at all, somewhat difficult, very difficult, extremely difficult. The last two responses suggest that the patient's functionality is impaired. After treatment begins, the functional status is again measured to see if the patient is improving.

*Copyright held by Pfizer Inc; but may be photocopied ad libitum*
Screener and Opioid Assessment for Patients with Pain (SOAPP®) Version 1.0 - 14Q

The Screener and Opioid Assessment for Patients with Pain (SOAPP) Version 1.0 is a tool for clinicians to help determine how much monitoring a patient on long-term opioid therapy might require. Physicians remain reluctant to prescribe opioid medication because of concerns about addiction, misuse, and other aberrant medication-related behaviors, as well as liability and censure concerns. Despite recent findings suggesting that most patients are able to successfully remain on long-term opioid therapy without significant problems, physicians often express a lack of confidence in their ability to distinguish patients likely to have few problems on long-term opioid therapy from those requiring more monitoring.

SOAPP version 1.0 is a quick and easy-to-use questionnaire designed to help providers evaluate the patients’ relative risk for developing problems when placed on long-term opioid therapy. Version 1.0-14Q is:

- A brief paper and pencil questionnaire
- Developed based on expert consensus regarding important concepts likely to predict which patients will require more or less monitoring on long-term opioid therapy (content and face valid)
- Preliminary reliability data (coefficient α) from 175 patients chronic pain patients
- Preliminary validity data from 100 patients (predictive validity)
- Simple scoring procedures
- 14 items
- 5 point scale
- <8 minutes to complete
- Ideal for documenting decisions about the level of monitoring planned for a particular patient or justifying referrals to specialty pain clinic.
- The SOAPP is for clinician use only. The tool is not meant for commercial distribution.
- The SOAPP is NOT a lie detector. Patients determined to misrepresent themselves will still do so. Other clinical information should be used with SOAPP scores to decide on a particular patient’s treatment.
- The SOAPP is NOT intended for all patients. The SOAPP should be completed by chronic pain patients being considered for opioid therapy.
- It is important to remember that all chronic pain patients deserve treatment of their pain. Providers who are not comfortable treating certain patients should refer those patients to a specialist.

Reproduced with permission from Stephen Butler. See www.painedu.org for additional information.
SOAPP® Version 1.0

Name: __________________________ Date: __________________________

The following are some questions given to all patients at the Pain Management Center who are on or being considered for opioids for their pain. Please answer each question as honestly as possible. This information is for our records and will remain confidential. Your answers alone will not determine your treatment. Thank you.

Please answer the questions below using the following scale:

0 = Never, 1 = Seldom, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

1. How often do you have mood swings? 0 1 2 3 4

2. How often do you smoke a cigarette within an hour after you wake up? 0 1 2 3 4

3. How often have any of your family members, including parents and grandparents, had a problem with alcohol or drugs? 0 1 2 3 4

4. How often have any of your close friends had a problem with alcohol or drugs? 0 1 2 3 4

5. How often have others suggested that you have a drug or alcohol problem? 0 1 2 3 4

6. How often have you attended an AA or NA meeting? 0 1 2 3 4

7. How often have you taken medication other than the way that it was prescribed? 0 1 2 3 4

8. How often have you been treated for an alcohol or drug problem? 0 1 2 3 4

9. How often have your medications been lost or stolen? 0 1 2 3 4

10. How often have others expressed concern over your use of medication? 0 1 2 3 4
0 = Never, 1 = Seldom, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very Often

11. How often have you felt a craving for medication? 0 1 2 3 4

12. How often have you been asked to give a urine screen for substance abuse? 0 1 2 3 4

13. How often have you used illegal drugs (for example, marijuana, cocaine, etc.) in the past five years? 0 1 2 3 4

14. How often, in your lifetime, have you had legal problems or been arrested? 0 1 2 3 4

Please include any additional information you wish about the above answers. Thank you.
**D.I.R.E. Score: Patient Selection for Chronic Opioid Analgesia**

For each factor, rate the patient’s score from 1-3 based on the explanations in the right hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | Diagnosis | 1 = Benign chronic condition with minimal objective findings or no definite medical diagnosis. Examples: fibromyalgia, migraine headaches, nonspecific back pain.  
2 = Slowly progressive condition concordant with moderate pain, or fixed condition with moderate objective findings. Examples: failed back surgery syndrome, back pain with moderate degenerative changes, neuropathic pain.  
3 = Advanced condition concordant with severe pain with objective findings. Examples: severe ischemic vascular disease, advanced neuropathy, severe spinal stenosis. |
|       | Intractability | 1 = Few therapies have been tried and the patient takes a passive role in his/her pain management process.  
2 = Most customary treatments have been tried but the patient is not fully engaged in the pain management process, or barriers prevent (insurance, transportation, medical illness).  
3 = Patient fully engaged in a spectrum of appropriate treatments but with inadequate response. |
|       | Risk | (R = Total of P + C + R + S below) |
|       | Psychological: | 1 = Serious personality dysfunction or mental illness interfering with care. Example: personality disorder, severe affective disorder, significant personality issues.  
2 = Personality or mental health interferes moderately. Example: depression or anxiety disorder.  
3 = Good communication with clinic. No significant personality dysfunction or mental illness. |
|       | Chemical Health: | 1 = Active or very recent use of illicit drugs, excessive alcohol, or prescription drug abuse.  
2 = Chemical coper (uses medications to cope with stress) or history of CD in remission.  
3 = No CD history. Not drug-focused or chemically reliant. |
|       | Reliability: | 1 = History of numerous problems: medication misuse, missed appointments, rarely follows through.  
2 = Occasional difficulties with compliance, but generally reliable.  
3 = Highly reliable patient with meds, appointments & treatment. |
|       | Social Support: | 1 = Life in chaos. Little family support and few close relationships. Loss of most normal life roles.  
2 = Reduction in some relationships and life roles.  
3 = Supportive family/close relationships. Involved in work or school and no social isolation. |
|       | Efficacy score | 1 = Poor function or minimal pain relief despite moderate to high doses.  
2 = Moderate benefit with function improved in a number of ways (or insufficient info – hasn’t tried opioid yet or very low doses or too short of a trial).  
3 = Good improvement in pain and function and quality of life with stable doses over time. |

___ Total score = D + I + R + E

Score 7-13: Not a suitable candidate for long-term opioid analgesia  
Score 14-21: May be a candidate for long-term opioid analgesia

Source: Miles Belgrade, Fairview Pain & Palliative Care Center © 2005.
Long-term Controlled Substances Therapy for Chronic Pain

SAMPLE AGREEMENT

A consent form from the American Academy of Pain Medicine

The purpose of this agreement is to protect your access to controlled substances and to protect our ability to prescribe for you.

The long-term use of such substances as opioids (narcotic analgesics), benzodiazepine tranquilizers, and barbiturate sedatives is controversial because of uncertainty regarding the extent to which they provide long-term benefit. There is also the risk of an addictive disorder developing or of relapse occurring in a person with a prior addiction. The extent of this risk is not certain.

Because these drugs have potential for abuse or diversion, strict accountability is necessary when use is prolonged. For this reason the following policies are agreed to by you, the patient, as consideration for, and a condition of, the willingness of the physician whose signature appears below to consider the initial and/or continued prescription of controlled substances to treat your chronic pain.

1. All controlled substances must come from the physician whose signature appears below or, during his or her absence, by the covering physician, unless specific authorization is obtained for an exception. (Multiple sources can lead to untoward drug interactions or poor coordination of treatment.)

2. All controlled substances must be obtained at the same pharmacy, where possible. Should the need arise to change pharmacies, our office must be informed. The pharmacy that you have selected is: ____________________________ phone: _______________________.

3. You are expected to inform our office of any new medications or medical conditions, and of any adverse effects you experience from any of the medications that you take.

4. The prescribing physician has permission to discuss all diagnostic and treatment details with dispensing pharmacists or other professionals who provide your health care for purposes of maintaining accountability.

5. You may not share, sell, or otherwise permit others to have access to these medications.

6. These drugs should not be stopped abruptly, as an abstinence syndrome will likely develop.

7. Unannounced urine or serum toxicology screens may be requested, and your cooperation is required. Presence of unauthorized substances may prompt referral for assessment for addictive disorder.

© 2001 American Academy of Pain Medicine
8. Prescriptions and bottles of these medications may be sought by other individuals with chemical dependency and should be closely safeguarded. It is expected that you will take the highest possible degree of care with your medication and prescription. They should not be left where others might see or otherwise have access to them.

9. Original containers of medications should be brought in to each office visit.

10. Since the drugs may be hazardous or lethal to a person who is not tolerant to their effects, especially a child, you must keep them out of reach of such people.

11. Medications may not be replaced if they are lost, get wet, are destroyed, left on an airplane, etc. If your medication has been stolen and you complete a police report regarding the theft, an exception may be made.

12. Early refills will generally not be given.

13. Prescriptions may be issued early if the physician or patient will be out of town when a refill is due. These prescriptions will contain instructions to the pharmacist that they not be filled prior to the appropriate date.

14. If the responsible legal authorities have questions concerning your treatment, as might occur, for example, if you were obtaining medications at several pharmacies, all confidentiality is waived and these authorities may be given full access to our records of controlled substances administration.

15. It is understood that failure to adhere to these policies may result in cessation of therapy with controlled substance prescribing by this physician or referral for further specialty assessment.

16. Renewals are contingent on keeping scheduled appointments. Please do not phone for prescriptions after hours or on weekends.

17. It should be understood that any medical treatment is initially a trial, and that continued prescription is contingent on evidence of benefit.

18. The risks and potential benefits of these therapies are explained elsewhere [and you acknowledge that you have received such explanation].

19. You affirm that you have full right and power to sign and be bound by this agreement, and that you have read, understand, and accept all of its terms.

Physician Signature

Patient Signature

Date

Patient Name (Printed)

Approved by the AAPM Executive Committee on April 2, 2001.

AAPM
4700 W. Lake Avenue
Glenview, IL  60025-1485
847/375-4731   Fax 847/375-6477
E-mail  info@painmed.org
Web site  http://www.painmed.org/

© 2001 American Academy of Pain Medicine
Appendix 13 – Suggested Patient Pain Medication Agreement and Consent

PATIENT PAIN MEDICATION AGREEMENT AND CONSENT

This agreement is important for you:
- You will have a safe and controlled pain treatment plan.
- Your medicines have a high potential for abuse. They can be dangerous if used in the wrong way. You need to understand the risks that come from use of pain medicines.

Please read and make sure you understand each statement here. Here are rules about refills and health risks. Here are also reasons for stopping your pain control treatment.

I WILL:
☑️ I will only get my pain medicine from this clinic during scheduled appointments.
☑️ I will take my pain medicine the way that my healthcare provider has ordered.
☑️ I will be honest with all my healthcare providers if I am using street drugs.
☑️ I will be honest about all the medicine I use. This includes medicine from stores and herbal medicines.
☑️ I will be honest about my full health history.
☑️ I will tell my healthcare provider if I go to an emergency room for any reasons.
☑️ If I get pain medicine from an emergency room, I will tell my healthcare provider.
☑️ I will call this office if I am prescribed any new medicine.
☑️ I will call this office if I have a reaction to any medicine.
☑️ I will tell all other healthcare providers that I have a pain medication agreement.
☑️ I will tell the emergency room people that I have a pain medication agreement.
☑️ I will take drug tests and other tests when I am told to do so.
☑️ I will go to office visits when I am told to do so.
☑️ I will go to physical therapy when I am told to do so.
☑️ I will go to counseling when I am told to do so.
☑️ I will follow directions for all treatment.
☑️ I will show up on time for all appointments.
☑️ I will make an appointment for refills before I run out of medicine.
☑️ I will tell my health provider if I will be out of town so that I can get my refills.
☑️ I will get past health records from other offices when needed.
☑️ I will deliver these records by hand if needed. I will do this within one month of being asked.
☑️ I will pay for these records if needed.
☑️ I will give permission to this clinic to talk about my treatment with pharmacies, doctors, nurses, and others who are helping me.
☑️ I will give permission to any healthcare provider to get information from this clinic about my health and my pain treatment.
☑️ I will take responsibility if I overdose myself accidentally or on purpose.
☑️ I will tell my healthcare provider if I plan to become pregnant.
☑️ I will tell my healthcare provider if I am pregnant while I am taking pain medicine.
☑️ I will only take this medicine the way I was told to take it.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
I WILL NOT:
- I will not share or sell, or trade any of my medicine.
- I will not drink alcohol or take street drugs while I am taking pain medicine.
- I know that I cannot call the office to have my medicine refilled over the phone.
- I will not go to the emergency room or other doctors for more pain medicine or other drugs.
- I know that when I drive a car, I must be fully alert. I know that when I use machines, I must also be fully alert.
- Pain medicines can make me less alert. When I am taking pain medicines, I need to be sure that I am alert.
- I need to be sure that it is safe for me to drive a car or use a machine.
- I will not stand in high places or do anything to hurt others after I have taken pain medicine.
- I will not leave my medicine where it can be stolen or where others can take it.
- I will not leave my medicine where children can find it.
- I will not suddenly stop taking my medicine. I know that if I do this, I can have withdrawals.

