Executive summary
Every infant, child, and adolescent will experience pain at times throughout their life. Childhood pain ranges from acute to chronic, and includes procedural, disease-related, breakthrough, and other types of pain. Despite its ubiquity, pain is a major challenge for individuals, families, health-care professionals, and societies. As a private mental experience, pain is often hidden and can go undiscussed or ignored. Undertreated, unrecognised, or poorly managed pain in childhood leads to important and long-lasting negative consequences that continue into adulthood, including continued chronic pain, disability, and distress. This undertreatment of pain should not continue, as there are available tools, expertise, and evidence to provide better treatment for childhood pain.

In this Commission, we present four transformative goals that will improve the lives of children and adolescents with pain and their families. These goals, taken at face value, might seem simple and obvious. However, if the goals were easy to achieve, there would be few, if any, young people reporting poorly managed acute pain, pain after surgery or procedures, or ongoing chronic pain. Pain is multifactorial, and influenced by biological, psychological, and social factors, making it complex and difficult to treat effectively. We take a developmental perspective that encompasses children from birth to 24 years, and focus on how the provision of paediatric pain treatment and services can be improved.

First, make pain matter. Pain has not mattered enough, as evidenced by common failings to provide adequate or appropriate pain relief in clinical practice, insufficient training among health-care professionals, a lack of investment in research and services, and inequity in access to pain management. Despite some good examples of knowledge translation, investment in a strong social science research base for paediatric pain is needed to catapult us into a new era in which the social and cultural context of pain can be understood and addressed.

Second, make pain understood. There has been excellent progress in our mechanistic understanding of nociception and pain perception for both acute and chronic pain states, but gaps in knowledge remain. Pain research needs to include the whole biopsychosocial model, including its subjective nature and the multiple inputs at different stages of development that affect the pain experience. Advances in developmental biology, genetics, psychology, nosology, and classification will all help to speed up discovery in these areas. Greater investment is also needed in larger international birth cohort studies that incorporate comprehensive pain-related measurements.

Third, make pain visible. Pain can and should be assessed in every child. Methods for pain assessment throughout childhood and in all clinical scenarios need to be optimised. Although subjective pain report is the primary and desirable method when this is possible, many of the methods and measures that are in common use can and should be improved. There have been developments in our understanding of the biological correlates of pain, and in broader patient-reported outcome variables that can provide a more holistic understanding of patients’ pain status. Finally, a greater focus should be placed on assessing outcomes that are important to patients, rather than those that are central to researchers and clinicians.

Fourth, make pain better. This goal can be achieved by advancing our knowledge of multiple treatment options in all areas (eg, psychological, pharmacological, and physical interventions). Few randomised controlled trials of pain interventions in children have been done, and the pipeline for innovation and new treatments is running dry. Novel drug discovery studies and trial design (eg, using single-case designs when the randomised controlled trial is not ethical or practical) could advance treatment options. There is innovation in new ways to personalise individual treatments, but greater investment in research and coordinated approaches at all levels are needed.

These four goals are not sequential and must be addressed simultaneously. It is time for change.

Paediatric pain should matter to everyone, and cross-sector collaboration is needed to make quick and effective progress. By bringing the issues of paediatric pain into the open, we call for policy makers, funders, and health-care executives, researchers, and clinicians to engage enthusiastically and to deliver both the easy and the difficult changes needed to improve the lives of children and adolescents with pain.

Introduction
Pain is a feature of life that is present across all cultures and ages. It is often associated with acute injury or is a symptom of disease, but it can also be evoked by physical activities or social interactions: from play and sport to body adornment and religious ritual. Regardless of its origin, pain is typically experienced as unpleasant, negative, and threatening. Although a primary function
of acute pain is to protect an organism from potential damage, at a biological, psychological, and social level it also functions to promote recovery, to facilitate escape from immediate harm, to avoid future harm, and to warn others of potential danger.4 Nevertheless, pain can often extend past its functional use, and can exist only as a residual of CNS plasticity in 1965. In 1986, her son, Jeffrey Lawson, was born prematurely and placed in the care of the Children’s Hospital National Medical Centre in Washington, DC, USA. Jeffrey underwent extensive surgery without adequate anaesthesia or analgesia because, as recently as 1986, the belief that infants did not have the capability to experience pain was common and prevalent among medical professionals.5,6 Although parents like Jill Lawson often assumed that their infants would be given pain relief during surgeries, the medical community were reluctant to provide analgesic and anaesthetic agents because of a paucity of scientific evidence for the existence of pain in infants, and because of a fear of possible serious adverse events associated with the available drugs. Infants received surgery using muscle paralytic agents, with a focus on immobilisation to facilitate the procedure rather than the prevention of suffering.7 Jeffrey Lawson lived for 5 weeks. Jill Lawson’s advocacy brought together a combination of science and education to challenge the practice of withholding anaesthesia and analgesia in infants because it was thought to be unnecessary or unsafe. By 1995, practices had changed and a UK-based survey showed that 91% of anaesthetists now provided systemic opioid analgesia to infants for major surgery, whereas in 1988 only 10% adopted this practice.5 Science is not always enough to change practice; public awareness and policy can translate knowledge into action.5,8

Panel 1: Jill Lawson’s advocacy for pain management in infants

It was a mother, Jill Lawson, who contributed to one of the most radical changes in pain research and pain treatment since Ronald Melzack and Patrick D Wall presented their theory of CNS plasticity in 1965. In 1986, her son, Jeffrey Lawson, was born prematurely and placed in the care of the Children’s Hospital National Medical Centre in Washington, DC, USA. Jeffrey underwent extensive surgery without adequate anaesthesia or analgesia because, as recently as 1986, the belief that infants did not have the capability to experience pain was common and prevalent among medical professionals.5,6 Although parents like Jill Lawson often assumed that their infants would be given pain relief during surgeries, the medical community were reluctant to provide analgesic and anaesthetic agents because of a paucity of scientific evidence for the existence of pain in infants, and because of a fear of possible serious adverse events associated with the available drugs. Infants received surgery using muscle paralytic agents, with a focus on immobilisation to facilitate the procedure rather than the prevention of suffering.7 Jeffrey Lawson lived for 5 weeks. Jill Lawson’s advocacy brought together a combination of science and education to challenge the practice of withholding anaesthesia and analgesia in infants because it was thought to be unnecessary or unsafe. By 1995, practices had changed and a UK-based survey showed that 91% of anaesthetists now provided systemic opioid analgesia to infants for major surgery, whereas in 1988 only 10% adopted this practice.5 Science is not always enough to change practice; public awareness and policy can translate knowledge into action.5,8

Goal 1: make pain matter

When one is in severe pain, nothing is as important as finding relief. But pain in others evokes a less urgent response. Pain is often expected to be transitory, diagnostically useful, bearable, and easily forgotten, but when this is not the case it is more difficult to tolerate. Although people can often be highly sensitive to their own pain, it can only extend past its functional use, and can exist only as a residual of need and we give examples of how pain can be inadvertently dismissed as being unimportant, and how our language can suggest to children that pain should be stochastically and quietly endured.26,27 We consider how ignoring childhood pain can be prevented in children who have a limited verbal repertoire, which can result in them being seen to have fewer needs than those who are better able to articulate their pain. We also consider how best to adapt clinical pain management practices needed for multidisciplinary attention from policy makers, funders, researchers, clinicians, and the public.
clear organisational strategy is in place. Successful approaches that have been used to improve knowledge, attitudes, and practices in health care and other formal settings frequented by children are also discussed.

**Social organisation**

Access to pain relief should be a basic human right, but navigating policy and governmental responses to uphold that right has not been easy and is arguably in retreat.\(^\text{17}\) Pain is not immediately thought to be a social phenomenon, but more often considered to be a physical and cognitive experience. Nevertheless, culture influences our behavioural expression of pain, and how others view and respond to people experiencing pain.\(^\text{18}\) Children learn how to express and respond to noxious stimuli in keeping with societal norms from their families and the wider society, and phrases—such as big boys don’t cry and no pain no gain—are common. For many, the experience of pain is short and self-limiting (eg, pain following an acute injury) or fairly straightforward to treat, with known underlying causes. Therefore, for many in society, pain that does not follow an acute trajectory can be dismissed and perceived as unimportant because of the belief that all pain is similar to the acute pain that most people experience. However, this belief is not true, and these societal misconceptions of pain can be harmful. The dominant social belief that pain is temporary and should be endured can result in stigmatisation of children and adolescents living with chronic pain.\(^\text{19}\) This belief can also predispose infants, children, and adolescents to endure repeated procedural pain,\(^\text{20}\) and can then lead to a culture of poor pain management practice.\(^\text{21-23}\) Variability in the experience and expression of pain might be a further contributing factor to the dominant misconceptions and myths held in society that inhibit access to pain management.

Traditionally, nurses and physicians were not formally taught about pain, nor how to provide adequate pain care to treat infants, children, and adolescents who had to undergo painful procedures and treatments (eg, lumbar puncture, bloodwork, and burn dressing changes). Clinicians were more concerned about the adverse consequences of treating pain (eg, administration of opioids) than the consequences of inflicting pain.\(^\text{24-26}\) Medical education in pain remains a challenge. In Canada, veterinary students received more formal education on pain (eg, understanding and treating pain) than nursing and medical students.\(^\text{26}\) Improvements in education are needed but alone are inadequate as, even when individual clinicians are interested in improving their own practice, systematic barriers exist.\(^\text{27}\)

The experience of pain within health care is often a product of treatment. For example, vaccinations and other related skin-breaking needle procedures (eg, bloodwork and intravenous cannulas) are routine and represent a substantial number of painful procedures in health-care settings for paediatric patients, yet in many cases pain relief is infrequently given.\(^\text{28}\) In the UK, children are usually given 16 separate injections between birth and the age of 14 years, many without any pain management.\(^\text{28}\) Although the short-term pain associated with these procedures could be considered fleeting or inconsequential, they are known to cause considerable distress when repeated in children or infants over weeks, months, or years, when each momentary experience is compounded and can be traumatic.\(^\text{29}\) Untreated pain has multiple consequences. For example, the establishment or exacerbation of needle fear is common during childhood, and 20–50% of adolescents report fear of needles.\(^\text{30}\) This consequence matters: it can delay or prevent important vaccinations and blood tests that are necessary for the prevention or diagnosis of illness. For example, needle fear and phobias were found to be the most commonly reported deterrent in obtaining the influenza vaccine in adults working in a health-care
Panel 2: Pain management during vaccinations

Immunisation is a global priority for preventing infectious disease. Vaccination involving a needle puncture is painful and can cause fear and vaccine hesitancy, resulting in future avoidance of vaccinations, which can have a large negative societal impact. In 2015, the first clinical practice guideline for reducing pain during vaccine injections in children and adults was published, and it suggests the following:

- Aspiration (pulling back on the syringe to ensure it is not in the blood vessel) should not be used during intramuscular injections for people of all ages
- Injecting the most painful vaccine last rather than first during visits with more than one vaccination
- Breastfeeding or formula feeding infants aged ≥2 years during the procedure or giving them a sugar solution before the injection
- Holding children aged ≥3 years in the caregiver’s arms during injections to provide them with a sense of comfort
- Adopting an upright position when administering vaccinations in children aged ≥3 years as this position provides a sense of control and decreases fear
- Parents of children aged ≤10 years should be present during vaccine injections to lower their child’s distress levels
- Topical analgesics should be applied before injection in children of all ages
- Educating parents, older children, and adults about what to expect with a vaccination and methods to manage any pain

The guideline culminated in a WHO position paper in 2015 on “Reducing pain at the time of vaccination”. The position paper was the first policy paper on pain mitigation at the time of vaccination, integrating information pertaining to the reduction of pain, distress, and fear across all age groups. It provides important acknowledgment from WHO that pain during vaccination sessions is manageable and managing pain does not decrease the efficacy of the vaccine. There are effective, feasible, non-costly, culturally acceptable, and age-specific evidence-based strategies to mitigate pain at the time of vaccination.

Mobilising knowledge: dissemination and implementation

The problems of poor paediatric pain practice might stem from inadequate knowledge or understanding, or from a failure of training. However, this view is at best partial. The problem in many cases is not one of knowledge but of knowledge translation, which refers to the uptake and application of knowledge in practice with a focus on overcoming barriers. Knowledge translation is also referred to as knowledge mobilisation or, increasingly, dissemination and implementation of evidence to improve practice. Shortening this gap from knowledge production to implementation is crucial and might now be more achievable given the explosion in new computerised media.

Because of the need for reliable information and support, and now the technological possibility to provide it, there are a growing number of initiatives to disseminate science more quickly to parents, health-care professionals, and communities (table). Launched in 2019, Solutions for Kids in Pain (SKIP) is a prominent organisation that brings together Canada’s paediatric pain specialists, front-line knowledge user organisations, end beneficiaries, and over 100 partners across various sectors (eg, charities, governments, businesses, and health care). It aims to improve children’s pain management in Canadian health institutions, beginning with members of Children’s Healthcare Canada (Ottawa, ON, Canada).

Good examples also exist of how to collectively capture and benchmark practice. For example, the EUROPAIN...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark practice</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Countries or regions involved</th>
<th>Weblink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUROPAIN (EUROpean Pain Audit In Neonates)</td>
<td>Document analgesic practice in neonatal care</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td><a href="https://www.uow.edu.au/ahsri/epnoc">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paediatric Electronic Persistent Pain Outcomes Collaboration (PaedePPOC)</td>
<td>Introduce common assessment practice for pain management in ten centres</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://childkindinternational.org">Link</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve clinical practice</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChildKind</td>
<td>Encourage institutional commitment to providing comfort and pain relief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase public awareness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solution for Kids in Pain</td>
<td>Confirm the information needed by the user (eg, parents), organise resources and evidence, produce and promote knowledge mobilisation tools, facilitate institutional change, and increase awareness of paediatric pain among the general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#ItDoesntHaveToHurt</td>
<td>Provide evidence-based information about the management of paediatric pain across social media platforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Initiatives to mobilise knowledge in paediatric pain, by aim

(EUROpean Pain Audit In Neonates) study showed that provision of analgesia is widespread among neonatal intensive care units in 18 European countries, but that there is extensive unexplained variability between sites. In Australia, the Paediatric Electronic Persistent Pain Outcomes Collaboration (PaedePPOC) initiative that introduced common assessment practice for pain management in ten centres has successfully been integrated into practice, providing the means for comparison between populations and different resource settings.