WHEN USING A PHARMACY, I WILL:
- I will use the same pharmacy for all my medicines. This is the pharmacy that I have picked: ____________________________________
- I will not ask for early refills or more pain medicine, even if I lose my medicine.

I KNOW THAT
- Pain management may include other treatment. Some treatment may not include medicine.
- Pain medicine will probably not get rid of all of my pain. Pain medicine can reduce my pain so that I can do more and have a better life.
- Part of my treatment is to reduce my need for pain medicine.
- If the pain medicines work, I will continue to use them. If the pain medicine does not help me, it will be stopped.
- My medicines will not be replaced if any of these things happen: Medicine is lost. Medicine gets wet. Medicine is destroyed.
- If my medicine is stolen, I might be able to get more medicine if I get a report from the police about the medicine being stolen.
- Any of my healthcare providers can find out from the California Prescription Drug Monitoring Program about any other medicines I get from any other pharmacy in California. This is called a CURES report.
- My healthcare provider may contact the drug enforcement agency, if I try to get other doctors to give me pain medicine.
- Healthcare providers may contact the drug enforcement agency if I am not honest about how I take pain medicine.
- My doctor and my clinic will help with any investigation if I am suspected of prescription drug abuse.
- I may be sent somewhere else for drug abuse or addiction help if I need it.
- Pain medicine can be addictive. This means that my body may need more and more pain medicine or that it can be hard for me to stop taking this medicine.
- If I suddenly stop using the medicine, I can get withdrawals.
- If I use too much pain medicine, I can end up with health problems. I could die.
- If I mix medicines, I could also end up with health problems. I could die.
- Here are some things that could go wrong if I use too much medicine or mix medicines:
  - Overdose
  - Slower reflexes
  - Problems with sex
  - Addiction
  - Nausea
  - Dry mouth
  - Constipation
  - Difficulty with urination
  - Depression
  - Vomiting
  - Confusion
  - Trouble breathing
  - Sleepiness
  - Itching
  - Death

CAUSE FOR DISMISSAL FROM THIS CLINIC
- I know that the pain medicines may be stopped if I break any part of this contract.
- My signature below means that I have read this contract. I am signing this to say that I understand all of this contract.

Patient Name ___________________________  Doctor Name ___________________________
Patient Signature ___________________________  Doctor Signature ___________________________
Date: ___________________________
Appendix 14 – Suggested Treatment Plan Using Prescription Opioids

Treatment Plan Using Prescription Opioids

Patient name: ____________________________

Prescriber name: __________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

THE PURPOSE OF THIS AGREEMENT IS TO STRUCTURE OUR PLAN TO WORK TOGETHER
TO TREAT YOUR CHRONIC PAIN. THIS WILL PROTECT YOUR ACCESS TO CONTROLLED
SUBSTANCES AND OUR ABILITY TO PRESCRIBE THEM TO YOU.

I (patient) understand the following (initial each):

_____ Opioids have been prescribed to me on a trial basis. One of the goals of this treatment is to improve my ability
to perform various functions, including return to work. If significant demonstrable improvement in my functional
capabilities does not result from this trial of treatment, my prescriber may determine to end the trial.

Goal for improved function: ____________________________

_____ Opioids are being prescribed to make my pain tolerable but may not cause it to disappear entirely. If that goal is
not reached, my physician may end the trial.

Goal for reduction of pain: ____________________________

_____ Drowsiness and slowed reflexes can be a temporary side effect of opioids, especially during dosage adjust-
ments. If I am experiencing drowsiness while taking opioids, I agree not to drive a vehicle nor perform other
tasks that could involve danger to myself or others.

_____ Using opioids to treat chronic pain will result in the development of a physical dependence on this medication,
and sudden decreases or discontinuation of the medication will lead to symptoms of opioid withdrawal. These
symptoms can include: runny nose, yawning, large pupils, goose bumps, abdominal pain and cramping, diarrhea,
vomiting, irritability, aches and flu-like symptoms. I understand that opioid withdrawal is uncomfortable but
not physically life threatening.

_____ There is a small risk that opioid addiction can occur. Almost always, this occurs in patients with a personal or
family history of other drug or alcohol abuse. If it appears that I may be developing addiction, my physician may
determine to end the trial.

Continued on other side.
I agree to the following (initial each):

____ I agree not to take more medication than prescribed and not to take doses more frequently than prescribed.

____ I agree to keep the prescribed medication in a safe and secure place, and that lost, damaged, or stolen medication will not be replaced.

____ I agree not to share, sell, or in any way provide my medication to any other person.

____ I agree to obtain prescription medication from one designated licensed pharmacist. I understand that my doctor may check the Utah Controlled Substance Database at any time to check my compliance.

____ I agree not to seek or obtain ANY mood-modifying medication, including pain relievers or tranquilizers from ANY other prescriber without first discussing this with my prescriber. If a situation arises in which I have no alternative but to obtain my necessary prescription from another prescriber, I will advise that prescriber of this agreement. I will then immediately advise my prescriber that I obtained a prescription from another prescriber.

____ I agree to refrain from the use of ALL other mood-modifying drugs, including alcohol, unless agreed to by my prescriber. The moderate use of nicotine and caffeine are an exception to this restriction.

____ I agree to submit to random urine, blood or saliva testing, at my prescriber’s request, to verify compliance with this, and to be seen by an addiction specialist if requested.

____ I agree to attend and participate fully in any other assessments of pain treatment programs which may be recommended by the prescriber at any time.

I understand that ANY deviation from the above agreement may be grounds for the prescriber to stop prescribing opioid therapy at any time.

____________________________  ________________________
Patient Signature                      Date

____________________________  ________________________
Prescriber Signature                  Date
PROGRESS NOTE
Pain Assessment and Documentation Tool (PADT™)

Patient Name: __________________________ Record #: __________________
Assessment Date: _________________________________________________

Current Analgesic Regimen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug name</th>
<th>Strength (eg, mg)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Maximum Total Daily Dose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PADT is a clinician-directed interview; that is, the clinician asks the questions, and the clinician records the responses. The Analgesia, Activities of Daily Living, and Adverse Events sections may be completed by the physician, nurse practitioner, physician assistant, or nurse. The Potential Aberrant Drug-Related Behavior and Assessment sections must be completed by the physician. Ask the patient the questions below, except as noted.

Analgesia

If zero indicates "no pain" and ten indicates "pain as bad as it can be," on a scale of 0 to 10, what is your level of pain for the following questions?

1. What was your pain level on average during the past week? (Please circle the appropriate number)

No Pain 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Pain as bad as it can be

2. What was your pain level at its worst during the past week?

No Pain 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Pain as bad as it can be

3. What percentage of your pain has been relieved during the past week? (Write in a percentage between 0% and 100%).

______________________

4. Is the amount of pain relief you are now obtaining from your current pain reliever(s) enough to make a real difference in your life?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Query to clinician: Is the patient’s pain relief clinically significant?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure

Activities of Daily Living

Please indicate whether the patient’s functioning with the current pain reliever(s) is Better, the Same, or Worse since the patient’s last assessment with the PADT.* (Please check the box for Better, Same, or Worse for each item below.)

Better ☐ Same ☐ Worse ☐

1. Physical functioning ☐ ☐ ☐

2. Family relationships ☐ ☐ ☐

3. Social relationships ☐ ☐ ☐

4. Mood ☐ ☐ ☐

5. Sleep patterns ☐ ☐ ☐

6. Overall functioning ☐ ☐ ☐

* If the patient is receiving his or her first PADT assessment, the clinician should compare the patient’s functional status with other reports from the last office visit.

Copyright Janssen Pharmaceutica Products, L.P. ©2003 All rights reserved.
Analgesia

1. Is patient experiencing any side effects from current pain reliever(s)? □ Yes □ No

Ask patient about potential side effects:

- None
- Mild
- Moderate
- Severe

a. Nausea □ □ □ □ □
b. Vomiting □ □ □ □ □
c. Constipation □ □ □ □ □
d. Itching □ □ □ □ □
e. Mental cloudiness □ □ □ □ □
f. Sweating □ □ □ □ □
g. Fatigue □ □ □ □ □
h. Drowsiness □ □ □ □ □
i. Other ________________ □ □ □
j. Other ________________ □ □ □

2. Patient’s overall severity of side effects?
□ None □ Mild □ Moderate □ Severe

Potential Aberrant Drug-Related Behavior
This section must be completed by the physician.

Please check any of the following items that you discovered during your interactions with the patient. Please note that some of these are directly observable (e.g., appears intoxicated), while others may require more active listening and/or probing. Use the “Assessment” section below to note additional details.

- Purposeful over-sedation
- Negative mood change
- Appears intoxicated
- Increasingly unkempt or impaired
- Involvement in car or other accident
- Requests frequent early renewals
- Increased dose without authorization
- Reports lost or stolen prescriptions
- Attempts to obtain prescriptions from other doctors
- Changes route of administration
- Uses pain medication in response to situational stressor
- Insists on certain medications by name
- Contact with street drug culture
- Abusing alcohol or illicit drugs
- Hoarding (i.e., stockpiling) of medication
- Arrested by police
- Victi of abuse

Other: ________________________________
                      ________________________________
                      ________________________________
                      ________________________________

Assessment: (This section must be completed by the physician.)

Is your overall impression that this patient is benefiting (e.g., benefits, such as pain relief, outweigh side effects) from opioid therapy? □ Yes □ No □ Unsure

Comments: __________________________________________________________
                      __________________________________________________________

Specific Analgesic Plan:

- Continue present regimen Comments: __________________________________________________________
- Adjust dose of present analgesic
- Switch analgesics
- Add/Adjust concomitant therapy
- Discontinue/taper off opioid therapy

Date: ___________________________ Physician’s signature: ___________________________

Provided as a service to the medical community by Janssen Pharmaceutica Products, L.P.
WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

The detection time of most drugs in urine is 1 to 3 days, but is longer if the drug is lipophilic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Cutoff (ng/mL)</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamine</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabinoids*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate smoker (4x/week)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy smoker (daily)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronic smoker</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzoylecgonine after street doses of cocaine</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiate (eg, morphine, heroin)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phencyclidine*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronic users</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>=30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These guidelines are general; interpretation of detection time must take account of variability of urine specimens, drug metabolism & half-life, patient’s physical condition, fluid intake, method, & frequency of use.

The two major types of UDT are immunoassays & GC/MS or HPLC
- Semisynthetic/synthetic opioids are not reliably detected by opiate immunoassays:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural (from opium)</th>
<th>Semisynthetic† (derived from opium)</th>
<th>Synthetic† (man-made)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>codeine</td>
<td>hydrocodone</td>
<td>meperidine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphine</td>
<td>oxycodone</td>
<td>fentanyl series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thebaine</td>
<td>hydromorphone</td>
<td>propoxyphene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oxymorphone</td>
<td>methadone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buprenorphine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Opioids not resulting in morphine or codeine in urine.

- Specify GC/MS or HPLC for patients taking opioids.
- A therapeutic drug level may fall below a test’s cutoff.
  - Do not assume a negative result means "no drug present."
  - Ask for "no threshold" testing (LOD), especially when testing for a semisynthetic or synthetic opioid.

There is no direct relationship between dose & urine drug concentration.

BEFORE YOU ORDER A TEST

Ask the patient:
- Are you taking any prescribed, OTC, or herbal drugs?
  - When was the last dose/quantity?
- Drug abuse/addiction history

Let the laboratory know what you are looking for:
- Illicit substance.
- Prescription drug misuse.
- Presence of prescribed medication.

Sponsored by the California Academy of Family Physicians in cooperation with PharmaCom Group, Inc.
This activity is supported by an unrestricted educational grant from Purdue Pharma L.P.
PRACTICAL STRATEGIES

Establish routine UDT immunoassay panel, which generally indentify drug classes.
- Recommended immunoassay screens are:
  - Cocaine
  - Amphetamines (including ecstasy)
  - Opiates
  - Methadone
  - Marijuana
  - Benzodiazepines.
- Additional tests, as needed.