Although some countries have not developed surveillance and benchmarking practices for paediatric pain management, there have been substantial advancements. In countries where evidence-based guidance is available, the focus should turn to the implementation of evidence-based guidelines. There is no single correct approach to implementing an organisational change programme to improve pain care. It is worth stressing that pain management also occurs outside of the hospital, such as in the home, in educational settings, in the community (eg, family practitioners’ offices), and in pre-hospital emergency environments. No single strategy works in all settings, and context needs to be considered; thus, the type of institution, leadership, culture, value of research in practice, number and type of health-care professionals, and physical resources are all relevant and need to be considered. A further example at a hospital level is the implementation of the Children’s Comfort Promise, which adopted new protocols for nurses to provide options to reduce pain during needle procedures. Developed by the Special Interest Group on Pain in Children of the International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP), ChildKind (the organisation that developed the Children’s Comfort Promise) is a prominent international initiative with the unique aim to establish and maintain practice improvement through certification. To obtain certification, ChildKind requires the institution to have a facility-wide policy on pain prevention, assessment, and treatment that shows clear institutional commitment to pain relief, and ongoing education on pain for staff, trainees, and patients. The institution also needs to show evidence of the sustained use of developmentally appropriate processes for pain assessment, specific evidence-informed protocols for pain prevention and treatment (including pharmacological, psychological, and physical methods), and regular institutional self-monitoring within the framework of continuous quality improvement.

A final example of an approach that helps to mobilise knowledge of paediatric pain is the online initiative #ItDoesntHaveToHurt, a collaboration between paediatric pain researchers, parents, and the YummyMummyClub.ca (an online blogging platform for parents to share advice on issues surrounding motherhood). This initiative provides Canadian parents with evidence-based information about children’s pain management across social media platforms (eg, Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, and Twitter) and, in 2016, had more than 72 million content views worldwide in the first 6 months.

**Equity**

Focus on the delivery and provision of care should come with a focus on equity. Equity is not about equal access to shared resource but is, instead, about fair access to unequal resources according to need. There is poor equity in access to pharmacological pain management worldwide and the types of multidisciplinary treatment described in this Commission are not available for all infants, children, and adolescents. Despite the documented international and intranational inequalities, there is little formal study of equity and...
inequity in the context of pain, with some exceptions, but very few in paediatrics. In research there has traditionally been an interest in inequities that are driven by income group, race, and sex and gender. With children, the most extensive study of these inequities has been in sickle cell disease, an inherited chronic disorder of blood cells causing painful crises in patients who are mostly of African heritage and for whom prejudicial inequity in access to pain management is well recognised. Other forms of pain management inequity exist among children with disability. For example, children and adolescents with disabilities have their postoperative pain assessed less often and receive fewer opioids and fewer days of opioid pain management for the same surgery than children and adolescents without disability. This issue is concerning as children with disabilities typically experience high pain intensity. There is a need to better understand the patterns and effect of inequity in pain-relief provision at a societal level. There is also a need to explore the psychological effects of perceived inequity. Human experimental studies are beginning to reveal that perceptions of injustice and inequity can affect pain and disability status. If one believes one is being unfairly treated, this belief can worsen the experience of pain, disability, and treatment effectiveness.

Little is known about how young people and their parents perceive inequity and injustice, and there are few studies attempting to implement change in perception, reality, or both.

An examination of the social science of paediatric pain treatment would be incomplete without the recognition that pain management has become highly politicised in many countries as a result of the changes in patterns of opioid prescribing and use for chronic pain, and the subsequent increase in substance use disorders and related harms. This debate has also been extended to the appropriate use of opioids in acute pain and in paediatric anaesthesia. 80% of the world’s supply of opioid medicines are distributed to less than 10% of the world’s population, with the highest supply being in the USA and Canada, followed by Austria and Germany. However, paediatric pain medicine has not been explicitly addressed in most of the national responses to the different opioid crises, leading to a concern that measures to control opioid use in adult pain management will be inappropriately applied to young people.

Substance use disorders and pain medication are both conflated in policy and in the media’s portrayal of the North American opioid crisis. An analysis of the Canadian media shows that the negative sequela of opioids is frequently reported, whereas an understanding of how to treat acute and chronic pain is not. Through this media, public views have been influenced to consider opioids as drugs of addiction rather than pain medicine. This misconception has, in turn, influenced policy approaches (eg, criminalisation and large oversights of physician prescribing behaviour), which risk distancing physicians from treating those who need their care. Health-care professionals, young people, and parents continue to hold misconceptions and believe myths about opioid use in paediatric patients, whereby the media depicts opioids as the villain and the underlying reason for substance misuse. Opioids have their place in paediatric pain medicine. In the context of the oversupply of opioids, childhood pain can usefully be considered a risk factor for long-term harmful exposure to opioids.

Overall, there needs to be a new social science of pain, as well as an explicit recognition that at an individual and societal level, the articulation of pain will always have to struggle against forces that would silence it. For some questions, a political science of pain is needed to move beyond description and policy towards understanding how political values shape experience. Other questions will need novel anthropological research to improve the understanding of culturally embedded experience, and modern implementation science is needed to explore the best evidence for organisational change.

Research and clinical priorities to make pain matter

Three areas should be prioritised to achieve the goal of making pain matter to everyone: (1) improve equity, (2) mitigate stigma, and (3) understand the social science of pain, including sociology, social psychology, political science, and anthropology. A final area on improving accountability in all sectors of society, increasing awareness, urgency, and responsibility for all children’s pain needs to be addressed by funders and policy makers.

First, it is important to know where equity and inequity in pain management exist, as well as to understand where inequity lies within health-care systems. Within chronic pain particularly, much of the research is done in adults who are middle class and white. Similarly, in high-income countries, patients are most likely to be treated by white men. Less is known about how different cultures, races, and socioeconomic groups interpret and communicate pain, or their preferences for pain management. In circumstances in which pain becomes invisible to others, in particular to those with power and control over the allocation of shared resources, inequality and inequity are perhaps inevitable. Such inequalities pervade paediatric pain management. And when invisibility and inequity exist, there is the opportunity for unchallenged prejudicial inequality. The issue of whose pain matters least needs to be addressed, as well as the social forces that silence the dissent of, or attempts at, social or political redress.

Second, the optimal methods for managing stigma and ways to mitigate its effects need to be researched. Pain has become reduced to a medical framework, invisible to others, in particular to those with power and control over the allocation of shared resources, inequality and inequity are perhaps inevitable. Such inequalities pervade paediatric pain management. And when invisibility and inequity exist, there is the opportunity for unchallenged prejudicial inequality. The issue of whose pain matters least needs to be addressed, as well as the social forces that silence the dissent of, or attempts at, social or political redress.
Patients and families often report these labels as unhelpful or insulting, but socially they function to silence complaint—pain does not seem to matter.14,23 Medical professionals might not be able to diagnose a specific disease or have immediate tools to provide pain relief. Although it is possible to inform the patient that they do not know what is wrong, this message must be communicated appropriately. When pain is dismissed, families report substantial distress from attempting to talk about something people do not want to hear. However, to not talk about something so fundamental as a child’s pain is equally distressing.

Finally, investment in a social science of paediatric pain is needed, starting from the premise that pain is inherently subjective and language resistant. Culturally it is language destroying.14 Like all private mental events, each person has a privileged position from which to observe one’s own experience, meaning that others’ experience of one’s pain is always secondary, always dependent on the clarity and force of the signal, and on the ability of the observer to be able to decode the signal.14 Their aptitude for allocentricism, and ultimately empathy,14 Furthermore, part of how humans cope with life events—with the sometimes staggering social and personal injustice, multiple experiences of loss, and fear of one’s own inevitable death—is to have inherent biases towards optimism, avoidance of emotional distress, and systematic diminution of the effect of problems that are difficult or impossible to solve.37 For the pain of others, these self-protection biases translate into the systematic underestimation of the pain children experience. Pain underestimation is not mitigated by familiarity, it is not a stranger effect: mothers underestimate the pain of their children and nurses of their patients.76 Humans have the capacity to experientially avoid distress, including the distress caused by witnessing other’s unalterable suffering.17 Socially and psychologically, every day and in multiple ways, the suffering of others is often ignored and underestimated.

**Goal 2: make pain understood**

Improvements in the care of children with pain— including better recognition, valid explanation, reliable assessment, and the development of safe and effective treatments—will only emerge in a safe and sustainable way if they are informed by a full scientific understanding of pain. Our second goal is to make childhood pain understood by improving our fundamental knowledge of the developmental aspects of nociception and pain systems.

**Moving on from the physical versus mental dualism**

Central to the challenge of explaining mechanisms in pain is the stubborn persistence of a longstanding Cartesian dualism regarding the relationship between physical and mental events that can hamper more modern scientific inquiry.76,79 Particularly damaging is the stubborn belief that an individual’s pain can only be objectively investigated by, and even reduced to, the so-called biological drivers, thereby denying the psychological and social elements that affect the experience of all types of pain.60–63 We judge that it is important to be clear in our thinking when describing models of nociception only, and when attempting to understand or explain pain as a whole. This distinction is particularly pertinent in children’s pain, in which both mechanisms and perceptions are also a function of age and developmental stage.

To make pain understood in all its contexts, the use of pain terminology should be consistent. The current clinical and scientific definitions and classifications of pain (panel 3) can seem complex and confusing, not least because they require frequent revision with advancing knowledge and experience. In this discussion of mechanisms, we have used the general clinical terms acute and chronic pain, as defined, nevertheless acknowledging that each encompasses an overlapping range of causes and mechanisms, which makes a strict temporal distinction somewhat arbitrary and artificial.

For chronic pain, IASP reported the results of their task force on an updated classification, and the latest version of the of the WHO International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) also included chronic pain as a discrete entity for the first time.56,67 Although the appearance of a new classification and nomenclature for chronic pain is itself a major success story, bringing increasing awareness and clarity to a complex area, it might not best represent all types of chronic pain in children: both acute and chronic pain in paediatric practice should also always be considered in a developmental context.

**Nociception and somatosensory pain transmission**

Figure 2 presents a schematic of current knowledge regarding the different mechanisms for nociceptive, neuropathic, and nociplastic pain (defined in panel 3), showing how they relate to different sources of pain, as well as some of the basic neural circuits and pathways that lead to pain perception in the brain. Clearly, one or more somatosensory mechanisms could be involved in a given clinical pain presentation, and the mechanisms involved might change over time (eg, due to disease progression in a long-term health condition such as arthritis or cancer, or when pain arises or persists although the damage to the tissue cannot be identified). A common characteristic of pain transmission by any mechanism is that modulation of pain signalling can potentially occur at multiple sites along pain pathways, including peripheral pain receptors (ie, nociceptors), the spinal cord, brainstem, and importantly the brain, which is also integrating multiple other pain-related and non-pain-related inputs, leading to different patterns of activity that characterise an individual’s pain. Importantly, during childhood, almost all body systems undergo structural and functional changes, including pain
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Panel 3: Pain definition and classifications

In 2020, a new International Association for the Study of Pain task force proposed an updated definition of pain as “an unpleasant sensory and emotional experience associated with actual or potential tissue damage, or described in terms of such damage”, with added text to recognise that, in many circumstances, pain could not be verbally mediated: “Verbal description is only one of several behaviours to express pain; inability to communicate does not negate the possibility that a human or a non-human animal experiences pain”. Pain can be classified or described in multiple ways, some of the most frequently used include:

By somatosensory mechanism
- Nociceptive pain: pain that arises from actual or threatened damage to non-neural tissue and is due to the activation of nociceptors (ie, pain-detecting nerves). Nociceptive pain is the mechanism operating in most everyday painful experiences and, when it results from an injury or a damage, it should resolve when healing has occurred. In infants, children, and throughout later development, the mechanisms of nociceptive pain change with age.
- Neuropathic pain: pain caused by a lesion or disease of the somatosensory nervous system. When the system that detects pain is itself damaged, it can generate pain, although it might not respond to a previously painful stimulus. Cellular and molecular mechanisms of neuropathic pain are different from those of nociceptive pain, and are less likely to resolve with the healing process. During development and maturation, the mechanisms and clinical presentations of neuropathic pain differ with age and depend on the underlying cause of damage.
- Nociplastic pain: pain that arises from altered nociception despite no clear evidence of actual or threatened tissue damage causing the activation of peripheral nociceptors or evidence for disease or lesion of the somatosensory system causing the pain. Changes in nociceptive processing mechanisms can be shown in some individuals for whom a clear underlying cause is not detectable by currently available methods.

By time
- Acute pain: pain that lasts ≤3 months (eg, acute postoperative pain and vaccination pain). Mechanisms of acute pain are mostly nociceptive and resolution is normally expected when healing occurs.
- Chronic pain: pain that lasts or recurs for ≥3 months (eg, chronic musculoskeletal pain and chronic disease-related pain). Chronic pain can involve nociceptive, neuropathic, and nociplastic mechanisms.
- In clinical situations, pain might also be described as continuous (ie, background pain) or intermittent (ie, episodic pain), or as either predictable (ie, incident) or unpredictable (ie, spontaneous).

By context or location
- Disease-related pain: pain that is associated with specific diagnoses or conditions (eg, juvenile inflammatory arthritis and cancer pain).
- Tissue or organ-dependent pain: pain arising from specific tissues or organs (eg, visceral, musculoskeletal [associated with bone, joint, and muscle], headaches, and pelvic pain).
- Iatrogenic pain: pain associated with or following medical treatments (eg, procedure pain including vaccination, surgical, or medical [eg, chemotherapy-induced neuropathy] interventions).
- Idiopathic pain (also known as functional or primary pain): pain for which there is no clear identified cause (eg, chronic primary abdominal pain)

When pain is described in terms of context, mechanisms might be nociceptive, neuropathic, or nociplastic, and could also be acute or chronic.

processing mechanisms themselves, potentially influencing nearly every aspect of the experience of pain at different ages with ongoing consequences for later life (figure 2).

Nociceptive pain occurs within an intact and normally functioning somatosensory nervous system and can therefore be regarded to an extent as so-called normal pain because it is the mechanism of the common everyday pain experienced after injury. This type of pain is often predictable in duration and intensity and is by far the most common and frequent experience reported. Therefore, but often erroneously, nociceptive pain is assumed to be the model for all pain. Nociceptive pain has different physiology, pharmacology, and psychology at different ages, and its relationship to other pain mechanisms and states needs to be fully appreciated to understand the mechanisms of aberrant or refractory pain presentations, including those underlying the intensity, quality, persistence, and consequence of pain.

Developmental aspects of nociception and analgesia

Nociceptive pain mechanisms have been studied in children but there are considerable and important gaps in our knowledge. Nociceptive pain involves temporary structural and functional changes in the system in response to tissue injury that resolve over time with healing—ie, peripheral and central sensitisation leading to lower pain thresholds (also known as allodynia) and increased sensitivity to previously painful stimuli (also known as hyperalgesia) at the site of inflammation or trauma, and changes affecting more distant sites. This neuroplasticity determines the adaptive ability of the somatosensory nervous system, and the mechanisms that initiate and control it have proven important for our
understanding of the changes in nociception throughout development and the changes in normal and pathological pain states in children and adults.94,95

Nociceptive signals are known to be processed through a complex network of neurons, glia, and immune cells in the peripheral nervous system and CNS. Pain perception, rather than being confined to a discrete single brain area (as with many senses, such as hearing or vision), is the result of activating a distributed network of brain regions that signal and modulate the sensory, affective, motivational, and cognitive aspects of pain (figure 2, 3A). Activity in this distributed network, sometimes described as the pain neuromatrix, gives rise to spatial and temporal patterns of activity in the brain known as the dynamic pain connectome, which characterises pain by recruiting multiple brain regions to produce a constantly adjusting signature of pain.92–94 This pain signature is currently not well characterised during different stages of development. Nevertheless, even newborn infants, who are only a few days old, show adult-like patterns of noxious-evoked brain activity following nociceptive events that adults have described as being mildly painful.95,96

Central and peripheral nervous system responses to nociceptive stimuli are clearly evident after birth. However, the rate of functional maturation varies in different regions of the nervous system and so there are marked differences in the response to pain at different ages. In the mature somatosensory nervous system, nociceptors respond to mechanical, thermal, and chemical stimuli and transduce signals into action potentials transmitted by primary afferent fibres to the spinal cord; the first CNS site for modulation and integration of incoming sensory information (figure 2). Ascending pathways from spinal laminae I and V project to brain regions that subserve different aspects of pain perception (including stimulus location, intensity, and modality), those involved in modulation, and the regions associated with physiological and behavioural responses to pain. Descending pathways from the brainstem have a bimodal function and can inhibit or facilitate spinal cord signalling (figure 3).

Following birth, noxious-evoked brain activity can be evaluated using electroencephalography (EEG) or inferred from blood flow changes using near-infrared
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**Figure 2: Pain mechanisms and sources of pain**

Pain can be broadly classified as being nociceptive, neuropathic, or nociplastic, with combinations of these mechanisms present in different forms of injury or illness (dashed arrows indicate mechanisms that are sometimes involved). Afferent activity in the peripheral nervous system can be generated by different sources of pain (figure 2, 3A). Activity in this distributed network, sometimes described as the pain neuromatrix, gives rise to spatial and temporal patterns of activity in the brain known as the dynamic pain connectome, which characterises pain by recruiting multiple brain regions to produce a constantly adjusting signature of pain.92–94 This pain signature is currently not well characterised during different stages of development. Nevertheless, even newborn infants, who are only a few days old, show adult-like patterns of noxious-evoked brain activity following nociceptive events that adults have described as being mildly painful.95,96
spectroscopy and functional MRI (fMRI). Cortical responses are evoked by noxious events, such as heel lance in preterm (from 25 weeks after conception) and term neonates,\textsuperscript{97,98} immunisation in infants,\textsuperscript{99} and venous cannulation in young children.\textsuperscript{100} The pattern and distribution of EEG response and relationship to stimulus intensity differs according to postnatal age and sex, and is influenced by stress, illness, and previous experience even at this young age. In neonates and adults, fMRI has shown activation of brain regions known to be involved in both sensory and affective components of pain response\textsuperscript{98} and variation with stimulus modality and intensity.\textsuperscript{100} These data show the influence of painful inputs on responses in developing central nociceptive pathways and highlight the potential for proxy measures of the effects of analgesics.\textsuperscript{97} Laboratory and clinical studies have already identified many age-dependent changes in these nociceptive processing pathways that influence responses to noxious stimuli, tissue injury, and analgesia. For example, alterations in the function,
distribution, and density of key receptors involved in the
detection and transmission of nociceptive signals
influence the sensitivity of the system. Myelination
affects the latency of response. These differences, among
others, result in a marked change in the relationship
between stimulus intensity and response that vary with
age (eg, mechanical nociceptive thresholds have been
shown to be lower in early development). Mechanical
thresholds for nociceptive threshold responses, such as hind-
limb withdrawal and abdominal musculature contraction,
are very low in preterm neonates and increase with
postnatal age. In addition, responses are initially
more generalised and less discriminate, with specificity
for a nociceptive stimulus improving with increasing
postnatal age.

In healthy children, cross-sectional and long-
itudinal psychological studies have shown that
increases in (modality-specific) pain thresholds continue
throughout adolescence, with sex-dependent differences
emerging for some modalities. Similar to adults, responses to standardised experimental stimuli also show
substantial variability between individuals. The balance
between excitatory and inhibitory descending modulation
of incoming pain signals is known to differ in immature
nociceptive circuits; reduced endogenous inhibitory
control also contributes to the lower thresholds and more
generalised reflex responses seen in children of younger
ages. Low-threshold sensory input (eg, touch) and spontaneous movements contribute to activity-dependent
normal maturation of sensorimotor circuits in the spinal
cord. The brain, spontaneous and evoked patterns
of activity in the somatosensory cortex are also influenced
by postnatal age and type of injury.

Sensitisation and long-term effects
Alongside lower nociceptive thresholds at younger ages,
tissue injury is known to induce sensitisation, familiar to
us as the tissue sensitivity that can develop after tissue
injury at all ages, including neonates and infants. Such
sensitisation is shown by reduced mechanical thresholds for
the hind-limb withdrawal reflex following repeated
heel lance; similarly, reductions in the force of
mechanical stimulus required to evoke contraction of
abdominal muscles (ie, abdominal skin reflex) has
quantified changes in wound sensitivity following
abdominal surgery and referred visceral hyperalgesia in
infants with unilateral hydrenephrosis of the kidney.
However, different forms of tissue damage (eg, inflammation,
surgical injury, visceral stimuli, nerve injury, and
chemotherapy) also have age-dependent mechanisms that
influence the patterns of behavioural sensitivity observed.
In normal circumstances, these changes in pain modulation leading to sensitisation of the system
resolve with healing, but in some patients such changes
do not happen for reasons that are less clear but are
starting to be investigated. Persistence of sensitisation is
thought to be a key feature of many types of chronic pain.

A better understanding of the factors that initiate and
maintain sensitisation during development will help to clarify why some pain is more refractory to treatment and could open pathways to potential new therapies.

Therefore, how an individual responds to, and
experiences, pain is different throughout infancy, childhood, and adolescence, and this difference is also
influenced by the cause of the pain and related psychological, environmental, and other factors (including pain
duration, intensity, and age first experienced), which strongly reinforces the assertion that children are not
merely little adults.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, reflecting the differences in underlying mechanisms, the developmental pharmacodynamic profile of analgesic interventions, such as opioids, can also be influenced by age, sex, genetics, and the type of tissue injury. Morphine, for example, is
widely used to manage distress and pain during mechanical ventilation of very preterm infants in neonatal
intensive care, with uncertainty regarding subtle long-
term effects of treatment. The importance of pharmacogenomic influences in neonates is little studied.

However, genetic variations that affect drug clearance
(eg, uridine 5′-diphospho-glucuronosyl-transferase
[UGT1A9]) or response (eg, catechol-o-methyltransferase
(COMT)) can result in greater morphine exposure in the
brain. Pharmacogenomics, together with neonatal clinical
factors, are differentially related to anxiety and depressive
symptoms (ie, internalising) and to acting out (ie, externalising) behaviours at 18 months postmenstrual
age in children born very preterm. Aside from these
genetic influences, responses to analgesic interventions
(as well as pain and injury) can differ between males and
females throughout the lifespan. For this reason, laboratory studies increasingly include sex as a biological
variable, but these potentially important factors are
rarely addressed in clinical studies.

Long-term consequences of acute pain
Activity-dependent regulation renders the developing
nervous system susceptible to injury-induced changes in
structure and function that can alter future development and
therefore responses, including those to reinjurythroughout the lifespan. In infants and children,
neuroimaging studies have identified long-term changes
in structure and connectivity that correlate with the degree
of acute pain exposure during neonatal intensive care
following preterm birth, and with subsequent cognitive,
behavioural, and somatosensory outcomes in later
life. Alterations in somatosensory function in adolescents who had neonatal intensive care early in life
have also been clearly shown, but precise changes can vary,
depending on initial exposure (eg, gestational age at birth,
need for surgery, and duration of intensive care), type and
intensity of experimental stimulus, and age at follow-up.
The extent to which persistent changes in somato-
sensory function correlate with altered response to future
injury (as shown in laboratory studies)\(^{96}\) or risk of chronic pain in later life is far from fully understood and requires further clinical evaluation. Complex age-dependent differences in communication between multiple physiological systems are likely to be relevant; for example, in juvenile rodent pain models spinal neuro-glial interactions have been associated with enhanced response to reinjury following neonatal incision\(^{107}\) and also with delayed emergence of allodynia, a marker of sensitisation, following traumatic nerve injury.\(^{118}\)

**Chronic pain**

Pain that persists is sometimes challenging to explain mechanistically and can be very difficult to manage clinically.\(^{112}\) Chronic pain lasting for more than 3 months, or beyond the expected time of healing following an injury, encompasses a wide range of potential antecedents, symptoms, mechanisms, and diagnoses. The biopsychosocial model of pain is helpful to fully appreciate and understand antecedents to chronic pain, the mechanisms involved, and how to best assess and treat pain.\(^{113}\) Data from adult neuroimaging and other studies have shown changes in brain structure, function, and neurochemistry associated with the transition from acute to chronic pain (figure 3B). Such changes include a general shift away from brain regions encoding the sensory components of pain towards those such as the subcortical limbic system, amygdala, and hippocampus that encode motivational and emotional aspects; this finding is consistent with features seen in clinical presentations of both adults and children with chronic pain (figure 3).\(^{114,115}\) Comparisons with healthy individuals, and some evidence of reversal of brain changes with effective treatment of chronic pain, also imply that these observed changes could be implicated in both the cause and effect of ongoing pain; it is important to note that data do not support any attempt to dichotomise chronic pain to either physical or psychological in its origins, and to do so is both inaccurate and unhelpful.\(^{110,115}\) The study of chronic pain in children lags woefully behind that in the adult despite evidence that it too is a serious global health and economic problem, the full impact of which is yet to be fully uncovered.\(^{110,119}\)

Although the incidence of chronic pain in childhood has been documented,\(^{36}\) integrative research examining mechanisms contributing to pain remains scarce, and even less examined is the role of childhood chronic pain on later biological development and health. Acute pain in children can progress to chronic pain, potentially leading or predisposing to chronic pain and other chronic health problems in adulthood.\(^{30,142}\)

There are substantial gaps in our understanding of the transition from acute to chronic pain in children and the maintenance of pain; initial data imply that multiple antecedents, mechanisms, and other factors are likely to be interacting. Emerging data show the importance of psychosocial and pre-morbid risk factors (eg, psychiatric conditions, depression, anxiety, coping, threat appraisal, and parental coping) for several chronic pain conditions, including post-surgical pain, with biological factors (eg, female sex and nociceptive function) clearly also relevant.\(^{96-98}\) Many different factors are likely to contribute to the development and maintenance of chronic pain, and these are modelled and summarised in figure 4.\(^{119}\) Key to this model is the concept of groups of inducers of pain and resilience factors (due to disease and an individual’s predisposition) that will interact to determine the clinical features and measurable changes in psychophysical and brain structural and functional parameters. Although many of the potentially important contributors to the development and maintenance of chronic pain are common to patients of all ages, the superimposition of developmental processes on these factors will determine the differences seen at different ages.