Specific drug identification:
- GC/MS or HPLC for all patients prescribed opioids, especially semisynthetic or synthetic opioids.
  - Specify "no threshold" (LOD) to increase likelihood of detecting prescribed medications.

Specimen collection:
- Random collection preferred.
- Unobserved specimen collection usually acceptable.
- Suspect tampering if urine characteristics are not consistent with normal human urine, which should have:
  - Temperature 90°F - 100°F
  - pH 4.5 - 8.5
  - Creatinine >20 mg/dL (<20 mg/dL=dilute).

UDT results:
- Anticipate what you will do with results.
- Consult with laboratory regarding ANY unexpected results.
- A positive UDT result reflects recent drug use.
  - Schedule appointment to discuss abnormal/unexpected results with patient.
  - Use results to strengthen physician-patient relationship & support positive behavior change.
  - The presence of addiction does not preclude the existence of pain.
- Document results & interpretation.

GC/MS= gas chromatography/mass spectrometry;
HPLC= high-performance liquid chromatography;
LOD= limit of detection; OTC= over-the-counter;
UDT= urine drug test
Current Opioid Misuse Measure (COMM)

The Current Opioid Misuse Measure (COMM) is a brief patient self-assessment to monitor chronic pain patients on opioid therapy. The COMM was developed with guidance from a group of pain and addiction experts and input from pain management clinicians in the field. Experts and providers identified six key issues to determine if patients already on long-term opioid treatment are exhibiting aberrant medication-related behaviors:

- Signs & Symptoms of Intoxication
- Emotional Volatility
- Evidence of Poor Response to Medications
- Addiction
- Healthcare Use Patterns
- Problematic Medication Behavior

The COMM will help clinicians identify whether a patient, currently on long-term opioid therapy, may be exhibiting aberrant behaviors associated with misuse of opioid medications. In contrast, the Screener and Opioid Assessment for Patients with Pain (SOAPP) is intended to predict which patients, being considered for long-term opioid therapy, may exhibit aberrant medications behaviors in the future. Since the COMM examines concurrent misuse, it is ideal for helping clinicians monitor patients’ aberrant medication-related behaviors over the course of treatment. The COMM is:

- A quick and easy to administer patient-self assessment
- 17 items
- Simple to score
- Completed in less than 10 minutes
- Validated with a group of approximately 500 chronic pain patients on opioid therapy
- Ideal for documenting decisions about the level of monitoring planned for a particular patient or justifying referrals to specialty pain clinic.
- The COMM is for clinician use only. The tool is not meant for commercial distribution.
- The COMM is NOT a lie detector. Patients determined to misrepresent themselves will still do so. Other clinical information should be used with COMM scores to decide if and when modifications to particular patient’s treatment plan is needed.
- It is important to remember that all chronic pain patients deserve treatment of their pain. Providers who are not comfortable treating certain patients should refer those patients to a specialist.

©2007 Inflexxion®, Inc. All rights reserved. 320 Needham Street, Suite 100, Newton, MA 02464
- Phone (617) 332-6028 • Fax (617) 332-1820 • www.inflexxion.com

The Screener and Opioid Assessment for Patients with Pain was developed with a grant from the National Institutes of Health (#2R44DA015617-02) and an educational grant from Endo Pharmaceuticals.

Reproduced with permission from Stephen Butler. See www.painedu.org for additional information.
Please answer each question as honestly as possible. Keep in mind that we are only asking about the past 30 days. There are no right or wrong answers. If you are unsure about how to answer the question, please give the best answer you can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please answer the questions using the following scale:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In the past 30 days, how often have you had trouble with thinking clearly or had memory problems?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the past 30 days, how often do people complain that you are not completing necessary tasks? (i.e., doing things that need to be done, such as going to class, work or appointments)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In the past 30 days, how often have you had to go to someone other than your prescribing physician to get sufficient pain relief from medications? (i.e., another doctor, the Emergency Room, friends, street sources)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the past 30 days, how often have you taken your medications differently from how they are prescribed?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In the past 30 days, how often have you seriously thought about hurting yourself?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In the past 30 days, how much of your time was spent thinking about opioid medications (having enough, taking them, dosing schedule, etc.)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In the past 30 days, how often have you been in an argument?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In the past 30 days, how often have you had trouble controlling your anger (e.g., road rage, screaming, etc.)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In the past 30 days, how often have you needed to take pain medications belonging to someone else?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please answer the questions using the following scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In the past 30 days, how often have you been worried about how you're handling your medications?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In the past 30 days, how often have others been worried about how you're handling your medications?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In the past 30 days, how often have you had to make an emergency phone call or show up at the clinic without an appointment?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In the past 30 days, how often have you gotten angry with people?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. In the past 30 days, how often have you had to take more of your medication than prescribed?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In the past 30 days, how often have you borrowed pain medication from someone else?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In the past 30 days, how often have you used your pain medicine for symptoms other than for pain (e.g., to help you sleep, improve your mood, or relieve stress)?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In the past 30 days, how often have you had to visit the Emergency Room?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Instructions for the COMM

To score the COMM, simply add the rating of all the questions. A score of 9 or higher is considered a positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Questions</th>
<th>COMM Indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 9</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for any scale, the results depend on what cutoff score is chosen. A score that is sensitive in detecting patients who are abusing or misusing their opioid medication will necessarily include a number of patients that are not really abusing or misusing their medication. The COMM was intended to over-identify misuse, rather than to mislabel someone as responsible when they are not. This is why a low cut-off score was accepted. We believe that it is more important to identify patients who have only a possibility of misusing their medications than to fail to identify those who are actually abusing their medication. Thus, it is possible that the COMM will result in false positives – patients identified as misusing their medication when they were not.

The table below presents several statistics that describe how effective the COMM is at different cutoff values. These values suggest that the COMM is a sensitive test. This confirms that the COMM is better at identifying who is misusing their medication than identifying who is not misusing. Clinically, a score of 9 or higher will identify 77% of those who actually turn out to be at high risk. The Negative Predictive Values for a cutoff score of 9 is .95, which means that most people who have a negative COMM are likely not misusing their medication. Finally, the Positive likelihood ratio suggests that a positive COMM score (at a cutoff of 9) is nearly 3 times (3.48 times) as likely to come from someone who is actually misusing their medication (note that, of these statistics, the likelihood ratio is least affected by prevalence rates). All this implies that by using a cutoff score of 9 will ensure that the provider is least likely to miss someone who is really misusing their prescription opioids. However, one should remember that a low COMM score suggests the patient is really at low-risk, while a high COMM score will contain a larger percentage of false positives (about 34%), while at the same time retaining a large percentage of true positives. This could be improved, so that a positive score has a lower false positive rate, but only at the risk of missing more of those who actually do show aberrant behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMM Cutoff Score</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>Positive Predictive Value</th>
<th>Negative Predictive Value</th>
<th>Positive Likelihood Ratio</th>
<th>Negative Likelihood Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score 9 or above</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

This clinical policy deals with critical issues in prescribing of opioids for adult patients treated in the emergency department (ED). This guideline is the result of the efforts of the American College of Emergency Physicians, in consultation with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Food and Drug Administration. The critical questions addressed in this clinical policy are: (1) In the adult ED patient with noncancer pain for whom opioid prescriptions are considered, what is the utility of state prescription drug monitoring programs in identifying patients who are at high risk for opioid abuse? (2) In the adult ED patient with acute low back pain, are prescriptions for opioids more effective during the acute phase than other medications? (3) In the adult ED patient for whom opioid prescription is considered appropriate for treatment of new-onset acute pain, are short-acting schedule II opioids more effective than short-acting schedule III opioids? (4) In the adult ED patient with an acute exacerbation of noncancer chronic pain, do the benefits of prescribing opioids on discharge from the ED outweigh the potential harms?

INTRODUCTION

Pain is a major symptom of many patients presenting to the emergency department (ED), with up to 42% of ED visits being related to painful conditions. Pain management has received increased emphasis in the past decade, including The Joint Commission’s focus on patient analgesia and increasing institutional emphasis placed on patient satisfaction surveys covering pain management. Much literature, including the most recent Institute of Medicine report on this topic, has stressed that health care providers have not done as well as possible in the area of pain management. A possible unintended consequence of these efforts is the increase in prescription drug abuse, especially opioid abuse, the fastest-growing drug abuse problem in the United States.

As part of this issue, there has been a startling increase in unintentional drug overdoses and related deaths since the late 1990s. Reported overdose deaths involving opioid analgesics increased from 4,030 in 1999 to 14,800 in 2008. Data from 2008 reveal that drug overdoses were the second leading cause of injury death in the United States, after motor vehicle crashes. Currently, deaths from opioid analgesics are significantly greater in number than those from cocaine and heroin combined.

The efforts of clinicians to improve their treatment of pain, along with pharmaceutical industry marketing, have been factors in contributing to a significant increase in the sale and distribution of opioids in the United States. For example, the sales of opioid analgesics to hospitals, pharmacies, and practitioners quadrupled between 1999 and 2010. Drug sales and distribution data of opioids show an increase from 180 mg morphine equivalents per person in the United States in 1997 to 710 mg per person in 2010. This is the equivalent of 7.1 kg of opioid medication per 10,000 population, or enough to supply every American adult with 5 mg of hydrocodone every 4 hours for a month.

The dilemma of treating pain appropriately while avoiding adverse events is further complicated by insufficient data supporting the long-term use of opioids in the treatment of chronic noncancer pain. Although selective use of opioids in the treatment of acute pain is traditionally accepted, the treatment of chronic noncancer pain is more complex. Many authors have begun to question the routine long-term use of opioids for the treatment of chronic noncancer pain. Multiple practice guidelines have been developed to address this issue. However, most recommendations in this area are of a consensus nature, being based on experiential or low-quality evidence.

Data from 2009 show that there were more than 201.9 million opioid prescriptions dispensed in the United States during that year. It is difficult to obtain reliable data concerning the degree to which this is an emergency medicine issue, but during 2009, in the 10- to 19-year-old and 20- to 29-year-old patient groups, emergency medicine ranked third among all specialties in terms of number of opioid prescriptions, writing approximately 12% of the total prescriptions in each age group. In the 30- to 39-year-old group, emergency medicine ranked fourth. Although these data do not deal with total doses dispensed by specialty, it is commonly postulated that the population served in EDs as a whole is at high risk for opioid abuse.

The significant increase in opioid-related deaths has raised the concern of many. This problem has also been observed in the pediatric population. Action at the national level includes the recent proposal from the Food and Drug Administration for the establishment of physician education programs for the prescribing of long-acting and extended-release opioids as part of their national opioid risk evaluation and mitigation strategy (the REMS program). State efforts to address this issue have included the development of statewide opioid prescribing guidelines, such as those developed by the Utah Department of Health and statewide ED opioid prescribing guidelines, such as those developed in Washington State by the Washington chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP) working with other state organizations. Some individual EDs and emergency physician groups have also promulgated opioid prescribing guidelines. Some of these policies also deal with the necessity of patient education about the safe use and proper disposal of opioid medications. Early data indicate that, in some cases, these guidelines may decrease prescription opioid overdose.

Anecdotal experience suggests that public policies such as these may change patient perceptions of appropriate prescribing and mitigate complaints arising from more stringent prescribing practices. ACEP has approved related policy statements about optimizing the treatment of pain in patients with acute presentations and the implementation of electronic prescription drug monitoring programs.
This clinical policy addresses several issues believed to be important in the prescribing of opioids by emergency physicians for adult patients treated and released from the ED for whom opioids may be an appropriate treatment modality. Although relieving pain and reducing suffering are primary emergency physician responsibilities, there is a concurrent duty to limit the personal and societal harm that can result from prescription drug misuse and abuse. Because long-acting or extended-release opioids are not indicated for the treatment of acute pain, the aim of this clinical policy is to provide evidence-based recommendations for prescribing short-acting opioids for adult ED patients with painful acute or chronic conditions while attempting to address the increasing frequency of adverse events, abuse, and overdose of prescribed opioid analgesics.

METHODOLOGY

This clinical policy was created after careful review and critical analysis of the medical literature. The critical questions were formulated in the PICO (patient, intervention, comparison, outcome) format to strengthen the clarity and scientific rigor of the questions. Searches of MEDLINE, MEDLINE InProcess, and the Cochrane Library were performed. All searches were limited to English-language sources, human studies, adults, and years 2000 to 2011. Specific key words/phrases and years used in the searches are identified under each critical question. In addition, relevant articles from the bibliographies of included studies and more recent articles identified by committee members were included.