**Developmental nociceptive plasticity**

Importantly, throughout development, there are critical periods when neurobiological factors and a wide range of experiences interact to shape normal brain development and long-term behaviour.\(^{110,116}\) Areas for simpler stimulus-dependent responses develop early, while the integration of key regulatory centres (eg, the thalamus)\(^{149}\) and the structure, function, and connections of regions for more advanced processing mature at older ages.\(^{110}\) Developmental processes—such as neurogenesis and apoptosis, the migration of neurons to appropriate targets, the formation of synapses, gliogenesis, and myelination—occur throughout the late prenatal period but continue after birth, with activity-dependent processes further refining synaptic function and neural circuit formation in the postnatal period and beyond. However, this normal developmental trajectory might be disrupted by abnormal stimulus exposures (eg, persistent pain input during critical periods). Prolonged exposure to acute nociceptive pain and episodes of high pain intensity could trigger adverse neuroplastic changes—eg, in neonates who had received intensive care. Psychophysical evaluation of somatosensory function with quantitative sensory testing has identified persistent changes associated with previous experience (including pain) or chronic disease in children that had been poorly recognised.\(^{99}\) Diabetic neuropathy causing neuropathic pain was previously thought to be rare in children, but one study found that almost half of teenagers with type 1 diabetes had detectable subclinical changes in small-fibre function.\(^{150}\) Following childhood acute lymphoblastic leukaemia, deficits in vibration and mechanical detection thresholds possibly reflect persistent chemotherapy-induced neuropathy.\(^{151}\) Persistent sensory loss (ie, anaesthesia) and sensory gain (ie, allodynia) have been identified adjacent to scars even after many years following surgery in the neonatal period\(^{36,109}\) and in later childhood.\(^{152,153}\) Nerve injury in early life does not result in neuropathic pain as frequently in younger children as if a similar injury occurred in an adult, but in laboratory
models (eg, rodents) pain might emerge in later life, long after any injury has taken place and was thought to have healed. This observation highlights the potential for clinical presentations in childhood to differ from that seen at older ages, despite the same initial insult, and the potential for subtle changes, possibly predisposing to long-term pain, to go undetected.

Endogenous modulation
Disruption of normal endogenous descending controls from the brain is considered an important factor in adults with many persistent pain states. Improved knowledge of the development of inhibitory modulation, the alterations induced by different pain conditions, and the interactions with psychological factors at different ages might improve our understanding of the transition to chronic pain in children, provide targets for therapy, and help to monitor progress. Psychophysical testing using conditioned pain modulation protocols can help to evaluate the degree and directionality (ie, facilitatory or inhibitory) of descending modulation from the brainstem by measuring changes in sensitivity to a test stimulus before and after a conditioning stimulus at a distant body site; decreased sensitivity to the test stimulus indicates descending inhibition, whereas increased sensitivity indicates descending facilitation. An increased degree of inhibitory conditioned pain modulation has been reported in children aged between 12 and 17 years compared with children aged between 8 and 11 years. This finding parallels the predicted normal delayed emergence of descending inhibition as seen in juvenile rodent studies, but results are also influenced by the testing protocol. In children with functional abdominal pain, both decreased descending inhibition and generalised increased pressure sensitivity on testing suggested centrally driven changes that led to enhanced responses to noxious inputs. Similarly, children with a high degree of pain and dysfunction related to functional abdominal pain continued to have persistent
pain and increased central sensitisation (ie, temporal summation to heat stimulus) years later into adulthood.169 Impaired conditioned pain modulation predicted persistent post-surgical pain in adults,170 and although impaired inhibition was identified in 49% of adolescents with chronic pain associated with idiopathic scoliosis,171 more research is needed in paediatric populations to clarify its significance. However, reduced inhibition did predict the transition from acute to persistent musculoskeletal pain in children.172 Similarly, offset analgesia protocols, in which endogenous inhibition of pain is induced (figure 4), also potentially allow exploration of pain inhibitory mechanisms that, although conceptually related to conditioned pain modulation, possibly act via different pain pathways and have rarely been used so far in children.163,164

Phenotypical sensory profiling
One of the major advances in adult chronic pain has been in the exploration of individual somatosensory function (ie, sensory phenotyping) using quantitative sensory testing.165,166 Sensory abnormalities appear in different combinations in individuals who have similar pain symptoms, which suggests that no single biological mechanism readily explains the various patterns of sensory dysfunctions observed.167 In adults, patterns of increased or decreased sensitivity have identified specific sensory profiles (ie, sensory loss, mechanical hyperalgesia, and thermal hyperalgesia) that could provide greater mechanistic insight than disease-based classifications.162,164 In children with chronic pain, further standardised evaluation in much larger samples will be required to fully characterise somatosensory alterations associated with chronic pain and to evaluate the potential use of sensory profiling as biomarkers for prediction of persistent pain, indicators of mechanism, or response to treatment. In addition, evaluations of the interplay between psychosocial variables (eg, fear of pain, anxiety, depression, and worry associated with pain) and nociceptive function (assessed with quantitative sensory testing) could also be helpful to predict pain outcomes in young people who are at risk of developing chronic pain.168,169

The brain and non-neural CNS structures
Compared with adult studies, relatively few studies for paediatric chronic pain have included neuroimaging. Those available have predominantly included adolescents with complex regional pain syndrome, a poorly understood but common presentation in paediatric chronic pain clinics. Nevertheless, such studies found alterations in brain structure and connectivity172 that might differ in acute versus chronic states, and from adults with complex regional pain syndrome.173 They also revealed different patterns and degrees of brain activation in response to sensory stimuli applied to affected and unaffected limbs,174 reduced grey matter density in the thalamic reticular nucleus associated with increased pain intensity,175 and altered brain connectivity within the amygdala, salience default mode, and sensorimotor networks.176 Studies have also found that functional outcomes (eg, fear of pain)177 and improvement in symptoms are associated with, at least partial, reversal of brain changes following intensive rehabilitation.178,179

There is no doubt that technical developments of bespoke brain imaging methods that are specifically designed for neonatal and paediatric populations will advance our understanding of the cerebral processes that underlie the development of paediatric pain.177,178 Alterations in thalamic function and thalamocortical dysrhythmia, which might influence the intensity and perception of persistent pain, have been observed in adults.179,180 Shifts from sensorimotor to emotion-related circuitry,181 as previously indicated, have been associated with the transition from acute to chronic pain. Connectivity changes within the dorsal medial prefrontal cortex–amygdala–accumbens circuit, as well as smaller amygdala volume, are risk factors for persistence of back pain in adults.182 Neuroimaging has not yet been used to assess risk factors for the chronification of pain in paediatric populations.

The roles of non-neural glial cells in the nervous system extend well beyond homoeostasis, the formation of myelin, and support for neurons, and non-neural glial cells have been implicated in the maintenance and modulation of chronic neuropathic pain (panel 3, figure 2) throughout postnatal development and into adulthood. Microglia affect neurogenesis, synaptic pruning, and synaptic plasticity.183,184 The normal age-dependent and sex-dependent developmental trajectories of microglial distribution and function can be influenced by afferent input and environmental factors.184,185 Subsequent immune or environmental challenges, and physical or psychological stressors, can influence susceptibility to neurological and psychological disorders186–189 or, more specifically, can influence injury response and analgesic efficacy.190,191

Stress and environment
Popular targets for exploring potential mechanisms underlying pathophysiological recovery and environmental factors contributing to chronic pain are those that relate to stress responses in the context of threat, and their relationship with measures of resilience.192,193 Acute stress alters modulation of experimental nociceptive pain sensitivity in healthy adults (eg, changes in temporal summation, reduced inhibitory conditioned pain modulation, and hyperalgesia), increases anxiety, and might be variably associated with changes in other physiological parameters (eg, differences in blood pressure or cortisol).193,194 By contrast, chronic stress is highly comorbid with chronic pain.195 Chronic stress has been categorised as a “worldwide epidemic” by WHO, is associated with increased rates of mental illness and suicide, and costs over US$300 billion annually.196,197

Physiological stress can alter nociceptive responses from very early life. Noxious-evoked brain activity recorded
The experience of adverse and stressful life events in childhood might also be related to the maintenance and exacerbation of chronic pain in later life. However, identifying stress as a causal factor is complicated by variable results in different studies and populations.\(^{200–202}\) Children exposed to environmental stressors or early adverse life events might have a higher risk of cognitive, emotional, and health problems,\(^{203,204}\) but the timing, severity, and type of stress needed to induce this cycle, and how it might contribute to chronic pain, is unclear. For example, negative life events in early childhood have been variably reported to be predictive,\(^{205}\) or have no association,\(^{206}\) with functional abdominal pain in adolescents.

Conversely, the biological reactivity model posits that stress could be protective for some, although the required amount of stress is unknown.\(^{207}\) Nevertheless, translational stress could be protective for some, although the required amount of stress is unknown.\(^{207}\) However, in an investigation of the long-term effect of severe stress exposure in the neonatal period, acute performance-related stress did not reduce sensitivity to experimental stimuli (eg, thermal and pressure tolerance) in children who had previously had severe burn injury as neonates, unlike healthy control children.\(^{199}\)

Research and clinical priorities to make pain understood

Progress in our understanding of how the maturing pain system determines and influences both current and future pain states has been slow. Several areas requiring further investigation and changes in research and clinical practice should be prioritised to make childhood pain better understood.

First, for pain to matter, it must be correctly understood. When an experience is ubiquitous it can be misinterpreted as unimportant. With procedural pain being common, and prevalence for chronic and recurrent pain estimated at approximately 28% in paediatric populations,\(^{199}\) it is tempting to reclassify pain as a normal part of life. But when it comes to child

Epigenetic modifications in DNA structure and chromatin formation regulate gene expression in early development and in response to environmental cues, and can be transmitted across generations.\(^ {221}\) Interactions between genes and the environment have been associated with early life (perinatal and postnatal) events that adversely\(^ {220,222}\) or positively\(^ {227}\) influence neurodevelopment, and account for a large proportion of individual variance in risk for chronic disease over the lifespan.\(^ {227}\) Epigenetic mechanisms also have roles in the development or maintenance of persistent pain\(^ {228,229}\) and could offer potential analgesic targets if more specific agents are developed.\(^ {228}\) How pain risk genes manifest phenotypically in differing environments will be an important area of study. Additionally, the investigation of intergenerational pain transmission\(^ {231,232}\) will be a valuable contribution to the field. Advances in genetic testing and more detailed phenotyping of clinical pain conditions could improve individualised therapy.\(^ {230}\)

Genetic influences

Genetic factors are estimated to account for 20–55% of reported variability in experimental pain sensitivity,\(^ {220}\) and influence the risk of transition from acute to chronic pain.\(^ {220}\) Single-nucleotide polymorphisms in multiple genes have been associated with several different chronic pain conditions.\(^ {230,237}\) Pharmacogenomic differences might be relevant as they can also influence response to current analgesic medications\(^ {238}\) and potentially new analgesic targets based on genetically determined differences in molecular signalling in individuals with chronic pain.\(^ {239}\)

Genetic disorders can also result in neuropathic pain. Mutations affecting voltage-gated sodium channels (Nav) on sensory nerves that can influence pain sensitivity or be associated with specific pain disorders are increasingly recognised in children.\(^ {240}\) Erythromelalgia (a rare disease related to mutations of the SCN9A gene that alter excitability of Nav1.7 channels and is characterised by neuropathic pain that typically affects the hands and feet) produces severe pain, and the genotype influences both the age of onset and the pharmacological response to potential analgesic interventions.\(^ {241}\) Neuropathic pain is often the first presentation of Fabry disease, an X-linked lysosomal storage disease, and tends to occur earlier and can be more severe in boys than girls; enzyme replacement therapy can reduce the pain and improve long-term outcome.\(^ {242–244}\)
pain, common does not mean trivial. However, such high prevalence does beg an explanation and should give us pause to ask whether the same types and severities of pain are being discussed when talking about pain. The effects of the new ICD-11 classifications in changing the science and clinical practice in chronic pain have yet to be seen, but its application is expected in the next decade. Masked behind the high prevalence reported in epidemiology is a complex network of interrelated functions and dysfunctions of the pain system. Making that system understood is a primary goal. We encourage further debate on the definition of pain. In some fields, constant redefinition is considered indecision, but in pain we believe that this definition needs to be regularly questioned. This work should be managed by a task force of IASP who published the latest definition of pain in 2020. Moreover, classification of disease states characterised by pain should be further developed.

Second, a major challenge in making pain understood is to escape the shadow of a pervasive dualism that diverts and misdirects science. An example is the search for an objective measure of pain as a goal in itself, which inappropriately relegates private experience as inaccurate or of less value than a biological correlate. It is possible to better define biological correlates and surrogates that will be helpful, but pain should also be defined within a psychological and social context, as well as a developmental context. A related example is the practice of representing pain as only a sensory phenomenon, measuring intensity and ignoring affect, cognition, motivation, or behaviour. Escaping dualistic notions of subjective and objective, mind and body, and physiology and psychology is not easy. These distinctions between the inside (ie, hidden) and the outside (ie, observable) are coded in language, structure much of how the world is experienced, and are useful in many areas of science and practice. However, they are not useful in the study of pain and they hold us back.

Third, perhaps one of the biggest advances in paediatric pain has been in developmental biology. Having an early experience of pain matters and has a lasting effect on nervous system development and subsequent pain behaviour. However, there is still a long way to go to understanding the effect of developmental factors on nociception, pain, child anxiety, and their clinical assessment and treatment.

Fourth, further methods are needed to facilitate pain assessment in neonates that are rigorous, valid, and reliable. It is unacceptable to be ignorant of anyone’s pain in the 21st century, particularly those who are most vulnerable.

Fifth, mechanisms underlying the development of chronic pain is an important area of study, in which a better understanding is needed. By focusing on mechanisms, pathology in the central and peripheral nervous system can be better described. Tissue damage can invoke peripheral sensitisation, but different forms of damage have age-specific responses. For some types of chronic pain, repeated peripheral sensitisation is thought to be a key feature. However, the importance of persistent peripheral sensitisation for the onset and persistence of chronic pain is not known. Indeed, a major turning point in this field will be to understand and treat the risk factors of developing chronic pain after an acute injury. Multiple mechanisms are implicated in the development of different chronic pain presentations, including CNS vulnerabilities, which project into adulthood. Depressive symptoms, anxiety, and adverse life events are implicated in the transition between acute and chronic pain. Understanding the long-term effects of often short exposures to physical insult at critical periods of development is imperative. Advances in human neuroimaging techniques will undoubtedly help, as will investment in the development of biomarkers and better phenotyping. This science is still in its infancy and improvements in measurement, identification, and replication are all necessary to better understand pain and its mechanisms.

Finally, investment in longitudinal datasets must continue and be developed, as these provide unique and crucial information over the course of childhood and adolescence. There are very few registries of children with pain. The advances in other areas of paediatrics, from rare disease to trauma, show how transformational these registries can be. Although lifelong epidemiological studies will help, such as the HUNT study or the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) cohort in the UK (also called the Children of the 90s study), investment in clinical cohorts of well described painful diseases is also needed. These registries can be helpful in phenotyping and understanding the effect of the indirect influences of environmental stress and of family context. However, these databases are rare, and their absence is setting us back in our understanding. Although there are some databases, these are not specifically medical or pain-related, but rather general developmental databases assessing a wide range of data for everything from road safety to diet. Pain researchers and clinicians should have a more prominent role when setting up these databases, as pain is a common feature not only of a healthy childhood, but also of disease. Assessing pain in these databases is crucial for fully understanding its advancement and effect on childhood.

**Goal 3: make pain visible**

Childhood pain can be assessed, no matter the age or clinical status of the child. Children need the opportunity to communicate their pain to clinicians, parents, and caregivers to drive decision making regarding treatment options and to evaluate whether a treatment is efficacious.
Nevertheless, there are challenges, especially in the youngest patients, and in patients with intellectual, communication, or motor limitations. However, assessment methods are available and should be used. Pain should be made visible by doing a developmentally appropriate valid pain assessment in every child.

Pain assessment in children is an inferential process in which all available information about the child should be considered. This assessment is not an easy endeavour as pain is, by definition, a private mental experience. Although the gold standard is self-report, whereby the child directly describes their experiences, doing so is not always possible and other indirect measures including facial expression, behavioural observations, physiological responses (eg, changes in heart rate or respiratory rate), and neuroimaging approaches can also be used to examine this private experience. Nevertheless, in most instances, human language provides a rich channel by which subtle sensory and affective experiences can be communicated, and early in development children learn to verbalise their experiences. This facility for communication is not different for pain, and expressions—such as ooh—are used to describe and communicate pain to others.

**Assessing pain**

In clinical practice, the most commonly used pain assessment is a numerical rating scale.\(^{236}\) This approach requires children to make a judgment about their pain intensity and label that judgment with a number, usually between 0–10. Hence, to use a numerical rating scale, children need to have acquired the capacity to assign a number to an experience and have the ability to summarise their experiences across various episodes. For example, asking a child the question “In the past 7 days, how would you rate your pain on average?” needs to be a developmentally informed assessment. For guidance, self-reported measures of pain, such as numerical rating scales, can be used from age 6 years onwards.\(^{237}\) There might be difficulties in applying this approach to all children due to the cognitive demands of such explicit judgment. It can also be difficult to appreciate the influence of other individual, interpersonal, and contextual factors that affect the child’s communication or expression of pain, and methods to assess pain should be developmentally appropriate (panel 4).

**Using proxies of pain**

In the absence of, or in addition to, self-report, reports of the child’s pain by others could be used. Researchers or clinical professionals can ask parents or others to make judgments about the pain or related experiences of the child when the child is not able to do so themselves, or to complement the child’s report.\(^{239}\) Parents can provide valuable information about their child’s pain experience. Nevertheless, one should be cautious about relying solely on others’ reports of the child’s pain because they might be biased or influenced by factors other than pain.\(^{240},241\) Disagreements between the child and parent do not necessarily reflect inaccuracies in judgment, but rather different perspectives on pain or the health problem.\(^{242}\) As such, such discrepancies should not be considered as error obscuring a true score, but as valuable information.

For children younger than 6 years or for those who are unable to verbally report, behavioural scales can provide a valuable alternative to assess pain in clinical settings.\(^{243}\) For example, it could be inferred that a newborn infant expresses pain when they are subjected to a procedure that would be painful to adults. Such inference is reasonable, given that infants have the basic neurological structures for pain perception\(^{244},245\) and manifest behaviours (eg, facial grimacing or crying) that are analogous to the pain responses of adults or older children.\(^{246}\) The behaviour of children is typically coded by trained observers.\(^{247}\) Numerous neonatal pain scales have been created; each calculate pain scores that are based primarily on behavioural and physiological observations following clinical procedures.\(^{248}\) These scales are not substantially different from each other, and most often the pain scales prescribe a value to a set of observed behaviours and physiological activity.\(^{249}\) Nevertheless, general dissatisfaction with these scales has meant that clinicians and researchers have adapted and tweaked them without the necessary validation steps to make them more appropriate for use in their specific settings. This inconsistency makes it difficult to combine and synthesise evidence about how much pain infants are experiencing and whether interventions to prevent or alleviate pain are efficacious.

Substantial research efforts are also being targeted towards identifying developmentally sensitive surrogate pain measures that can discriminate between responses

---

**Panel 4: Developmentally appropriate methods to assess pain intensity for children aged ≥6 years**

A wide range of methods are available to researchers and clinicians who are interested in assessing pain intensity in children across the developmental lifespan. In a 2019 systematic review,\(^{38}\) 60 separate pain intensity assessments were identified. Not only were there many different measures, but there were also different anchors for the scales used to measure pain, such as the numerical rating scale and the visual analogue scale. The systematic review also showed that researchers and clinicians must understand whether the participants and patients can understand and interpret the scale to provide a reliable response.

The systematic review also provides recommendations (strong or weak) for and against the scales used to measure pain.\(^{238}\) For children aged ≥6 years with acute pain, there is a strong recommendation for the use of the numerical rating scale with an 11-point scale from 0 (no hurt) to 10 (the worst hurt you could ever imagine). The Faces Pain Scale-Revised was strongly recommended for children aged ≥7 years, and the Colour Analogue Scale was strongly recommended in children aged ≥8 years. No other strong recommendations were provided for other pain intensity scales for acute, post-operative, or chronic pain. However, there is a weak recommendation for using the visual analogue and numerical rating scales in children aged ≥6 years to assess post-operative and chronic pain, provided that the child could show numerical competency.
to noxious and innocuous events, for example, by using fMRI, near-infrared spectroscopy, and EEG to quantify changes in brain activity that are evoked by noxious input (figure 5). These brain-derived measures will aid our understanding of the underlying neurological activity associated with pain in infants, and could also prove useful in other pediatric populations who are non-verbal or not able to self-report their pain experience.

The identification of robust and developmentally-sensitive pain indicators should continue to be a priority, so that there are better tools for use in both clinical practice and research. Accuracy is a challenge when using proxies and, when used, the possibilities of accurate detections of pain or false positives (ie, infant indicates they are in pain when they are not) should be considered. Consider that false-positive inferences can arise when newborn infants display pain-related behaviours in response to non-painful events. For example, infant crying has evolved as a non-specific protective mechanism to elicit response from caregivers, and can be used to signal other experiences, such as tiredness, hunger, or discomfort at handling. False-negative inferences are also possible, in which a newborn infant experiences pain but fails to manifest the usual external signs of pain. For example, extremely premature infants can display reduced facial grimacing compared with term-born infants, and infants who are at high risk of neurological impairment can exhibit decreased facial grimacing following clinical procedures compared with infants who have a low risk of neurological complications. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, for many patients, such as those who are non-verbal, other-reported measures of their pain is the only option. Our confidence in their use will increase when there is a strong evidence base documenting the sensitivity and specificity of behavioural markers and alternative pain biomarkers.

Screening for future pain problems
Making future pain visible, or at least understanding the risks that influence whether pain might emerge in the future, is important. Moreover, being able to predict which children are likely to experience pain later on can create windows of opportunities for early interventions and allow the prioritisation of resources (ie, time, personnel, and treatment intensity) for those who have a high risk of having a poor outcome. The growing interest in predicting the transition from acute to chronic pain has spurred efforts to identify the risk factors of chronic pain. The challenge is to identify the characteristics with predictive value and then to validly measure them, as briefly as possible. Research is uncovering neurobiological, social, emotional, and behavioural risk factors that are associated with the transition from acute to chronic pain in children and adolescents, and these could form the basis of screening tools. In adults, several screening tools for predicting chronic pain problems have been developed and validated. These tools are brief self-reported instruments and usually cover domains such as pain and other somatic symptoms, disability, low
mood and anxiety, pain-related worrying, and expectancies about future pain or disability. Overall, these screening instruments are good to excellent at predicting the future adverse effects of pain. The field of clinical prediction is rapidly evolving, and guidelines and standards are available to help researchers and clinicians to develop and validate such screening tools. There are few screening tools for use in paediatric settings. A notable exception is the Paediatric Pain Screening Tool (PPST), which is based on the nine-item StARt Musculoskeletal Screening Tool in adults. The content of the items in the PPST has been thoughtfully selected and adapted for use in children (aged between 8–18 years) presenting with pain problems. The instrument can be used to rapidly identify treatment targets (e.g., sleep disruption and pain-related fear) and to stratify young people into low-risk, medium-risk, and high-risk groups to inform referral to appropriate interventions. The initial results are promising, and further studies show its potential usefulness for specific pain populations.

Going beyond pain and measuring its wider effects

Importantly, the field of pain measurement has not focused solely on pain intensity. Indeed, progress has been made in making pain visible through the development of tools to assess both pain characteristics (e.g., location, frequency, and duration) and its effects on multiple aspects of life. There are many validated tools available to assess pain, as well as physical, emotional, and social role functioning, and health outcomes in children and adolescents. Systematic reviews of measures of pain effect, pain-related anxiety, sleep disturbances, observational and behavioural measures of pain, and self-reported measures of pain for very young children are available. Despite the efforts of many to go beyond pain and to measure the effects of pain on daily life, patient experience is often unexamined. Even in resource-challenged environments, or where routine assessment is frustrated by structural or attitudinal barriers, there are simple questions one can ask of each child, to make pain and its effects immediately visible (panel 5).

Core outcome sets

Several notable efforts have been made to develop core outcome sets in paediatric pain. In 2006, a paediatric working group of the Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials (Ped-IMMPACT) gathered 26 professionals from academia, governmental agencies, and the pharmaceutical industry to participate in a two stage Delphi process and a subsequent consensus meeting to identify core outcome domains and measures that might be considered in clinical trials of treatments for acute and chronic pain in children and adolescents. According to the Ped-IMMPACT recommendations, acute pain trials should include six outcome domains: pain intensity, global judgment of satisfaction with treatment, symptoms and adverse events, physical recovery, emotional response, and economic factors. Chronic pain trials should include eight outcome domains: pain intensity, physical functioning, emotional functioning, role functioning, symptoms and adverse events, global judgment of satisfaction with treatment, sleep, and economic factors.

These recommendations are highly cited as a guide for choosing outcome domains in clinical trials and clinical registries. However, the actual uptake of the recommendations was suboptimal. Of 337 randomised controlled trials of paediatric postoperative pain management, only two outcome domains of the Ped-IMMPACT recommendations were commonly included: pain intensity (included in 93% of trials) and symptoms and adverse events (included in 83% of trials). Fewer than 30% of these trials included outcomes in any of the other four Ped-IMMPACT domains. Similarly, a systematic review of reporting practices in 107 randomised controlled trials of paediatric chronic pain interventions found that nearly all trials included pain intensity as an outcome domain, but fewer than 35% of trials included outcomes in the other Ped-IMMPACT domains. Trials of behavioural interventions were more likely to include outcome domains of quality of life, emotional functioning, and physical functioning than trials of pharmacological treatments. Sleep and economic factors were rarely assessed across any intervention for paediatric chronic pain. Overall, these findings indicated that trials of interventions for acute and chronic paediatric pain had insufficiently used the Ped-IMMPACT recommended core outcome sets.

Uptake of the Ped-IMMPACT core outcome set will increase when the following concerns are addressed. First, it is essential to have the systematic involvement of children and parents as stakeholders in the entire process. Second, further specificity is needed in recommendations or criteria for selecting instruments. For example, multiple outcome instruments are recommended rather than one instrument for each domain. Third, there are gaps in available measures of several outcome domains (e.g., adverse events, global judgment of satisfaction with treatment, and economic factors).

Panel 5: Routine assessment questions to help make child pain and its effect visible

- What are your concerns and worries about your pain?
- What is a typical day like for you when you have pain?
- What are the things you do that make your pain better, and things you do that make your pain worse?
- What would you be doing differently if your pain was lessened?
- How would you know that a pain treatment was working for you? What would be a meaningful change to you?
- What impact does pain have on your life?
which hinder their inclusion in trials. Understandably, there are challenges in standardising recommendations because of the large number of pain conditions, disciplines, and treatment modalities involved in children’s pain management.

Another well-established core outcome set is the juvenile idiopathic arthritis core outcome set, developed in 2014 by Outcome Measures in Rheumatology (OMERACT), an international group of health professionals, methodologists, and patient research partners focused on outcome measures in rheumatology. OMERACT originally published a recommendation for four core outcomes: life impact, pathophysiological manifestations, resource use, and adverse events. However, because the original set did not include the perspective of children and parents, the OMERACT group updated the juvenile idiopathic arthritis core outcome set, which included several strategies to obtain broader input, including literature reviews, qualitative surveys, and online discussion boards with patients and parents. A Delphi process was used to edit the domain list and to achieve consensus on domains. Notably, this process led to the inclusion of new domains, and the juvenile idiopathic arthritis core outcome set now consists of five domains: pain, joint inflammatory signs, activity limitation and physical function, patients’ perception of disease activity (overall wellbeing), and adverse events. Using the rigorous criteria of the CONsensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement nInstruments (COSMIN) initiative, this group is identifying and evaluating the best outcome measures for these domains.