This policy is a product of the ACEP clinical policy development process, including expert review, and is based on the literature; when literature was not available, consensus of panel members was used. Expert review comments were received from emergency physicians, toxicologists, pain and addiction medicine specialists, pharmacologists, occupational medicine specialists, and individual members of the American Academy of Clinical Toxicology, American Academy of Family Physicians, American Academy of Pain Medicine, American Chronic Pain Association, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, American College of Osteopathic Emergency Physicians, American College of Physicians, American Pain Society, American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians, Emergency Medicine Resident’s Association, and Emergency Nurses Association. Their responses were used to further refine and enhance this policy; however, their responses do not imply endorsement of this clinical policy. Clinical policies are scheduled for revision every 3 years; however, interim reviews are conducted when technology or the practice environment changes significantly. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention was the funding source for this clinical policy.

All articles used in the formulation of this clinical policy were graded by at least 2 subcommittee members for quality and strength of evidence. The articles were classified into 3 classes of evidence on the basis of the design of the study, with design 1 representing the strongest evidence and design 3 representing the weakest evidence for therapeutic, diagnostic, and prognostic studies, respectively (Appendix A). Articles were then graded on dimensions related to the study’s methodological features: blinded versus nonblinded outcome assessment, blinded or randomized allocation, direct or indirect outcome measures (reliability and validity), biases (eg, selection, detection, transfer), external validity (ie, generalizability), and sufficient sample size. Articles received a final grade (Class I, II, III) on the basis of a predetermined formula, taking into account the design and study quality (Appendix B). Articles with fatal flaws or that were not relevant to the critical question were given an “X” grade and were not used in formulating recommendations for this policy. Evidence grading was done with respect to the specific data being extracted and the specific critical question being reviewed. Thus, the level of evidence for any one study may have varied according to the question, and it is possible for a single article to receive different levels of grading as different critical questions were answered. Question-specific level of evidence grading may be found in the Evidentiary Table included at the end of this policy. Evidence grading sheets may be viewed at http://www.acep.org/clinicalpolicies/?pg=1.

Clinical findings and strength of recommendations about patient management were then made according to the following criteria:

Level A recommendations. Generally accepted principles for patient management that reflect a high degree of clinical certainty (ie, based on strength of evidence Class I or overwhelming evidence from strength of evidence Class II studies that directly address all of the issues).

Level B recommendations. Recommendations for patient management that may identify a particular strategy or range of management strategies that reflect moderate clinical certainty (ie, based on strength of evidence Class II studies that directly address the issue, decision analysis that directly addresses the issue, or strong consensus of strength of evidence Class III studies).

Level C recommendations. Other strategies for patient management that are based on Class III studies, or in the absence of any adequate published literature, based on panel consensus.

There are certain circumstances in which the recommendations stemming from a body of evidence should not be rated as highly as the individual studies on which they are based. Factors such as heterogeneity of results, uncertainty about effect magnitude and consequences, and publication bias, among others, might lead to such a downgrading of recommendations.

This policy is not intended to be a complete manual on the evaluation and management of adult ED patients with painful conditions where prescriptions for opioids are being considered, but rather is a focused examination of critical issues that have
particular relevance to the current practice of emergency medicine.

The goal of the ACEP Opioid Guideline Panel is to provide an evidence-based recommendation when the medical literature provides enough quality information to answer a critical question. When the medical literature does not contain enough quality information to answer a critical question, the members of the ACEP Opioid Guideline Panel believe that it is equally important to alert emergency physicians to this fact.

Recommendations offered in this policy are not intended to represent the only management options that the emergency physician should consider. ACEP clearly recognizes the importance of the individual physician’s judgment. Rather, this guideline defines for the physician those strategies for which medical literature exists to provide support for answers to the critical questions addressed in this policy.

**Scope of Application.** This guideline is intended for physicians working in hospital-based EDs.

**Inclusion Criteria.** This guideline is intended for adults presenting to the ED with acute noncancer pain or an acute exacerbation of chronic noncancer pain.

**Exclusion Criteria.** This guideline is not intended to address the long-term care of patients with cancer or chronic noncancer pain.

**CRITICAL QUESTIONS**

1. In the adult ED patient with noncancer pain for whom opioid prescriptions are considered, what is the utility of state prescription drug monitoring programs in identifying patients who are at high risk for opioid abuse?

**Recommendations**

**Level A recommendations.** None specified.

**Level B recommendations.** None specified.

**Level C recommendations.** The use of a state prescription monitoring program may help identify patients who are at high risk for prescription opioid diversion or doctor shopping.

Key words/phrases for literature searches: opioid, drug prescriptions, drug monitoring, drug utilization review, substance abuse detection, drug-seeking behavior, drug and narcotic control, substance-related disorders, physician’s practice patterns, program evaluation, emergency service, and variations and combinations of the key words/phrases with exclusion of cancer.

Emergency physicians must balance oligoanalgesia (undertreatment or ineffectual treatment of pain) with concerns about drug diversion* and doctor shopping. Therefore, the development of mechanisms to address these issues is justified. The expanded use of prescription drug monitoring programs to curb prescription opioid misuse was recommended in the 2011 Prescription Drug Abuse Prevention Plan released by the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy. Prescription drug monitoring programs are state-based monitoring programs for certain controlled substances that are prescribed by licensed practitioners and dispensed by pharmacies. Although existing in various forms for more than 3 decades, the first effort to standardize prescription drug monitoring practice was the passage in 2005 of the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act (NASPER). Unfortunately, this federal legislative mandate that intended to harmonize prescription drug monitoring programs across the various states has yet to be fully funded.

Prescription drug monitoring programs ideally serve multiple functions, including identifying patients who engage in doctor shopping, and patients, providers, or pharmacies who engage in diversion of controlled substances and providing information about prescribing trends for surveillance and evaluation purposes. Such information may serve to benefit the patients, the health care system, epidemiologists, policymakers, regulatory agencies, and law enforcement. Certain large health care systems, particularly closed prescribing systems such as the Veterans Administration and health maintenance organizations, maintain databases that allow prescribers to view recent prescriptions of enrolled clients or patients. Forty-one states have operational prescription drug monitoring programs of various complexity and capability, with an additional 7 states having prescription drug monitoring program legislation in place but with programs that are not yet operational. Most states allow health care providers and pharmacists to access the programs for patients under their care. Other groups such as law enforcement and regulatory boards may also have access. One program tracks only schedule II drug prescriptions, whereas most track drug prescriptions of schedule II to IV or II to V drugs.

Despite prescription drug monitoring programs providing an intuitive perception of benefit for the medical community, there are limited data to indicate any benefit of these programs for improving patient outcomes or reducing the misuse of prescription drugs. In part, this relates to the limited optimization of and standardization between the programs and the lack of a mechanism to allow interstate communication.

*Doctor shopping: The practice of obtaining prescriptions for controlled substances from multiple providers, which is regarded as a possible indication of abuse or diversion. There is no rigorous definition, and various authors have defined it in different ways, from 2 or more prescribers within 30 days, greater than 4 during 1 year, and greater than 5 during 1 year. It has also been defined as the amount of drug obtained through doctor shopping compared with the amount intended to be prescribed. The use of “pill mills,” in which a prescriber provides ready access to prescriptions or pills, can be considered a form of doctor shopping.
One study has demonstrated that compared with states without a prescription monitoring program, those with such a program had a slower rate of increase in opioid misuse.38

In an attempt to quantify the effect of a prescription drug monitoring program, Baehren et al39 conducted a prospective study (Class III) of 18 providers who cared for a convenience sample of adult patients with pain in a single Ohio ED. After the clinical assessment of a patient, the researchers queried the providers about 3 patient-specific issues: (1) the likelihood of querying the state’s prescription drug monitoring program, called Ohio Automated Rx Reporting System; (2) the likelihood of providing an opioid prescription at discharge; and (3) if yes, which opioid and what quantity. They were then provided with a printout of the patient data from the prescription drug monitoring program and asked to reassess the same questions. Of the 179 patients with complete data, information from the Ohio Automated Rx Reporting System altered prescribing practice in 74 of 179 (41%). The majority (61%) of these patients received fewer or no opioids, whereas 39% received more. The change in management was attributed to the number of previous prescriptions, 30 of 74 (41%); number of previous prescribers, 23 of 74 (31%); number of pharmacies used, 19 of 74 (26%); and number of addresses listed, 12 of 74 (16%). A limitation of this study was that 4 prescribers accounted for almost two thirds of the total patient encounters. In this study, knowledge of the information provided by a prescription drug monitoring program had an important impact on the prescription practices for controlled substances in an ED, although the actual effect of prescription drug monitoring program data on patient outcomes in this study is unknown.

Although not specifically evaluating the benefit of prescription drug monitoring programs on identifying high-risk patients, Hall et al,32 in a Class III study, reviewed characteristics of decedents who died of prescription drugs in West Virginia and reported that opioid analgesics accounted for 93% of deaths. Cross-referencing the medical examiner’s detailed analysis of the cause of death with the West Virginia prescription monitoring program, the authors determined the prescription history of the drug associated with each fatality. Patients who had received controlled drugs from 5 or more prescribers in the year before death were defined as engaging in “doctor shopping,” whereas those whose death was not associated with a valid prescription were considered to have obtained their drugs through “diversion.” Of the 295 deaths that were reviewed, the mean age of patients who died was 39 years, and 92% were between ages 18 and 54 years. Diversion was associated with 186 (63%) of the fatalities, and doctor shopping was associated with 63 (21%) of the fatalities. Of the 295 total decedents, 279 (95%) had at least 1 indicator of substance abuse, and these differed according to whether the drug was obtained through diversion or doctor shopping. Deaths involving diversion were associated with a history of substance abuse (82.3% versus 71.6%; odds ratio [OR] 1.8; 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.0 to 3.4), nonmedical route of pharmaceutical administration (26.3% versus 15.6%; OR 1.9; 95% CI 1.0 to 3.8), and a contributory illicit drug (19.4% versus 10.1%; OR 2.1; 95% CI 1.0 to 4.9). Patients with evidence of doctor shopping were significantly more likely to have had a previous overdose (30.2% versus 13.4%; OR 2.8; 95% CI 1.4 to 5.6) and significantly less likely to have used contributory alcohol (7.9% versus 19.8%; OR 0.3; 95% CI 0.1 to 0.9). Few patients (8.1%) were involved in both doctor shopping and diversion. The study suggests that the information provided by a prescription drug monitoring program, with correct interpretation and action based on that knowledge, might have prevented some inappropriate prescribing and poor outcomes in this patient population.

In another Class III study, Pradel et al33 monitored prescribing trends for buprenorphine in a select area of France, using a prescription drug database during a multiple-year period. During this time, a prescription drug monitoring program was implemented, allowing a before-after comparison of the buprenorphine prescribing pattern for more than 2,600 patients. The doctor shopping drug quantity, which was defined as the total drug quantity received by the patient minus the quantity prescribed by an individual provider, increased from 631 g in the first 6 months of 2000 to a peak of 1,151 g in the first 6 months of 2004, equivalent to 143,750 days of treatment at 8 mg/day. The doctor shopping ratio, determined as the ratio of the quantity delivered to the quantity prescribed, increased steadily from early 2000 (14.9% of the grams of drug prescribed) to a peak value in the first 6 months of 2004 (21.7%). After implementation of the prescription drug monitoring program in early 2004, this value decreased rapidly, in fewer than 2 years reaching the value observed in 2000. The points of inflection of the doctor shopping curves (quantity and ratio) coincided with the implementation of the prescription drug monitoring program, suggesting an immediate benefit of this program. The prescribed quantity did not change after the implementation, indicating that access to treatment may not have changed. Eighty percent of the total doctor shopping quantity of buprenorphine was obtained by approximately 200 (8%) of the total patients. However, it is difficult to make any inferences about the effect of a decrease in doctor shopping, given the fractional amount of total prescribing accounted for by this practice.33 The authors suggested that the doubling in the street price of buprenorphine after the prescription drug monitoring program implementation was an indicator of success.

An observational study of opioid-related deaths by Paulozzi et al37 highlights some important considerations in the assessment of the effectiveness of prescription drug monitoring programs. The authors assessed the mortality rate from 1999 to 2005 from schedule II and III prescription opioids in the United States and compared states that had prescription drug monitoring programs with those that did not. They further divided states with prescription drug monitoring programs into those that proactively informed prescribers, generally by mail, of potential...
discharged from the ED with acute low back pain, the

2. In the adult ED patient with acute low back pain, are prescriptions for opioids more effective during the acute phase than other medications?