Innovations in pain assessment

Several innovations in assessment are ongoing, and more are to be expected. A first area of innovation is the standardisation of patient-reported outcomes through the Patient Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS), developed by the US National Institutes of Health. Since 2012, considerable work has been invested in the development of these measures, including use of item response theory and computer adaptive testing, and they are now freely available for both clinical and research use. Paediatric PROMIS measures include assessments in the domains of mental health, physical health, and social health (eg, pain interference, emotional distress, and physical mobility), and are recommended by various initiatives. Because PROMIS measures are available for adults, an important advantage is the consistency in measurement at the upper end of the adolescent and young adult age range and in assessing the opinions of parents and caregivers as proxy measures. Work is underway to validate the PROMIS measures in children and adolescents in a variety of painful conditions. For example, one study validated that all seven PROMIS domains showed treatment responsiveness in children and adolescents with chronic musculoskeletal pain conditions. Widespread use of validated PROMIS measures have been integrated into registries that track patient-reported information as part of standard clinical practice in paediatric chronic pain, such as the Pediatric-Collaborative Health Outcomes Information Registry (Peds-CHOIR).

PROMIS measures are publicly available and include domains that span different diseases and settings (eg, physical function and depressive symptoms). There are now more than 20 multidimensional item banks of physical, mental, and social health for children and adolescents aged between 1 and 17 years. These item banks include short forms (comprised of 4–10 items), computer adaptive tests, and profiles normed to the US general population and validated in clinical subgroups. Versions are available in Dutch, English, German, and Spanish, among other languages. Moreover, PROMIS can be expanded for use in clinical practice, population health (eg, large epidemiological studies), and internationally to improve measurement consistency.

A further development is the frequent capture of information in the contexts that matter to children and their parents. Typically, instruments for self-reporting require children or parents to report on their experience over a particular time period (eg, a week or a month). Such recalls are affected by memory biases or heuristics, such as the peak (or saliency) heuristic. Technological advances make the real-time capture of information within reach of research and practice. Children can be prompted by smartphone notifications to report on their experience during randomly selected times during the day (ie, time sampling), or to report on their experience when particular events occur (ie, event sampling). It is also possible to capture information passively (eg, via geolocation, physical activity, physiological measurement, and bodily position). These innovations allow real-time recording of experience of the dynamics of pain and its effect across time and daily contexts. These data will provide invaluable information for the initial phase of diagnosis, and for the evaluation of interventions using designs that capture within-day changes. Ultimately, such work could be developed into the delivery of so-called just-in-time adaptive interventions, in which health behaviour interventions are adapted to an individual’s changing internal and contextual state, as has been done in other paediatric populations (eg, children with diabetes).

With ongoing technological innovations, there is an increasing use of electronic daily diaries in paediatric chronic pain trials, in particular for the real-time measurements of pain, physical functioning, sleep, and emotional functioning (eg, depression and anxiety). Technological advances are abundant in many areas and already profoundly affect research and clinical practice. Computerised automated systems for the recognition of pain expression and behaviour are being developed that...
could lower the burden in observers who code pain expression or behaviours.\textsuperscript{265,284} 3D motion capture and analysis allow us to evaluate gait mechanics, balance, and other functional movements.\textsuperscript{262} All in all, these technological advances occur at an incredibly fast pace, and initial results are promising. Notwithstanding the pace of development, research documenting the reliability and validity of these innovations is lagging behind. This research is essential because the same criteria for the reliability and validity of instruments for self-reporting apply to these technological innovations as they do to standard measurement practice.

**Clinical relevance and use**

The real test of measurement technology is not its popularity, or how researchers use the tools in studies, but whether the routine measurements in paediatric pain produce useful outcomes for patients, families, and their clinicians. To make pain visible, a better understanding of whether outcome measures show that pain treatments are effective and safe is needed. Standardisation of outcome domains and measurement tools for clinical trials would enhance the quality of the evidence for treatments of pain in childhood, strengthen and simplify systematic reviews of paediatric pain interventions, and help clinicians to make evidence-based treatment decisions for this patient population. Further research should study commonly used paediatric pain outcome measures to understand clinically meaningful change, and should gather child and family input to learn what information they use to determine whether a treatment is working (eg, attaining particular goals or having fewer high-pain days). Novel ways of characterising pain and treatment effects are on the horizon. Intensive longitudinal data analyses of the daily pain experience will allow researchers and clinicians to identify alterations in the child’s typical pain experience through new analytics, such as dynamic structural equation modelling.\textsuperscript{266} Regulatory agencies are now using longitudinal daily experience data in clinical trials to better understand how an intervention makes a difference in patients’ daily life.

**Research and clinical priorities to make pain visible**

We are dragging paediatric pain out of the shadows, although we acknowledge that this exposure is confronting for many people. Witnessing others’ distress can be discomforting. However, the self-report of internal states is not new. People want to communicate and share their experience.\textsuperscript{265} Accurately capturing private experience and improving its communication has been the subject of over 100 years of measurement science.\textsuperscript{189} In mental health studies, knowing the structure of aberrant experiences is crucial to the diagnosis of pathology. In neurology, descriptions of internal state, cognitive testing, and interview responses can be as important to tailoring treatment as brain imaging. In physical medicine, there is now a recognition that patient-reported outcomes are the missing piece of the patient experience that can guide more effective intervention, with growing interest in patient-related outcome measures and core outcome sets.\textsuperscript{265,277} Moreover, there is movement towards values-based health care, in which shared decision making by patient, family, and health-care professionals becomes the norm.\textsuperscript{268} All rely on the communication of private personal experience. Several areas of clinical practice and research need to be prioritised.

First, pain characteristics should be assessed in every child. It is important for everyone, from parents to clinicians, to be comfortable with assessing internal processes by self-reporting where possible. Of course, self-reporting is influenced by factors such as social demand (ie, the obedient desire to please), but this factor should not discredit attempts to capture private experience or be a reason to leave pain unassessed. Child pain assessment is an inferential process and is drawn from multiple sources of evidence. For neonatal pain, researchers and clinicians can capture observer judgments of a range of behaviours that are relevant to pain, from facial expression and bodily expression, to non-verbal utterances, including crying. Health-care professionals need to guard against over-interpretation and under-interpretation of these behavioural signals, and context can be crucial. For older children who are verbal and are able to form concrete operations and manage metaphor and temporal abstraction, one can use measures that assign numbers to experience, or require a judgment about time. As a child’s ability to introspect develops, they can learn to compartmentalise experience. Researchers and clinicians rarely go beyond intensity when measuring pain, but Carl von Baeyer, an international expert in pain measurement, reminded us that to describe pain by its intensity is like describing music by its volume only.\textsuperscript{269} Going beyond intensity—at least to quality, duration, affect, and interference, and even to its meaning—is possible and desirable.

Second, the effects associated with pain is not only the experience itself. Pain negatively affects a child’s physical, emotional, and social functioning, and health-care professionals must understand all the consequences of pain on daily life. There are multiple measures to assess domains within these areas of functioning. For example, within pain anxiety, fear of pain, and pain catastrophising, which are conceptually similar areas, a systematic review found seven separate measures.\textsuperscript{281} In chronic pain, the measurement of multiple domains of experience should be routine. In randomised trials of novel interventions in chronic pain, it would now be considered poor science to ignore multiple domains of the child’s experience. A consequence of this measurement translation of concepts and assessments is that factors that are most important to children and their caregivers (eg, consequences on friendships, career, finance, and marital
relationships) are not assessed. Siblings are also ignored. Due to the multitude of measures assessing the same concept, measurement development in some areas needs to be stopped; it is time that outcomes that are important to patients are explored, invested in, and developed.

Third, most measures are created in a top-down manner, a worrying trend observable across the field of pain. Assessments that are first created and tested in adults are then simplified for children and assume that children have the same worries and fears as adults. Very few measures are created in a bottom-up manner. Consolidation of existing measures and careful thinking about their developmental validity is important before integrating them into a research study or practice.

Fourth, as we have highlighted throughout this Commission, people are complex. There is a need for a person-centred approach to assessment of pain in infants, children, and adolescents. This approach will help when allocating patients to optimal treatments to reduce symptoms. In particular, children with chronic pain often present with comorbidities, and therefore assessing multiple domains of functioning is important to inform which treatments to provide.

Lastly, the next frontier in the measurement of child pain is partly technological and partly intellectual. Computing technology has radically altered all biomedical science. Whatever the domain of experience, large amounts of data can now be captured. The near ubiquitous adoption of mobile telephones means that the passive capture of geolocation and movement sensing data is now easy. So-called near-time assessment of behaviour linked to a specific antecedent target is also possible, meaning that the context of specific behaviours and experiences can be assessed. Big data creates the possibility for machine learning to identify population and experiences can be assessed. Big data creates the possibility for machine learning to identify population and experience patterns of data, which has been used to follow patterns of behaviour linked to a specific antecedent target is also possible, meaning that the context of specific behaviours and experiences can be assessed. Big data creates the possibility for machine learning to identify population and experience patterns of data, which has been used to follow patterns of experience.

**Goal 4: make pain better**

Every child should have access to evidence-based pain assessment and subsequent treatment using the most effective methods and means available. A growing number of high-quality systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and clinical practice guidelines show that some psychological, pharmacological, physical, and integrative treatment modalities are efficacious in reducing pain and improving function. These treatment strategies are crucial for care to move beyond historical and harmful practices that can still easily be found.

**Treatment approaches**

We will not provide an exhaustive review of all possible treatments here. Physical, psychological, and pharmacological treatment have their own relevance to paediatric pain management, as different approaches might work for different children of different ages, at different times, and in different circumstances. In chronic and episodic pain, psychological treatments have the most robust evidence base of all treatment modalities, having been the most studied, particularly in older children. Effective psychological treatments are predominantly based on cognitive and behavioural therapies and target cognitions, emotions, and behaviours, most notably cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT). The therapeutic aims of psychological treatments include the prevention of episodic pain (eg, headache or recurrent abdominal pain), the mitigation of severe or unavoidable pain, and the management of the aversive consequences of persistent pain. Psychological interventions with robust evidence for procedural pain include distraction, hypnosis, combined CBT, and breathing exercises.

There are many primary studies and evidence syntheses of psychological therapies delivered to children and adolescents with pain, including hypnosis, problem-solving therapy, acceptance commitment therapy, mindfulness, and memory reframing, among others. However, data for the possible harms from these approaches is rarely collected and is largely unavailable.

Physical interventions are commonly used to address both acute and chronic pain but the literature supporting them is not as robust as the frequency of their use would suggest. The investigation of physical interventions for paediatric pain has largely focused on those available for preterm infants, term infants, and young children during medical procedures. Evidence-supported interventions include non-nutritive sucking (eg, by using a pacifier), breastfeeding (for babies experiencing acute pain), swaddling or facilitated tucking (flexed positioning of the infant’s arms and legs in supine, prone, or side position), skin-to-skin contact, rocking, and holding (eg, comfort positioning). Other contextually relevant strategies to effectively reduce acute pain and distress are to direct how procedures are done (eg, simultaneous injections) or alterations to the environment (eg, low noise and lighting, and soothing smells). Evidence for physical interventions for paediatric chronic pain is less common, although neuromuscular exercise training and aerobic exercise are promising strategies. The scarce adult literature on other physiotherapeutic techniques (eg, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation) has been extrapolated to children and this modality is commonly used in children and young adults.

Reviews of integrative therapies highlight the interest in acupuncture, creative arts, herbal therapy, homeopathy, and massage therapy for different pain conditions. However, the evidence supporting these therapies is scarce. Evidence suggests that improving patient or family understanding of pain and its mechanisms through the provision of pain education could also provide some therapeutic benefit. Furthermore, given the complex biopsychosocial nature of all pain experience, efforts to consolidate scientific evidence to inform multi-modal paediatric pain care are noted in...
clinical practice guidelines to address acute and procedural pain,23 perioperative pain,24 and chronic pain management from infancy to late adolescence.25

Although there is a growing research interest in physical, psychological, and surgical interventions, by far the most commonly used treatments are pharmacological. Pharmacotherapy for pain, both acute and chronic, includes paracetamol,26 topical anaesthetics,27 sweet-tasting solutions,28 non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs,29,30 antiepileptic drugs,31 antidepressants32, and opioids.33 However, despite the common use, ubiquity, and clinical utility of pharmacotherapy, there is very little research on existing or new agents, particularly in the area of chronic pain management. In a 2019 overview of systematic reviews, only six randomised controlled trials of analgesic pharmacological interventions for paediatric chronic non-cancer pain were identified and there were no trials for chronic cancer-related pain,34 meaning that the evidence base for the most common treatments used in children with chronic pain was formed on the basis of small trials with few patients (ie, <400 patients). Similarly, the use of interventional procedures (eg, nerve blocks and neurostimulation) for paediatric chronic pain is supported primarily by case reports with few randomised trials.35 Although there are more randomised trials for paediatric perioperative care, evidence from adults is often extrapolated to paediatric populations,36 mirroring a shortage of clinical drug trials across other areas of paediatrics.37 A more substantive indirect evidence base will support the use of pharmacological treatments and regional nerve blocks for paediatric acute, postoperative, and procedural pain.38

An absence of evidence is not the same as evidence of an absence of effect, and there is a growing need for new treatments.39,40 Therefore, we should ask why there is no concerted effort to capture data for the efficacy and safety of existing medicines, or to develop new medicines for children and adolescents.

Practices of analgesic decision making

Analgesic provision for both acute and chronic pain is often guided by local culture or attitudes. A good example is the provision of analgesia for infants and children after surgery. Analgesic medications are not licensed for pain management in newborn infants, so the choice of treatment is left to clinical judgment. Therefore, the choices of drug, dose, and route of administration are selected on the basis of expert consensus and individual experience, which might not be supported by strong evidence. Consequently, off-label analgesics are commonly administered to infants in unsuitable formulations, with little knowledge of the pharmacokinetic properties, drug efficacy, or safety. Furthermore, despite being developmentally distinct, children are frequently grouped together using broad age ranges, and in the absence of adequate data due to the paucity of studies, regulatory decisions that are designed to protect some children can have unintended effects on access to analgesia for a greater number of children who are at low risk. An example is the regulatory response to reports of respiratory depression following codeine use,34,35 which had effectively led to analgesic compounds (eg, codeine and tramadol)36,37 becoming unavailable to increasingly large numbers of children after surgery. There is an urgent need for analgesic drugs to be studied and licensed in children, especially infants, and stronger links between academia, industry, regulatory bodies, and patients and parents are essential for improving the treatment of pain. A clear pathway from identifying optimal endpoints to measuring drug efficacy and safety through to licensing should be forged. International collaborations need to lead the way and be supported in their efforts to provide safe and effective treatments for the neonatal population.

Of course, many treatments do not lend themselves easily to randomised controlled trials and the right course of action is not immediately clear. For example, there are considerable uncertainties in how to manage pain in newborn or preterm infants, for whom it can be unclear as to whether the infant is experiencing pain. This problem is also true for many children with communication impairments, leading to ethical questions related to how best to treat pain, whereby the reduction or avoidance of pain is not a goal without costs and favourable analgesic effects can seem inseparable from unfavourable adverse effects.32 As an example, considerable uncertainty exists regarding whether preterm infants should receive medication before they receive surfactant by so-called minimally invasive techniques.38,39 These techniques involve laryngoscopy and passing a fine bore catheter into the larynx to administer surfactant to the spontaneously breathing infant. In part, the proposed benefit of this technique is attributed to the belief that the infant’s spontaneous breathing distributes surfactant more effectively than if it was applied using positive pressure in a non-breathing infant. However, it is not known how distressing laryngoscopy without sedation or analgesia is for extremely preterm infants, although it seems reasonable to assume that it is unpleasant. The provision of sedation or analgesia presumably reduces the infant’s discomfort (although this is difficult to evaluate); however, studies have shown that even low-dose sedation is associated with increases in episodes of blood oxygen desaturation and the need for manual ventilation during the procedure.40

This question is not only a clinical one, but also an ethical one: how should these risks be balanced? Is it worse for the infant to have a more unpleasant procedure, or to have more episodes of oxygen desaturation and increased likelihood for the need for ventilation and consequent increased morbidity? This example highlights the way that decisions about pain management are often posited, in which it is necessary to weigh different values. Attaining more clarity about the adverse effects of
early life pain compared with increased physiological instability might be possible as more evidence is acquired. However, there will still be a need to decide which, and whose, values to prioritise. Considering these balanced ethical considerations, a recommendation based on the precautionary principle is made. Care providers should, when possible, make all efforts to reduce pain exposure by avoiding pain-causing procedures. In scenarios in which these procedures are unavoidable, interventions to alleviate pain should be used that have been carefully evaluated and are least likely to be associated with long-term harm. There is an unknown balance between the potential benefits and harms associated with these decisions, and this uncertainty is likely to vary. Parents should be involved in decisions relating to pain management in their infants and children so that their views and values are considered. Medical care providers need to be aware of the drugs that they administer, recognise their potential complications so that they are better able to inform parents and patients, and to have the skills and strategies to resolve these complications when they arise. It is important to see more involvement of clinical ethicists, or perhaps the public recognition of the involvement of clinical ethicists, in the questions surrounding paediatric pain management, especially in infants and children who cannot verbally communicate.

Even with older children who can communicate complex needs, there is an absence of primary studies, and little translation from theory to preclinical studies to clinical intervention research. For example, one of the most examined areas of paediatric pain management is in child-focused psychological treatments. However, there are important areas that are missing. First, few studies included parents, siblings, and peers, although these studies are starting to emerge. Second, there is a distinct missing focus on prevention of pain, its exacerbation, or its maintenance in both post-surgical and chronic primary pain conditions. In post-surgical pain, up to 20% of children and adolescents go on to report long-term pain, and in chronic primary pain, treatments have not been developed and risk factors are only starting to be identified.

Promoting evidence-based paediatric pain management

Adoption of such a meta-scientific approach could appear unduly and unhelpfully critical. In dwelling on the practically, ethically, and clinically complex aspects of pain, we are not promoting a nihilistic abandonment of scientific endeavour. Complexity is the starting point, not the destination. To make pain better, there needs to be more creative and far-reaching methods to evaluate new and emerging health technologies. The pain community is at an important turning point in the production of evidence. If we do the same as we have done before, we will get the same results. Further, the common methods and study designs might not be advanced enough to quickly improve this field. For example, randomised controlled trials, the gold standard trial design, are in many instances unethical, impractical, or both, such as in the example of testing the effectiveness of pharmacological interventions in a palliative or end-of-life setting in which randomisation without a viable rescue medication would be unethical and difficult to justify. The blinded randomised controlled trial is a gold standard in clinical evidence production because it evolved as a method to control for known biases in evidence production (see Cochrane Risk of Bias tool), but this method should not be thoughtlessly applied when reviewing evidence.

Increasingly common are practical designs, such as stepped-wedged design, in which centres or individuals can act as their own control for varying amounts of time before beginning treatment. Similarly, the use of single case series, in which an individual can act as their own control, are being reintroduced. As an example, most of the studies included in a review of interdisciplinary chronic pain care used a single-group, pre-post design. This review found significant differences after treatment on most outcomes, including pain intensity, physical and emotional functioning, and school attendance. In this instance, a focus on methods for describing complex interventions was needed, including the content of the intervention, using criteria such as available templates for intervention description and replication, and open availability of manuals with full treatment descriptions to allow for an analysis of active components. Hybrid effectiveness-intervention designs also provide a method to evaluate the efficacy of interventions, as well as implementation strategies, which are needed to determine how the intervention can be integrated within clinical settings.

One way to improve the quality and quantity of evidence for how to help children in pain is to create a fundamental shift in the thinking of the pain community, policy makers, and research funders. When appropriate, there should be a move away from the adoption of non-bespoke research methods from another field of study, or from another time or population, and go back to basics. The reason the randomised controlled trial and its constituent parts is popular is because it successfully manages bias. The methods and associated statistics were created, however, to support agriculture, not medicine, only later being transferred across to the study of humans. When asking how to design a study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of any intervention, either clinically for the individual or in a trial on a sample population, one needs to understand how to manage bias.

One must always be critical when reviewing evidence in any field, and paediatric pain is no exception. Primary or secondary outcome measures that differ between the online trial registry (eg, ClinicalTrials.gov) and publication, or important prespecified outcome measures that
are missing at publication, might lead to suspicion unless addressed adequately. Other key considerations when interpreting evidence for the treatment of paediatric pain include managing and interpreting risk of biases, size, and quality of evidence. Depending on trial design, trialists should reduce bias and fully report methods whenever possible. Full and transparent reporting will increase confidence around the estimate of effect and improve the evidence base, rather than adding more uncertainty. In regard to size, many research papers strongly argue that size matters when analysing and interpreting evidence from pain trials. Trials with fewer than 50 participants overestimated the treatment effect around 50% of the time. This inflated effect size found in smaller studies was also seen in a 2018 review of psychological interventions for children with chronic pain, which found that small trials produced a large beneficial treatment effect for reducing pain compared with larger trials, which found no beneficial effect. Therefore, larger trials will also help to increase certainty, as smaller trials typically overestimate the effects of interventions.

Finally, it is important to interpret the quality of evidence with the effect of treatment, such as by using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) in GRADE, outcomes are rated from very low (ie, there is very little confidence in the effect estimate; the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect) to high (ie, there is high confidence that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of effect). Therefore, even when interventions show a very large beneficial effect or a null effect, the quality of evidence is important to interpret what will guide clinicians, researchers, and policy makers on how reliable that evidence is, and how likely it would be to change if new trials were done.

**Improving available treatments**

Another way to make pain better is by working with what is already known. A good example is in the application of the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of analgesics in the developing child. Medical practitioners caring for children in pain want to know how effective a drug is likely to be and the optimal dose, timing, and route of administration. Although they might be aware that the dose should be reduced in children who are very young, there are often uncertainties about how much the dose is reduced or what reduction is required for a loading dose as opposed to a maintenance dose. Dose reduction could be attributable to pharmacokinetics (commonly defined by clearance [CL] and volume of distribution [V]) combined with a pharmacodynamic effect (often defined by maximum effect [efficacy or EMAX] and the concentration at which half that maximum effect is achieved [C50]). These parameters are associated with variability. Quantifying and sourcing this variability and how it relates to dose in individual children helps clinicians to personalise drug use. This method avoids the concept that one dose fits all, regardless of age, maturation, or disease process. It also sidesteps the concept that pain relief only has merit if it decreases by a predetermined value (eg, by 50%). Determining the right dose can be achieved by the use of target concentration strategy (figure 6).

Population pharmacokinetic–pharmacodynamic modelling can be used to determine key parameters such as CL, V, EMAX, and C50. This modelling is a Bayesian statistical method in which mathematical equations are used to describe the typical (or population) time–concentration and concentration–response relationships observed after drug administration. Compartment models are usually used to describe drug disposition. This approach has been extended by integrating physiological parameters into the equations. The Hill equation, used originally to describe oxygen dissociation, has proven popular and versatile to describe drug response, although other descriptors are equally valid. This method involves determination of a desired target effect, which in turn requires a robust pain measure or measures. Description of a concentration–pain response relationship allows for the assessment of pain relief on a concentration continuum (figure 7). Such pharmacokinetic knowledge can then be used to estimate the dose that will achieve that target concentration in an individual and be used as the starting point of in-vitro trial design to determine the optimal dose.

Population pharmacokinetic–pharmacodynamic modelling uses mixed effects to study variability in drug responses in individuals who represent those for whom the drug will be used. If the variability between patients is modelled, then it is possible to predict the magnitude of the difference between predictions and the observations in the individual patient. Variability is associated with all parameters used in pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic equations. Covariate information (eg, weight, age, pathology, drug interactions, and pharmacogenomics) can be used to help predict the
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Figure 7: A concentration-response relationship for ibuprofen and diclofenac, determined for acute pain after tonsillectomy

The response curve is described using the Hill equation. The maximum effect (E_max) is similar for both drugs. A target reduction of 4 pain units on the VAS (range 0–10; a score above 4 is usually considered as pain) correlates with a target concentration of 5.8 mg/L for both diclofenac and ibuprofen. VAS=visual analogue scale.

Typical dose in a specific patient, reducing population parameter variability. This type of modelling aims to personalise medicine.

Pharmacogenomics is one area that can provide information to individualise treatment. The drug irinotecan, used to treat cancer, has an active metabolite that is metabolised by a glucuronide (UGT1A1), a pathway similar to that involved in morphine clearance (UGT2B7). A variant allele, UGT1A1*28, has been identified that is associated with severe neutropenia and diarrhoea. Genetic testing in patients to identify this allele (present in approximately 10% of white individuals) has been shown to be beneficial in adults. Single polymorphisms that control the hepatic enzyme CYP2D6 influence the metabolism of drugs commonly used for pain management, such as codeine, tramadol, and amitriptyline. Consequently, this enzyme contributes to observed effects and adverse effects. It is possible to do bedside testing to assess genotype and this information can be used to review dose. Although genotype does not always equate with phenotype, such information can be used as a guide for initial dosing.

Genetic influences are complex and could prove difficult to unravel. The importance of pharmacogenomics in dose individualisation is still uncertain. If a single genetic variant was responsible for major pharmacokinetic or pharmacodynamic differences, then dose individualisation would be easier. However, there appears to be a multiplicity of genetic influences on both morphine pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics, and the effects from interaction of these variants are not fully understood. Pain response is further complicated by numerous other factors (eg, psychosocial, race, environment, underlying pathology, and age). An understanding of these complexities is needed before they can be used to individualise therapy.

We present this argument in full as an approach to optimise drug management that is rarely used for children with chronic pain but could be an effective way to radically improve the use of existing treatments. One way to improve the management of pain is through better education around the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of analgesics in children.

This approach to personalisation could have merit across many of the existing treatments. Although assessing the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of drugs can help to optimise pharmacological interventions, other strategies can be used (eg, with psychological treatments). Within research of children with chronic pain, researchers are starting to stratify children and provide more targeted treatment modalities. Children with chronic pain often have comorbidities, such as anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress, or insomnia. Therefore, trialists have started trying to combine treatment modalities and test the efficacy of delivering CBT for pain and insomnia together, or for anxiety and pain concurrently, and initial results seem promising. In addition, researchers are also investigating which patients report the greatest gains in treatment in completed randomised trials. Studies have found that parental factors at the beginning of treatment could predict which children will benefit most from treatment. For example, parents with higher distress before treatment predicted less improvement in their children’s disability 12 months following treatment, compared with parents who reported lower distress. This finding indicates that for caregivers with high distress, it could be important to target their own distress early in treatment to effect change on child disability. This information is crucial for refining psychological therapies and providing more individualised treatment.