Recommendations

Level A recommendations. None specified.
Level B recommendations. None specified.
Level C recommendations. (1) For the patient being discharged from the ED with acute low back pain, the emergency physician should ascertain whether nonopioid analgesics and nonpharmacologic therapies will be adequate for initial pain management.

(2) Given a lack of demonstrated evidence of superior efficacy of either opioid or nonopioid analgesics and the individual and community risks associated with opioid use, misuse, and abuse, opioids should be reserved for more severe pain or pain refractory to other analgesics rather than routinely prescribed.

(3) If opioids are indicated, the prescription should be for the lowest practical dose for a limited duration (eg, &lt;1 week), and the prescriber should consider the patient’s risk for opioid misuse, abuse, or diversion.

Key words/phrases for literature searches: acute low back pain, opioid, and variations and combinations of the key words/phrases.

Acute low back pain is a common ED presenting complaint. Opioids are frequently prescribed, expected, or requested for such presentations. In a recent study, it was estimated that low back pain–related disorders result in approximately 2.6 million annual ED visits in the United States. Of medications either administered in the ED or prescribed at discharge, the most frequently used classes were opioids (61.7%; 95% CI 59.2% to 64.2%), nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) (49.6%; 95% CI 46.7% to 52.3%), and muscle relaxants (42.8%; 95% CI 40.2% to 45.4%). The opioid analgesics most commonly prescribed for low back pain, hydrocodone and oxycodone products, are also those most prevalent in a Government Accountability Office study of frequently abused drugs. Low back pain as a presenting complaint was also observed in a recent study to be associated with patients at higher risk for opioid abuse. Low back pain, although a common acute presentation, is also often persistent and recurrent, with 33% of patients continuing to complain of moderate-intensity pain and 15% of severe pain at 1 year from initial presentation. Symptoms recur in 50% to 80% of people within the first year. In one study, 19% reported opioid use at a 3-month follow-up. Emergency physicians, as a specialty, are among the higher prescribers of opioid pain relievers for patients aged 10 to 40 years. Recent data show simultaneous increases in overall opioid sales rates and prescription opioid–related deaths and addiction rates and suggest that widespread use of opioids has adverse consequences for patients and communities.

There is a paucity of literature that addresses the use of opioids after ED discharge for acute low back pain versus the use of NSAIDs or the combination of NSAIDs and muscle relaxants. Two meta-analyses published in the last 5 years identified relatively few valid studies that address the use of opioids for low back pain. In a Class III 2008 Cochrane review, NSAIDs were compared with opioids and muscle relaxants for the treatment of low back pain. Three studies were reviewed that compared opioids (2 of which are no longer in use) with NSAIDs for treatment of acute low back pain, including 1 study considered by the Cochrane reviewers to be of higher quality. None of
the individual studies found statistically significant differences in pain relief. A Class III review by McIntosh and Hall\(^45\) of clinical evidence for treatment of acute low back pain similarly found no evidence for superiority of opioids over other therapies and no direct information to demonstrate that opioids were better than no active therapy; however, the authors concluded that the opioid-related studies were too small to detect any clinically important differences.

A Class III Cochrane review of NSAID treatment for acute low back pain evaluated 65 studies (including more than 11,000 patients) of mixed methodological quality that compared various NSAIDs with placebo, other drugs, other therapies, and other NSAIDs.\(^46\) The review authors concluded that NSAIDs are slightly effective for short-term symptomatic relief in patients with acute and chronic low back pain without sciatica (pain and tingling radiating down the leg). In patients with acute sciatica, no difference in effect between NSAIDs and placebo was found but moderate efficacy was found for opioids. The systematic review also reported that NSAIDs are no more effective than other drugs (acetaminophen, opioids, and muscle relaxants). Placebo and acetaminophen had fewer adverse effects than NSAIDs, and NSAIDS had fewer adverse effects than muscle relaxants or opioids.

A 2003 Cochrane review of muscle relaxants for low back pain (Class X because it did not address the role of opioids) found that muscle relaxants were effective for short-term symptomatic relief in patients with acute and chronic low back pain.\(^48\) However, muscle relaxants were associated with a high incidence of adverse effects. This study cited strong evidence in 4 trials involving a total of 294 people that oral nonbenzodiazepine muscle relaxants are more effective than placebo in patients with acute low back pain for short-term pain relief, global efficacy, and improvement of physical outcomes.

Although no superiority has been demonstrated for opioids over other therapies for treatment of acute low back pain, groups have recommended against use of opioids as first-line therapy for treatment of this problem.\(^49\)\(^50\) A guideline for diagnosis and treatment of low back pain endorsed by the American College of Physicians and the American Pain Society recommends opioids only for severe, disabling pain that is not controlled or not likely to be controlled with acetaminophen or NSAIDs.\(^49\) In their 2007 guidelines, the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine stated that routine use of opioids for acute, subacute, or chronic low back pain is not recommended.\(^50\)

Several observational non-ED studies also suggest caution with regard to opioid prescribing for back pain. Franklin et al.\(^51\) in a retrospective study (Class X because of the non-ED patient population), found that workers with acute low back injury and worker’s compensation claims who were treated with prescription opioids within 6 weeks of acute injury for more than 7 days had a significantly higher risk for long-term disability. In a subsequent Class III population-based prospective study of opioid use among injured Washington State workers with low back pain, Franklin et al.\(^52\) observed a strong association between the amount of prescribed opioids received early after injury and long-term use of prescription opioids. A retrospective study of 98 workers with acute low back pain and subsequent disability claims by Mahmoud et al.\(^53\) found that patients whose treatment of new work-related low back pain involved opioid use for 7 days or more were more likely to have long-term disability (relative risk 2.58; 95% CI 1.22 to 5.47); however, the direct applicability of this study (Class X) was limited because most patients were not seen in the ED. In another study that addressed associations of long-term outcome with opioid therapy for nonspecific low back pain, Volinn et al.\(^54\) found that the odds of chronic work loss were 11 to 14 times greater for claimants treated with schedule II (“strong”) opioids compared with those not treated with opioids at all. They further observed that the strong associations between schedule II use and long-term disability suggest that for most workers, opioid therapy did not arrest the cycle of work loss and pain. Although this study was also graded as Class X because of the population selected and failure to directly address acute or immediate benefit, the results highlight potential problems of treating acute low back pain with opioids.\(^54\) Unfortunately, causation cannot be directly inferred from these studies because of possible confounding.

In summary, although opioids currently offer the most potent form of pain relief, there is essentially no published evidence that the prescription of opioid analgesics for acute low back pain provides benefit over other available medications or vice versa. Several observational studies suggest associations of both prescription of “strong” opioids or longer prescription duration (greater than 7 days) and early opioid prescribing with worsened functional outcomes. Additionally, as noted, the overall increased rate of opioid sales has been strongly associated with adverse effects in the community (overdose, addiction, aberrant use, and death).\(^8\) Therefore, it can be recommended that opioids not be routinely prescribed for acute low back pain but reserved for select ED patients with more severe pain (eg, sciatica) or pain refractory to other drug and treatment modalities. Prescriptions for opioids should always be provided for limited amounts and for a limited period. Extra caution (such as use of prescription drug monitoring programs and seeking of collateral patient information such as patient visit history) may be indicated for patients identified as possibly having an increased risk for substance dependence or abuse.

3. In the adult ED patient for whom opioid prescription is considered appropriate for treatment of new-onset acute pain, are short-acting schedule II opioids more effective than short-acting schedule III opioids?

**Recommendations**

*Level A recommendations.* None specified.

*Level B recommendations.* For the short-term relief of acute musculoskeletal pain, emergency physicians may prescribe short-acting opioids such as oxycodone or hydrocodone...
products while considering the benefits and risks for the individual patient.

**Level C recommendations.** Research evidence to support superior pain relief for short-acting schedule II over schedule III opioids is inadequate.

Key words/phrases for literature searches: opioids, schedule II narcotics, schedule III narcotics, acute pain, acute disease, emergency service, and variations and combinations of the key words/phrases.

Schedules II and III are classifications established by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 and determined by the Drug Enforcement Administration. Among other criteria, classification decisions for specific drugs are based on judgments about the potential for their abuse. Schedule II opioids include morphine (eg, MS Contin), oxymorphone (eg, Opana), oxycodone (eg, Roxicodone) and oxycodone combination products (eg, Percocet, Percodan), as well as hydromorphone (eg, Dilaudid) and fentanyl (eg, Duragesic patch, Actiq). Schedule III opioids include combination products, such as hydrocodone (15 mg or less) combined with acetaminophen (eg, Vicodin, Lortab) or ibuprofen (eg, Vicoprofen), as well as some of the codeine combination products. Schedule classifications for opioids may change over time in response to a number of factors, including their perceived risk of abuse. Calls to reclassify hydrocodone combination products (eg, Vicodin, Lortab) from schedule III to schedule II have increased in recent years in response to increasing levels of abuse of these substances. These recommendations address only new-onset acute pain. Long-acting or extended-released schedule II products such as oxycodone ER (OxyContin), methadone, fentanyl patches, or morphine extended-release (MS Contin) are indicated for chronic pain and should not be used for acute pain. Long-acting and extended-release opioids are for use in opioid-tolerant patients only and are not intended for use as an “as-needed” analgesic. In addition, the immediate-release oral transmucosal formulations of fentanyl are indicated only for breakthrough pain relief in cancer patients who are already taking sustained-release medications and are opioid tolerant. These formulations should not be used for acute new-onset pain.

As part of the decision to prescribe opioids for new onset of acute pain, the care provider can select between short-acting schedule II or III agents (Table). In general, equianalgesic doses of opioids are equally efficacious in relieving pain. Therefore, a priori, there is no reason to consider an equianalgesic dose of a short-acting schedule II opioid more effective in providing pain relief than a short-acting schedule III opioid. However, some studies have compared schedule II and III opioids combined with nonopioid analgesics with one another. Two prospective randomized controlled trials have compared the efficacy of short-acting oxycodone, a schedule II drug, with hydrocodone combination products (schedule III) and found them to be equal. In 2005, Marco et al compared single doses of oxycodone 5 mg with hydrocodone 5 mg (both combined with 325 mg acetaminophen). In this single-site Class II study of 67 adolescent and adult subjects with acute fractures, no differences in analgesic efficacy were observed at 30 or 60 minutes. Constipation rates were higher for hydrocodone. In a 2002 Class I study, Palangio et al compared oxycodone 5 mg combined with acetaminophen 325 mg (schedule II) with hydrocodone 7.5 mg combined with ibuprofen 200 mg (schedule III) in a prospective, multicenter, multidose, randomized controlled trial of 147 adults with acute or recurrent low back pain. During an 8-day study period, no differences were found in pain relief, doses taken, global evaluations of efficacy, health status, or pain interference with work. As noted above, equianalgesic doses of opioids have similar efficacy in the treatment of acute pain, no matter their Drug Enforcement Administration classification. Given this understanding, it was not unexpected that 2 randomized controlled trials comparing schedule II with III agents found no differences in analgesic efficacy.

4. **In the adult ED patient with an acute exacerbation of noncancer chronic pain, do the benefits of prescribing opioids on discharge from the ED outweigh the potential harms?**

**Recommendations**

**Level A recommendations.** None specified.

**Level B recommendations.** None specified.

**Level C recommendations.** (1) Physicians should avoid the routine prescribing of outpatient opioids for a patient with an acute exacerbation of chronic noncancer pain seen in the ED. (2) If opioids are prescribed on discharge, the prescription should be for the lowest practical dose for a limited duration (eg, <1 week), and the prescriber should consider the patient’s risk for opioid misuse, abuse, or diversion. (3) The clinician should, if practicable, honor existing patient-physician pain contracts/treatment agreements and

**Table.** Short-acting oral opioid formulations. Dose and interval are recommended starting dosing ranges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medication</th>
<th>Initial Dose/Interval</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Codeine/APAP</td>
<td>30-60 mg* PO Q4-6h PRN</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeine</td>
<td>30-60 mg PO Q4-6h PRN</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocodone/APAP</td>
<td>5-15 mg* PO Q4-6h PRN</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydromorphone</td>
<td>2.4 mg PO Q4-6h PRN</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphine</td>
<td>15-30 mg PO Q4-6h PRN</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxycodone/APAP</td>
<td>5-15 mg* PO Q4-6h PRN</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxycodone</td>
<td>5-15 mg PO Q4-6h PRN</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxymorphone</td>
<td>10-20 mg PO Q4-6h PRN</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*APAP, acetaminophen; h, hour; mg, milligram; PO, by mouth; PRN, as needed; Q, every.

*Listed dose is of the opioid component. Note that the acetaminophen component is now limited to 325 mg or less per pill.
consider past prescription patterns from information sources such as prescription drug monitoring programs.

Key words/phrases for literature searches: opioid, patient discharge, pain, emergency service, and variations and combinations of the key words/phrases with exclusion of cancer.

Patients with chronic noncancer pain, either already taking opioids or not, commonly present to the ED for treatment of acute exacerbation of their pain. There have been no studies that evaluate the efficacy or potential harms of prescribing opioids specifically for these patients on discharge from the ED. Thus, given the paucity of evidence, this critical question cannot be definitively answered. Despite the biological plausibility that treating any acute exacerbation of pain with parenteral or oral opioids should decrease pain intensity, no studies were found to support this hypothesis.

Only 2 randomized controlled trials were identified that addressed the use of short-acting opioids for the treatment of breakthrough pain in patients taking opioids for chronic noncancer pain; transmucosal fentanyl was the intervention for both trials. Because of methodological problems, valid estimates for efficacy of the intervention could not be determined, but adverse event rates among both treated populations were common and similar (range 63% to 65%) (Class III).

A systematic review of nonrandomized studies by Devulder et al examined the effect of rescue medications on overall analgesic efficacy and adverse events. They examined 48 studies of patients treated with long-acting opioids for chronic noncancer pain and compared the analgesic efficacy and adverse events among those that allowed short-acting opioid rescue medications for breakthrough pain with those that did not allow such rescue medications. Although graded Class X because of lack of randomized studies and the limitation of harms studied to adverse effects only, no significant difference in the analgesic efficacy between the rescue and nonrescue studies was found. There was also no difference between these 2 groups in the incidence of nausea, constipation, or somnolence. Kalso et al, in a Class III systematic review, found that 80% of patients receiving opioids for chronic noncancer pain had at least 1 adverse event, including nausea (32%), constipation (41%), and somnolence (29%).

Studies of the use of opioids for chronic pain indicate that adverse effects of these drugs are common. Several studies assessed the adverse effects with the use of tramadol with acetaminophen in the treatment of patients with chronic low back pain. All of the studies had high dropout rates and reported adverse event rates of nausea, dizziness, and somnolence between 8% and 17%. Allan et al, in a nonblinded Class III study comparing transdermal fentanyl versus oral morphine, found a constipation rate of 48% in the morphine-treated patients compared with a rate of 31% in the fentanyl-treated patients. Constipation was also the major adverse effect in a Class III study by Hale et al comparing oxymorphone extended release, oxycodone controlled release, and placebo. Furlan et al, in a Class II meta-analysis of 41 randomized studies of opioid use in the treatment of chronic noncancer pain, found that constipation and nausea were the only significant adverse effects. Holmes et al, however, in a Class III study, assessed an opioid screening instrument, the Pain Medication Questionnaire, in chronic noncancer pain patients and found that those patients with a higher score were more likely to have a substance abuse problem or request early refills of their opioid prescription. In a retrospective Class III cohort study, Jensen et al conducted a 10-year follow-up on patients discharged from a pain clinic and found that chronic opioid treatment may put patients at risk for chronic depression. Unfortunately, near-universal shortcomings of these studies include the exclusion of patients with a history of substance abuse, other significant medical problems, or psychiatric disease, and lack of follow-up to detect long-term effects such as aberrant drug-related behaviors, addiction, or overdose. Therefore, studies such as these can be confounded, making the ability to draw conclusions about causality difficult.

Questions of opioid effectiveness involve the assessment of reduction in pain and improvement in function for the patient, potential patient adverse effects, and the potential harm to the community (eg, opioid diversion and abuse) from the drugs prescribed. Hall et al, in a Class III retrospective analysis of 295 unintentional prescription overdose deaths, found that 93% were due to opioids, 63% represented pharmaceutical drug diversion, 21% of the patients had engaged in doctor shopping, and 95% of the patients had a history of substance abuse.

Although no studies have addressed the effects related to dose and duration of prescribed opioids in this specific patient population, 2 general studies have shown a correlation between high daily opioid dose and overdose death.

Patient assessment tools such as the Screener and Opioid Assessment for Patients with Pain (SOAPP), Opioid Risk Tool (ORT), Diagnosis, Intractability, Risk, and Efficacy (DIRE), and others to assess the risk of prescription opioid misuse and abuse have yet to be fully validated in the ED in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and utility. Many, however, believe that use of these tools, as imperfect as they are, represents a beginning in the ability to better quantify potential risks related to opioid prescribing for outpatients.

Many patients undergoing treatment for chronic noncancer pain have pain contracts/treatment agreements with their primary care providers. These should be honored if possible in treating any acute exacerbation of their pain. As discussed in critical question 1, use of prescription drug monitoring programs may also assist the emergency physician in making appropriate clinical decisions about the use of outpatient opioid prescriptions for these patients.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Provider pain management practices related to opioids are highly variable. In part, this variability reflects the lack of evidence to guide many of these therapeutic decisions.
Although there is high-quality research assessing the treatment of acute pain with opioid analgesics during the ED encounter, there is a paucity of studies assessing the benefits of prescribing opioids for discharged ED patients with acute pain and chronic noncancer pain, especially in comparison to other analgesic drugs and pain treatment modalities. Therefore, clinical decisions and practice recommendations must rely on practice experience and consensus rather than research evidence.

ED populations typically include patients with unmet substance abuse treatment needs and psychiatric comorbidities, and many of these patients present with acute pain. In almost all pain studies, these patients are excluded, leaving clinicians with little evidence-based guidance for their pain management. There are also significant research gaps in clearly understanding the long-term harms of opioids, including drug abuse and addiction, aberrant drug-related behaviors, and diversion. As mentioned above, further research and validation is needed on ED patient abuse and addiction-related assessment tools.

Additional studies to characterize individual patient-related risks for opioid abuse are also greatly needed.

Although there has been recent widespread adoption of prescription monitoring programs, there remains a dearth of evidence about the effectiveness of these programs in altering physician prescribing patterns or diminishing the adverse effects of opioids in the community. For research in this area to advance, further refinement of prescribing metrics (quantity, duration, and frequency) and public health measures is required. Comparison of the functionality and effectiveness of the various state prescription drug monitoring program models may provide additional insight into developing best practices that could be adopted nationally, including the sharing of data between states. Important distinctions among the states, such as immediate online prescriber access to the prescription monitoring program, should be examined for their relative contributions. However, this type of analysis must consider baseline variability among states for prescription opioid misuse (versus heroin or methadone, for example) and other state-specific issues (such as prescription-writing regulations).

With respect to the treatment of acute low back pain in the ED, there is a need for quality studies comparing the effectiveness of the more commonly prescribed opioids (hydrocodone and oxycodone congeners and other semisynthetic opioids) and nonopioid therapies, with attention to confounding variables such as depression or other psychopathology. Further study is needed to validate or refute the reported associations of early or potent opioid prescribing with increased rates of disability. Given the frequency of acute low back pain as an ED presentation and its association with perceived drug-seeking behavior, and with apparent higher risk for misuse, more attention needs to be paid to discriminatory historical or physical factors that may be predictive of drug-seeking or abuse to allow better matching of treatment modality for individual patients.

Future studies should include additional multiple-dose analgesic protocols to better understand the postdischarge experience of patients with acute pain and what would constitute optimum patient follow-up provisions. Investigators should include clinically relevant study periods (days to weeks), which vary by diagnosis; thus, trials should be stratified by specific presenting complaints, pain site, discharge diagnosis, and classification of pain type, ie, nociceptive, neuropathic, and visceral pain. In addition to measuring pain and adverse effects, functional outcomes, such as return to work or pain-related quality-of-life measures, should be included. Straightforward observational studies are needed to determine the relative duration of different acute pain presentations, thus informing decisions to prescribe an appropriate number of opioid doses per prescription. Current prescribing practice often involves a “one size fits all” pattern that is encouraged by electronic prescribing software. Prescribing practices that ignore variable durations of acute pain syndromes will predictably result in undertreatment for some patients and overtreatment for others. The latter increases the likelihood that unused opioids will be diverted into nonmedical use in communities at risk.

Additional research should include evaluation of the appropriateness of patient satisfaction as a quality metric as related to patient expectations of opioids and the prevalence of providers reporting pressure through low patient satisfaction scores or administrative complaints to provide opioids when the providers believe these drugs are not medically indicated. This issue may gain increased importance with the institution of the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS) survey, which may tie some reimbursement to patient satisfaction scores. Additional work is needed to investigate what constitutes an appropriate educational curriculum in both medical school and residency for physician education concerning safe, appropriate, and judicious use of opioids.

Research addressing the treatment of chronic noncancer pain would be enhanced by the use of accepted case definitions, standardized definitions of adverse events, and validated pain measurements. Case definitions should use a similar definition of chronic, nociceptive (musculoskeletal or visceral) versus neuropathic pain, or pain by disease type (headache, low back pain, etc). Research reporting also requires more refined descriptions of opioid potency and routes of administration.

Although opioids represent a treatment modality that has long been used in patient care, it is clear by the paucity of definitive answers to the questions posed in this document and the significant number of future research issues that much work remains to be done to clarify the best use of opioids in the care of patients.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</th>
<th>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Limitations/Comments</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall et al$^{32}$</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Retrospective, population based, observational study</td>
<td>Comparison of West Virginia medical examiner data with patient data from the state prescription monitoring program and opioid abuse treatment program records</td>
<td>Behaviors of those who died of a pharmaceutical overdose; diversion; doctor shopping; substance abuse history; type of drug</td>
<td>295 deaths; 67% male; 92% aged 18-54 y; 63% pharmaceutical diversion; 21% doctor shopping; 95% substance abuse history; 93% opioids</td>
<td>Actual source of opioids involved in death not known; single state; not validated definitions; retrospective</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pradel et al$^{33}$</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Review of prescription drug database (not prescription monitoring program) to identify amount of buprenorphine delivered, prescribed, and obtained by doctor shopping; extension of 2004 study, used multiple time period comparisons; evaluation of trends in doctor shopping over time</td>
<td>Determined prescribed quantity of buprenorphine, delivered quantity, and the doctor shopping quantity</td>
<td>Although there was some variation over time, the trend for prescribing stayed constant overall and doctor shopping decreased after 2004, associated with the change in the mechanism by which prescriptions are monitored</td>
<td>Reasons for multiple providers or overlapping or interrupted prescriptions unclear; did not examine risk factors for abuse</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baehren et al$^{39}$</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Prospective, uncontrolled</td>
<td>Physicians prescribing analgesics for nonacute pain were asked details about the patient’s prescription and then again after being informed of the prescription monitoring program search result for that patient</td>
<td>Change in prescription for the specific patient</td>
<td>179 enrolled; management changed in 41%; 61% received fewer opioids, 39% received more</td>
<td>Convenience sample; majority of data from 4 prescribers</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evidentiary Table (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</th>
<th>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Limitations/Comments</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McIntosh and Hall⁵⁵</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Review of randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, and observational studies found searching MEDLINE 1966-12/2009, EMBASE 1980 to 12/2009, and Cochrane database up to 12/2009; 49 studies met inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Multiple treatment modalities for acute low back pain, including oral drugs, local injections, and nondrug treatment</td>
<td>Clinical improvement of low back pain</td>
<td>NSAIDs shown to effectively improve symptoms compared with placebo, but use associated with gastrointestinal adverse effects; muscle relaxants may reduce pain and improve clinical assessment but are associated with adverse effects including drowsiness, dizziness, nausea</td>
<td>The studies examining the effects of analgesics such as acetaminophen or opioids were generally too small to detect any clinically important differences</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roelofs et al</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Cochrane review: search of MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Cochrane central registry of controlled trials up to 7/2007; 65 trials qualified for review</td>
<td>NSAIDs and COX-2 inhibitors administered to treat low back pain</td>
<td>Clinical improvement of low back pain</td>
<td>Review authors found NSAIDs are not more effective than other drugs (acetaminophen, opioids, and muscle relaxants); placebo and acetaminophen had fewer adverse effects than NSAIDs, although the latter had fewer adverse effects than muscle relaxants and opioids; the new COX-2 NSAIDs do not seem to be more effective than traditional NSAIDs but are associated with fewer adverse effects, particularly stomach ulcers, although other literature has shown that some COX-2 NSAIDs are associated with increased cardiovascular risk</td>
<td>7 studies reported on acute low back pain, 5 of which, including 1 higher-quality study, did not find any statistical differences between NSAIDs and opioids or muscle relaxants; there is moderate evidence that NSAIDs are not more effective than other drugs for acute low back pain</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videman et al</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Double-blind parallel study</td>
<td>70 patients; comparative trial of meptazinol vs diflunisal for up to 3 wk</td>
<td>Patients examined at 1-wk intervals for task capability, range of motion, and subjective pain self-assessment</td>
<td>Both regimens produced marked improvement in most parameters, similar adverse effect profiles</td>
<td>No mention of patient randomization</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin et al²</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Prospective cohort;</td>
<td>Prospective cohort of workers with back injuries interviewed at 18 days (medial) and 1 y after injury; pharmacy data obtained from computerized records; analyzed for demographic and covariates</td>
<td>Injury severity, pain, function, and quantities of opioids used</td>
<td>For long-term users total number of medications increased significantly ($P=.01$) from the first to the fourth quarter; after adjustment for baseline pain, function, and injury severity, the strongest predictor of longer-term opioid prescriptions was total number of medications in the first quarter; receipt of $\geq 10$ mg/day medicine in first quarter more than tripled the odds of receiving opioids long term, and receipt of $\geq 40$ mg/day medicine in first quarter had 6-fold odds of receiving long-term opioids; amount of prescribed opioid received early after injury predicts long-term use</td>
<td>Addressed progression to long-term use according to initial treatment and continuation of same treatment</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco et al</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Single site; prospective; double blind; randomized controlled trial; concealment method described; ED patients with fractures</td>
<td>Single dose of oxycodone 5 mg/acetaminophen 325 mg schedule II vs hydrocodone 5 mg/acetaminophen 325 mg schedule III</td>
<td>Primary outcomes were numeric pain scores (0-10) at 30 and 60 min</td>
<td>88 subjects evaluated, 73 enrolled, 67 completed ED study period, 35 to oxycodone, 32 to hydrocodone; no baseline differences, no differences in outcomes at 30 min: -0.6 (95% CI -1.8 to 0.5); 60 min -0.5 (95% CI -2.0 to 1.0); adverse effects higher for constipation with hydrocodone (21% vs 0%; (95% CI 3% to 39%)</td>
<td>Small sample size powered to address acute pain during the first 30 to 60 min in the ED; study also assessed adverse effects during a longer period of time; excluded history of alcohol or opioid or other substance abuse; limited time period</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palangio et al</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Prospective multicenter (18 sites), randomized controlled trial, sequential assignment by computer-generated randomization schedule</td>
<td>Hydrocodone 7.5 mg/ibuprofen 200 mg (schedule III) vs oxycodone 5 mg/acetaminophen 325 mg (schedule II)</td>
<td>Primary outcome was mean daily pain relief score at endpoint (day 8 or day of discontinuation), study period up to 8 days, intention-to-treat analysis</td>
<td>147 subjects enrolled (75 hydrocodone/ibuprofen, 72 oxycodone/acetaminophen), adults with acute or recurrent low back pain requiring opioids, 85% completed study in both groups, mean days to endpoint 6.5 vs 6.9 days, no baseline differences, no differences in pain relief, number of pills, global evaluations, SF-36, pain interference with work, adverse events</td>
<td>Excluded drug or alcohol abuse, concealment methods described</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portenoy et al&lt;sup&gt;99&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Randomized, double blind, placebo controlled</td>
<td>Fentanyl buccal tablet for breakthrough pain in chronic low back pain patients</td>
<td>Pain before treatment and for 2 h after treatment</td>
<td>Fentanyl buccal tablet effective for breakthrough pain in chronic low back pain; adverse effects in 65%; 34% during double-blind phase</td>
<td>Severe selection bias in initial screening; industry sponsored</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson et al&lt;sup&gt;100&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Randomized, double blind, placebo controlled</td>
<td>Fentanyl buccal tablet for breakthrough pain in chronic pain patients</td>
<td>Pain before treatment and for 2 h after treatment</td>
<td>Fentanyl buccal tablet effective for breakthrough pain; adverse effects in 63%; 22% dropout</td>
<td>Severe selection bias in initial screening; industry sponsored</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalso et al&lt;sup&gt;102&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Randomized trials in chronic noncancer pain comparing potent opioids with placebo</td>
<td>Pain intensity outcomes</td>
<td>15 randomized trials were included; 11 studies compared oral opioids for 4 wk; pain intensity decrease was 30% compared with placebo; only 44% were taking opioids by mo 7 to 24; 80% of patients experienced at least 1 adverse event: constipation (41%), nausea (32%), somnolence (29%)</td>
<td>4-wk duration on average; differing causes of pain; open label in many of the studies; limited power calculations; concealment not maintained in some studies</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peloso et al</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Prospective, randomized, blinded study</td>
<td>Tramadol/acetaminophen vs placebo; patients with chronic low back pain requiring daily medication for at least 3 mo</td>
<td>Pain VAS; pain relief rating scale; Short Form Magill Pain Questionnaire SF-36; 3-mo trial</td>
<td>336 patients randomized; improved mean final pain scores (47 vs 63; ( P &lt; .001 )), adverse effects: nausea 12%, dizziness 11%, constipation 10%, somnolence 9%</td>
<td>35%-40% dropout rate; pharmaceutical-sponsored research</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruoff et al</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Prospective, randomized, blinded study</td>
<td>Tramadol/acetaminophen vs placebo; patients with chronic low back pain requiring daily medication for at least 3 mo</td>
<td>Pain VAS; pain relief rating scale; Short Form Magill Pain Questionnaire SF-36; Roland Disability Questionnaire</td>
<td>318 patients randomized; tramadol improved pain VAS (( P = .15 )) and final Pain Relief Rating Scale (( P &lt; .001 )); adverse effects: nausea 13%, somnolence 12%, constipation 11%, dizziness 8%</td>
<td>153 of 318 dropped out; pharmaceutical-sponsored research</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnitzer et al⁵⁵</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Prospective, randomized, blinded study</td>
<td>Tramadol/acetaminophen vs placebo; patients with chronic low back pain requiring daily medication for at least 3 mo</td>
<td>Time to discontinuation because of inadequate pain relief; Short Form Magill Pain Questionnaire; Roland Disability Questionnaire</td>
<td>380 patients in open-label phase; 254 entered into blinded phase; time to therapeutic failure was greater in the placebo group ($P&lt;.0001$); other parameters showed improvement; adverse effects: nausea 17%, dizziness 15%, somnolence 14%, headache 12%</td>
<td>The dropout rate was the primary outcome; pharmaceutical-sponsored research</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan et al</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Nonblinded, randomized comparison of 2 treatments in patients with chronic low back pain</td>
<td>Transdermal fentanyl vs sustained-release oral morphine; 680 total patients; dose titrated to effect; followed for 13 mo; outpatient setting; not applicable to ED</td>
<td>Pain relief (VAS scale); bowel function (validated questionnaire); quality of life (SF-36); disease, progression (3-point scale), days not working, adverse events all during 13 mo</td>
<td>Comparable pain relief, noninferior, VAS score for fentanyl (56) vs morphine (55); fentanyl had lower constipation rate: fentanyl (31%) vs morphine (48%)</td>
<td>Both groups had half of the participants drop out; vague definition of chronic low back pain; not blinded</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale et al57</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Randomized trial, blinded</td>
<td>Comparison of oxymorphone extended-release vs oxycodone controlled release vs placebo in patients with chronic low back pain who were taking a stable dose of opioids</td>
<td>VAS of pain score 4 h after morning dose; use of breakthrough pain medications; categorical pain intensity, pain intensity, global assessment, adverse events</td>
<td>Opioids were superior to placebo at reducing VAS for pain compared with placebo, oxymorphone (-27), oxycodone (-36); oxymorphone was comparable to oxycodone in pain efficacy and adverse effects; sedation and constipation were more common with opioids (35% vs 29% vs 11%)</td>
<td>Only 22 of 75 patients in the placebo group completed the study; included only patients receiving stable opioids and then randomized to opioids or placebo; baseline characteristics between groups not specified; pharmaceutical-sponsored research</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furlan et al 68</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>Study included randomized trials of any opioid for chronic noncancer pain (defined as pain for longer than 6 mo) vs placebo or some other nonopioid treatment</td>
<td>41 randomized studies with 6,019 patients evaluated for effectiveness and adverse effects; most (80%) had nociceptive pain</td>
<td>81% of the studies were believed to be of high quality; dropout rates were 33% in the opioid group and 38% in the placebo group; opioids improved pain and functional outcomes compared with placebo in nociceptive and neuropathic pain; strong opioids were superior to naproxen and nortriptyline for pain relief; weak opioids were not superior; constipation and nausea were the only significant adverse effects observed</td>
<td>Average duration of the study was 5 wk (range 1-16 wk); adequate random patient assignment in only 17 of 41 trials; 90% of trials were pharmaceutical-sponsored research</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidentiary Table (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</th>
<th>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Limitations/Comments</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holmes et al(^{69})</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Prospective cohort</td>
<td>Convenience sample of patients who were new at a pain clinic; Pain Medication Questionnaire was administered; patients were treated with interdisciplinary treatment and/or medications alone, depending on the results of an initial evaluation</td>
<td>Beck Depression Inventory; Confidential Pain questionnaire; SF-36; Million VAS; Oswestry Disability Questionnaire; Physician Risk Assessment; VAS</td>
<td>271 patients, divided into low-, medium-, and high-score pain medication questionnaire; high-score group was more likely to have a known substance use problem (OR 2.6), request early refills (OR 3.2), or drop out of treatment (OR 2.3)</td>
<td>Only 26% of patients completed the full treatment program; heterogeneous types of pain diagnosis; differing treatment plans</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Intervention(s)/Test(s)/Modality</td>
<td>Outcome Measure/Criterion Standard</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations/Comments</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen et al. 70</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Retrospective review of cohort</td>
<td>Patients who were treated and discharged from a pain clinic 10 y ago; medical records were abstracted and questionnaires were sent to willing participants</td>
<td>Demographics, health care utilization, SF-36; Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; Coping Strategy Questionnaire; CAGE* test</td>
<td>160 patients; 60% of patients were still taking long-acting opioids; dose escalation was unusual; chronic users had lower health-related quality of life and higher occurrence of depression</td>
<td>160 of 279 possible patients participated; no control group</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*COX-2, cyclooxygenase-2; ED, emergency department; h, hour; mg, milligram; min, minute; mo, month; NSAID, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug; OR, odds ratio; SF-36, Short-Form Health Survey; VAS, visual analog scale; vs, versus; wk, week; y, year.

*CAGE (Cutting down, Annoyed, Guilty, Eye-opener) test is a method of screening for alcoholism.
### Appendix A. Literature classification schema.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design/Class</th>
<th>Therapy</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Prognosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Randomized, controlled trial or meta-analysis of randomized trials</td>
<td>Prospective cohort using a criterion standard or meta-analysis of prospective studies</td>
<td>Population prospective cohort or meta-analysis of prospective studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nonrandomized trial</td>
<td>Retrospective observational</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>Case series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>Case report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (eg, consensus, review)</td>
<td>Other (eg, consensus, review)</td>
<td>Other (eg, consensus, review)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some designs (eg, surveys) will not fit this schema and should be assessed individually.
†Objective is to measure therapeutic efficacy comparing interventions.
‡Objective is to determine the sensitivity and specificity of diagnostic tests.
§Objective is to predict outcome, including mortality and morbidity.

### Appendix B. Approach to downgrading strength of evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downgrading</th>
<th>Design/Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 level</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 levels</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatally flawed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exit Strategy Guide for Discontinuation of Opioid Therapy

The possibility of subsequent discontinuation from opioid therapy should be discussed with the patient at the time that opioid therapy is initiated.

**Determine patient is not sufficiently responsive to opioid therapy to continue with such treatment**

Suggested criteria:
- Intolerable side effects at the minimum dose that produces effective analgesia
- Reasonable attempts at opioid rotation unsuccessful
- Noncompliance with patient care agreement
- Clinically rational dose escalation without adequate analgesia
- Deterioration in physical, emotional, or social functioning attributed to opioid therapy

**Establish collaborative relationship with patient around need for discontinuation of opioid therapy**

- Review exit criteria agreed upon in patient care agreement
- Clarify that exit is for patient’s (not doctor’s) benefit
- Clarify that exiting opioid therapy is not synonymous with abandoning pain management or abandoning patient

---

Patient appears to have a problem with drug addiction

- Refer for addiction management or co-management

---

No apparent addiction problem. Patient able to cooperate with office-based taper.

- Taper opioids gradually over one month
- Implement non-opioid pain management strategies, including psychosocial support, cognitive-behavioral therapies, physical therapy, non-opioid analgesics, management of insomnia, anxiety, depression

---

Patient unable or unwilling to cooperate with outpatient taper

- Provide sufficient opioid for one-month taper or maintenance until admission
- Refer to inpatient program or comprehensive outpatient program, or similar services as available
Appendix 15 – Suggested Strategies for Tapering and Weaning

Strategies for Tapering & Weaning

Strategies for tapering:
From a medical standpoint, weaning from opioids can be done safely by slowly tapering the opioid dose and taking into account the following issues:

- A decrease by 10% of the original dose per week is usually well tolerated with minimal physiological adverse effects. Some patients can be tapered more rapidly without problems (over 6 to 8 weeks).
- If opioid abstinence syndrome is encountered, it is rarely medically serious although symptoms may be unpleasant.
- Symptoms of an abstinence syndrome, such as nausea, diarrhea, muscle pain and mydriasis can be managed with clonidine 0.1 – 0.2 mg orally every 6 hours or clonidine transdermal patch 0.1mg/24hrs (Catapres TTS-1™) weekly during the taper while monitoring for often significant hypotension and anticholinergic side effects. In some patients it may be necessary to slow the taper timeline to monthly, rather than weekly dosage adjustments.
- Symptoms of mild opioid withdrawal may persist for six months after opioids have been discontinued.
- Consider using adjuvant agents, such as antidepressants to manage irritability, sleep disturbance or antiepileptics for neuropathic pain.
- Do not treat withdrawal symptoms with opioids or benzodiazepines after discontinuing opioids.
- Referral for counseling or other support during this period is recommended if there are significant behavioral issues.
- Referral to a pain specialist or chemical dependency center should be made for complicated withdrawal symptoms.

Recognizing and managing behavioral issues during opioid weaning:
Opioid tapers can be done safely and do not pose significant health risks to the patient. In contrast, extremely challenging behavioral issues may emerge during an opioid taper.

Behavioral challenges frequently arise in the setting of a prescriber who is tapering the opioid dose and a patient who places great value on the opioid he/she is receiving. In this setting, some patients will use a wide range of interpersonal strategies to derail the opioid taper. These may include:

- Guiit provocation (“You are indifferent to my suffering”)
- Threats of various kinds
- Exaggeration of their actual suffering in order to disrupt the progress of a scheduled taper

There are no fool-proof methods for preventing behavioral issues during an opioid taper, but strategies implemented at the beginning of the opioid therapy are most likely to prevent later behavioral problems if an opioid taper becomes necessary.
**Step 13. Stepwise approach for managing opioid-induced constipation**

1. Nonpharmacologic approaches for all patients
   - Increase fluid intake as tolerated
   - Increase dietary fiber as tolerated (unless patient is severely debilitated or bowel obstruction is suspected)
   - Encourage mobility and ambulation if appropriate
   - Ensure comfort and privacy for defecation
   - Encourage bowel movements at the same time each day
   - Rule out or treat impaction

2. Consider pharmacologic interventions and discuss approaches with patient
   - Intermittent use (every 2-3 days) of an osmotic laxative, such as magnesium hydroxide, magnesium citrate, or sodium phosphate
   - Trial of a daily softening agent (sodium docusate) alone
   - Intermittent use (every 2-3 days) of a contact cathartic, such as senna or bisacodyl
   - Daily use of a contact cathartic preparation (with or without a concurrent softening agent)
   - Daily use of lactulose or sorbitol
   - Daily use of polyethylene glycol

3. Adjust dose and dosing schedule of selected therapy to optimize effects

4. Switch or combine conventional approaches if initial therapy is inadequate

---

### Table 14. Types of enemas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enema</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Indications/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small volume</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium phosphate</td>
<td>Stimulates lower bowel</td>
<td>May be used 1-3 times per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil retention</td>
<td>Softens hard, impacted stool</td>
<td>Best if oil can be retained; administered before large-volume enema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk and molasses</td>
<td>Stimulates lower bowel; sugar in the molasses is an irritant to bowel lining and can lead to gas production that distends bowel and causes pressure, peristalsis, and evacuation</td>
<td>Softens hard, impacted stool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large volume</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helpful to warm the solution; mineral oil may be added to any large-volume enema to soften stool; difficult to self-administer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap water</td>
<td>Induces peristalsis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap suds</td>
<td>Stimulates lower bowel, promotes evacuation</td>
<td>Can be irritating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>Stimulates lower bowel, promotes evacuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris flush (up-and-down flush)</td>
<td>Provides lower-bowel irrigation, promotes expulsion of flatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Bulk-forming laxatives (cellulose, psyllium seeds)</th>
<th>Osmotic/saline cathartics (magnesium salts, sodium salts, lactulose, sorbitol)</th>
<th>Lubricants (mineral oil)</th>
<th>Surfactants (penciclohexylamine)</th>
<th>Oral lavage (polyethylene glycol)</th>
<th>Contact cathartics (Diphenoxylate, chlorpromazine, anthranilic acids, senna)</th>
<th>Contact cathartics (Castor oil)</th>
<th>Contact cathartics (Prokinetic agents (metoclopramide, domperidone))</th>
<th>Oral naltrexone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase mass and water content of stool</td>
<td>• Increase water in bowel</td>
<td>• Soften stool</td>
<td>• Facilitate mixture of fat</td>
<td>• Rushes colon</td>
<td>• Increase peristalsis</td>
<td>• Increases secretion</td>
<td>• Promote transit through gastrointestinal tract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decrease transit time</td>
<td>• Decrease transit time</td>
<td></td>
<td>and stool</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce absorption of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lactulose and sorbitol attract water into colon, acidity contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>water and electrolytes from intraluminal contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Commonly used for bowel cleansing before medical procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly recognized as safe and well tolerated for management of chronic constipation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Users may find formulation acceptable in daily management</td>
<td>• Usually combined with contact cathartic as first-line therapy for opioid-induced constipation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May be used for acute constipation or fecal impaction</td>
<td>• Bases used clinically (usually 200-400 mg/day) produce surfactant effect rather than contact cathartic effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased transit time</td>
<td>• Doses used for bowel cleansing procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased transit time</td>
<td>• Available powder formulation can be used daily for long-term management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased transit time</td>
<td>• Not generally recommended for chronic constipation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased transit time</td>
<td>• Experience is limited, and trial should be considered only if constipation has responded poorly to more conventional measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased transit time</td>
<td>• May exacerbate opioid-induced constipation without causing systemic opioid withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased transit time</td>
<td>• Should be used only if other therapies have failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased transit time</td>
<td>• Treatment should incorporate dose escalation that identifies a dose that produces bowel withdrawal without concurrent systemic withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased transit time</td>
<td>• Some patients absorb sufficient naloxone and experience uncomfortable signs of abstinence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/comments</td>
<td>May worsen fatigue, distention, bloating, or abdominal pain in patients with intra-abdominal disease</td>
<td>Risks are generally minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid use in patients who are severely debilitated or have partial bowel obstruction</td>
<td>Severe diarrhea and dehydration may occur with overdose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant allergies have been reported</td>
<td>Rarely, cause serious electrolyte disorders or volume overload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patients with renal insufficiency or cardiac failure must be carefully monitored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lactulose and sorbitol may increase flatulence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term use impairs absorption of fat-soluble vitamins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intestinal perforation may occur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for serious lope abdominos if aspiration occurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constipation and dehydration are possible side effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risks associated with short-term use are minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term use may result in laxative bowel, a condition characterized by dependence on laxatives for bowel function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allergies to these substances may be reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overuse may produce dehydration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cramping and diarrhea are common with long-term use, malabsorption of nutrients may occur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some patients absorb sufficient naloxone and experience uncomfortable signs of abstinence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of agent</td>
<td>Starting dose</td>
<td>Effects/comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk-forming laxatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psyllium</td>
<td>1 tbsp tid</td>
<td>2-4 days, Must be taken with at least 8 oz of water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyl cellulose</td>
<td>1 tbsp tid</td>
<td>2-4 days, Must be taken with fluids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmotic (saline) cathartics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium citrate</td>
<td>1/2-1 bottle</td>
<td>3-6 hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium sulfate</td>
<td>5-15 g</td>
<td>3-6 hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Epsom salts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium hydroxide</td>
<td>30-60 mL</td>
<td>30 min-6 hr, Useful as prep for colonoscopy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium phosphate</td>
<td>45 mL</td>
<td>30 min-6 hr, Useful as prep for colonoscopy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactulose, sorbitol</td>
<td>30 mL</td>
<td>24-48 hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyethylene glycol</td>
<td>1 capful/day</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubricants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral oil</td>
<td>1-2 tbsp</td>
<td>1-3 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfactants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docusate</td>
<td>300 mg</td>
<td>1-3 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact cathartics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphenylmethane</td>
<td>1-2 tabs</td>
<td>6-12 hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisacodyl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthraquinones</td>
<td>1-2 tabs</td>
<td>6-12 hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascara, senna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor oil</td>
<td>1-2 tbsp</td>
<td>3-6 hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokinetic agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metoclopramide</td>
<td>10 mg qid</td>
<td>Titrate dose, monitor for withdrawal symptoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral naloxone</td>
<td>1 mg bid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Initial dose*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroleptics</td>
<td>Prochlorperazine</td>
<td>10 mg PO q6h; 25 mg PR q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenothiazines</td>
<td>Chlorpromazine</td>
<td>12.5-25 mg PO q8h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butyrophenones</td>
<td>Haloperidol</td>
<td>0.5 mg IV q6h; 1 mg PO q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticholinergic drugs</td>
<td>Scopolamine</td>
<td>1.5 mg q3d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antihistamines</td>
<td>Promethazine</td>
<td>25 mg PO/PR q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meclizine</td>
<td>25 mg PO q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diphenhydramine</td>
<td>25 mg PO/IV q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimenhydrinate</td>
<td>25 mg PO/IV q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydroxyzine</td>
<td>25 mg PO/IV q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trimethobenzamide</td>
<td>250 mg PO; 200 mg PR q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokinetic drugs</td>
<td>Metoclopramide</td>
<td>10 mg PO/IV q6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corticosteroids</td>
<td>Dexamethasone</td>
<td>1-4 mg PO/IV q8h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzodiazepines</td>
<td>Lorazepam</td>
<td>0.5-1 mg SL/PO/IV q4-6h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabinoids</td>
<td>Dronabinol</td>
<td>2.5 mg PO q12h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-HT₃ receptor antagonists</td>
<td>Ondansetron</td>
<td>4-8 mg PO/SL/IV q8h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granisetron</td>
<td>1 mg PO/SL/IV q12h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dolasetron</td>
<td>50-100 mg PO/IV q12h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV, intravenous; PO, by mouth; PR, parenteral; SL, sublingual.

* May start at lower dose in older patients.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemoreceptor trigger zone</td>
<td>Nausea is described in nonspecific terms, without associated symptoms.</td>
<td>A neuroleptic (e.g., prochlorperazine, haloperidol) or a prokinetic drug with dopamine antagonist properties (e.g., metoclopramide) is typically first-line therapy. If neuroleptics are ineffective at relatively high doses, other options include a trial with an alternative opioid or route of opioid administration or treatment with an alternative neuroleptic (e.g., haloperidol, chlorpromazine), antihistamine (e.g., diphenhydramine, hydroxyzine), benzodiazepine (e.g., lorazepam), corticosteroid (e.g., dexamethasone), or serotonin antagonist (e.g., ondansetron).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced vestibular sensitivity</td>
<td>Nausea is markedly exacerbated by movement (e.g., when patient arises from bed) or is associated with vertigo, reading, or watching television.</td>
<td>Patients may benefit from use of an anticholinergic drug (e.g., scopolamine), an antihistamine (e.g., meclizine, promethazine), or a benzodiazepine (e.g., lorazepam).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed gastric emptying</td>
<td>Nausea is most severe immediately after eating and may be associated with postprandial vomiting, early satiety, and bloating.</td>
<td>A prokinetic drug (e.g., metoclopramide) is the most reasonable initial treatment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. References