Improving access and scale

An additional way to make pain better is by working to increase access to the available treatments and, by extension, increase their scale of production. We have already highlighted the important contribution of knowledge translation (table). Researchers have risen to the challenge of improving access to evidence-supported treatments in the use of computing technology to deliver psychological, educational, or nurse-led treatments that have behaviour as a core target of the intervention. In the same way as technology has started to be used for assessment, investigators have begun exploring the use of computing technology for treatment. There is a long history of attempts at using technology to increase access (eg, the telephone) and at automating instruction or therapeutic direction. Often these attempts expanded as computing technology became ubiquitous. The dominance of mobile phones and the growth of computing in smartphones have led investigators to transfer face-to-face approaches onto these platforms, and to attempt innovation in new treatments that can only be delivered remotely. One systematic review identified ten randomised controlled trials that tested the efficacy of remotely delivered treatments for children.
with chronic pain, and found small effects for reducing pain intensity and disability after treatment. However, the long-term effects of these approaches are unknown.

Despite the large number of mobile applications for pain education and treatment, very few are supported by evidence or are based on a theoretical framework. There are some very good examples of how technology has been successfully used to improve access to treatments, but attempts at increasing the scale of access to treatments have been less successful. Applications that have been developed by scientists and tested for efficacy, often in university settings, are typically difficult to commercialise. For example, fewer than 30% of researcher-led applications for paediatric pain assessment and management became available to users, accounting for an average of $300 000 of grant funds for each application. Scalability and sustainability remain challenging and could involve a reassessment of how treatments are developed, as well as changing the relationships between researchers, commercial providers, health-care planners, insurers, and government agencies to improve funding and regulatory access to treatments.

One country that has made online, evidence-based psychological therapies for mental and physical health freely available is Australia. The eCentre Clinic at Macquarie University (Sydney, NSW, Australia) has developed over 15 interventions for mental and physical health conditions in children and adults, including panic attacks, depression, social anxiety, post-traumatic stress, chronic pain (solely in adults), diabetes, and epilepsy. Once an intervention has been determined to be efficacious, it is made freely available to Australians. Often, participants accessing the interventions agree to share outcomes, with needs being less successful. Applications that have been developed by scientists and tested for efficacy, often in university settings, are typically difficult to commercialise. For example, fewer than 30% of researcher-led applications for paediatric pain assessment and management became available to users, accounting for an average of $300 000 of grant funds for each application. Scalability and sustainability remain challenging and could involve a reassessment of how treatments are developed, as well as changing the relationships between researchers, commercial providers, health-care planners, insurers, and government agencies to improve funding and regulatory access to treatments.

Embracing complexity

Finally, to fulfil the ambition of improving the effectiveness, safety, quality, access, and scalability of available treatments, there should be a focus on the context in which these treatments will be delivered. Much of the evidence is based on single studies or the amalgamation of those studies in research syntheses. There are three specific challenges associated with the translation from the research to the clinical setting: comorbidity, ecological validity, and specificity.

Very few patients present with a single condition. Although medicine has arguably become fragmented through specialisation and super-specialisation, and there is a general tendency to see a patient through the lens of an individual’s specific or specialist training; the skills and experience of the more general practitioner or child health worker are equally important. Pain is often managed in the context of disease or after immunological challenge, as in surgery. In neonates, as described earlier, fast developing systems (often at a crucial stage of development) need to be understood in any analgesic strategy. In children with neurodisability, pain from multiple sources (eg, muscle spasms) and complex comorbid conditions (eg, sleep apnoea) is frequent. In adolescents with chronic pain, comorbid mental health problems are common and should be considered in any management plan. Trials in this area often exclude patients with more complex diagnoses and aim to improve physical functioning. Despite the comorbidities often seen in child and adolescent populations, randomised controlled trials of pain management provide little treatment to manage anxiety and depression and, therefore, there is little change in their symptoms after pain treatment.

Our habit of excluding complexity in clinical trials and other research designs by excluding patients with multiple needs has led to gaps in our knowledge that are felt most acutely when faced with variety in patients who present for help. Attempts have, and are, being made across paediatric pain to address problems in the ecological validity of trials used to guide practice. For example, there have been several studies in populations that are typically excluded from trials, such as children from low-income communities or children with complex comorbidities. More needs to be done to reach these groups and those who do not present with manageable disease due to assessment difficulties, stigma, fear of social exclusion, or a coping strategy of minimising adverse health concerns.

One size does not and should not fit all. Not all treatments work for everyone, exemplified by a desire to individualise and personalise pharmacotherapy. Sex and gender influence treatment outcome, as do genetic factors in later development of pain sensitivity or drug metabolism. Many factors beyond the individual child are also relevant, such as parental distress and the social context surrounding the child. A challenge for us will be to use what is known about what makes pain better as a foundation on which to build. Achieving this goal will mean understanding not only the evidence but the strengths and weaknesses of our habits of evidence production.

Research and clinical priorities to make pain better

Researchers and care providers have to get smarter about how to make pain better; in trial design, treatments, what is delivered, and to whom. There are currently serious shortcomings in treatment plans for children throughout the developmental age-span that need to be addressed.

First, there are fundamental gaps in the ambition to make pain better for all children and innovative solutions are needed to overcome current shortcomings. There is very little evidence for or against most pharmacological treatments commonly used in pain, with needs being greatest for acute pain indications in the youngest children, and chronic and long-term pain for all age
groups. This situation is far from new, and in recognition of the widespread scarcity of data for medications in children, the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act (2002) and the Pediatric Research Equity Act (2003) in the USA, and the Paediatric Rule (2007) in Europe, were introduced. This legislation was designed to incentivise or require pharmaceutical companies to do randomised controlled trials in children, and include paediatric formulations when feasible. Unfortunately, these strategies, although welcome, have had little success in the field of pain. The absence of suitable data has driven calls for newer and different approaches and for the modification of trial designs, although the perception persists that these kinds of studies are difficult and impractical to do. Nevertheless, alternative approaches are needed to generate evidence to guide clinical practice that go beyond the pharmacological randomised controlled trial. Although randomised controlled trials can manage some of the biases affecting study outcomes, they are expensive, time consuming, often inconclusive, and difficult to translate into clinical practice. Randomised controlled trials also incur opportunity costs for alternative ways of exploring efficacy and harm for the individual patient. Nevertheless, large, multi-site trials that minimise bias will increase the confidence in the estimate of effects and provide clinicians with confidence when treating patients.

Second, there is a pressing need for novel drug discovery. In particular, there is an urgent need for medications that do not stimulate the reward system, especially in this era of concern about opioid misuse. We encourage variety in clinical studies, especially in studies of efficacy. The analysis of a close investigation of pharmacokinetic–pharmacodynamic profiling was one such example. Health-care professionals often use older analgesics (eg, morphine), the properties of which are well documented and understood at a population level and in multiple clinical samples. Quantifying and determining the source of variability in response, and how the variability relates to dose, route of administration, and scheduling in individual children can help clinicians to personalise their analgesic strategy. One size does not fit all. Optimal drug management can be done at an individual level. Often, individual hospitals and individual physicians treat patients by essentially doing single case designs when prescribing and switching drugs in children to manage their pain. However, these procedures are not systematically and fully reported in an accessible way. Creating a shared national or international database of essential participant characteristics (eg, age, sex, weight, height, and diagnosis), prescription (eg, drug, dose, and route), and outcomes (eg, pain intensity and interference, adverse events, and functioning) that can be systematically recorded and shared will further our understanding of which drugs work for children with different pain conditions. Although there is a strong tradition of single case studies in clinical psychology, their application in paediatric pain is rare, but examples exist in adult pain research. Paradoxically, focusing on the individual might allow us to imagine ways to increase access to evidence-supported treatments and to scale up the production of these treatments.

Third, there is a need to intervene earlier to prevent the onset of chronic pain. Identification of risk factors and the tailoring of treatments could accelerate progress in this field. Early prevention is likely to reduce personal and societal effects of developing chronic pain, particularly in childhood. Psychological and physical interventions could be particularly useful in this domain, providing children and their parents with skills and understanding of pain management. Much of the trial evidence so far has focused on managing chronic or procedural pain, but understanding who is most likely to develop pain and how to reduce this risk, through interventions delivered at community level, could substantially reduce the number of children transitioning from acute to chronic pain after injury, surgery, or other events.

Fourth, there is a need to stop some trials in fields for which there is sufficient evidence, or for which further evidence is unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect. Examples include psychological interventions for chronic pain, and distraction for children undergoing procedural pain. It is unlikely that more randomised controlled trials of psychological interventions, however well done, will reduce the overall uncertainties around effect estimates. The next steps in psychological treatment research should be to establish an evidence base for interventions to reduce distress and improve function in children with comorbidities or complex needs, and interventions that target parents. There is also a need for further evidence for interventions to improve social outcomes and to prevent long-term pain in children and adolescents. Although commonly used in practice, physical interventions for chronic pain would benefit from rigorous evaluation to better understand and dissect the roles of the specific techniques, general conditioning, and the ongoing relationship with the therapist. However, when trials are reported, so should data for adverse events be, which are frequently missing in psychological interventions.

Finally, a benefit of an idiographic approach to research, by focusing on the individual, is that complexity ceases to be a problem and instead becomes the solution. Researchers and care providers should recognise that complexity is the norm, and focus on what works for individual patients. For some, that complexity will possibly involve comorbidity and polypharmacy, and will also include a personal learning history and a specific environmental and learning context. Complexity science could be helpful in determining novel individualised treatments; for example, pain-related data (big and small) can be made visible by the pervasive personal sensing and computing and begin to inform treatment.
Transformative action for policy makers and funders

Child pain matters. But not, it seems, to everyone—not for every child, and not for every pain. The pain community has to work harder to make child pain matter to all, understood, and visible, and to make it important enough to bring out into the open and to be acted upon. Only then can pain be made better. However, these goals are not sequential, and each must be addressed simultaneously to improve the wellbeing of infants, children, adolescents, and the adults they become.

The WHO–UNICEF–Lancet Commission on securing a future for children argued that children should be put at the centre of action to meet the sustainable development goals and that a focus on the health and well-being of children is essential to population survival. In this Commission, we focused on paediatric pain in middle-income and high-income countries.

We welcome a focus on child thriving, on the promotion of cognitive, emotional, and motivational resource, and on positioning children as central to political action. Children’s ability to drive sustainable change should not be underestimated, nor should the degree to which young people care about a positive future for all.

Consensus on the importance of child health and well-being is an important start. Among health-care professionals, it is easy to agree that no child should experience pain if that pain can and should be prevented, avoided, or successfully treated. In practice, however, there is ample evidence that children frequently experience preventable pain, and that in high-income settings with advanced health-care systems and highly educated and regulated health professionals, children, from newborns to emerging adults experience pain that goes unnoticed, unreported, or is not responded to. Asserting a voice in pain can lead to social rejection, marginalisation, and stigma. Advocating individually for a child in pain can bring similar dangers of being labelled at best as unhelpful, and at worst as criminally interfering.

In this Commission, we set out four important goals that, if achieved, will transform paediatric pain—making children’s and adolescents’ pain matter, understood, visible, and better for future generations. These goals might seem obvious and many people might believe that they have confidence in successfully actioning them every day. However, we challenge everyone to step back and reconsider how they can further improve their clinical and research practice based on these goals. We sought to understand the reasons for the discordance between a belief in the importance of a goal, in what is thought correct and morally defensible, and the collective inaction in organised attempts to deliver that goal. Casting the problem as a social science problem, in addition to a psychological or medical one, can help reframe our future investigations. We do not suggest that individuals deliberately hurt or harm children by their actions or inaction. It is the individuals working to improve the lives of children and family who advocate for children in pain and deliver the solutions needed.

In the Introduction of this Commission, we asked how much of what we do (or fail to do) now for children in pain will come to be seen as unwise, unacceptable, or unethical in the next 40 years? While we have set out the clinical and research priorities needed to achieve the four goals (panel 6), it is only by cross-sector collaboration between researchers, clinicians, policy makers, funders, patients, and parents that progress can be made quickly and effectively. A coordinated approach is needed on all fronts, from all disciplines and agencies, and policy makers and funders should focus on several priority areas (panel 7).

On a national level, longitudinal data are needed to fully understand the effects of childhood pain on later development and achievement. Although several databases exist, pain often does not have a central role in such databases, despite it being a primary symptom of many diseases and illnesses. Children who experience pain are likely to go on to report pain in adulthood, so understanding the effects of pain from inception is crucial to understanding the effects of pain later on in life. A coordinated approach between countries is essential so that researchers are able to compare the prevalence and impact of pain across settings and cultures.

As evidence for understanding, assessing, and treating pain continually evolves, so should the education of health-care professionals. Specialist knowledge of treating pain is often centralised, and greater efforts are needed to educate those in community settings to be able to manage neonates, children, and adolescents with pain. Curricula for all health-care professionals should include information on pain assessment and management, so that the health-care professionals are better equipped to manage pain and not perceive it as a by-product of a procedure or disease. In addition, curriculum revision is needed for medical nursing and allied health students treating future children with pain, who receive insufficient information about assessing and managing pain across the childhood lifespan, as well as regular retraining for front-line staff treating neonates, children, and adolescents.

Knowledge mobilisation is another strategy that could be key in reducing inequity in health-care knowledge. There is now an active discussion about the importance of bridging the gaps between knowledge and its use, between science and clinical practice, and between patient experience and the design of services, and several initiatives are ongoing to mobilise knowledge in paediatric pain (table). There is also a need for countries or international efforts to develop knowledge mobilisation networks to promote awareness of the problems of pain, particularly in an increasingly digitalised world where health-care information is often only a click away.
Panel 6: Priorities for research and clinical practice

Make pain matter

- Improve equity—pain care should not be determined by non-personal determinants of health (eg, socioeconomic status, age, sex, disability, and ethnicity).
- Study factors that contribute to inequity in pain management, the consequences of inequality in pain management, and strategies to mitigate inequity.
- Develop effective strategies to make the latest pain management research accessible and understandable for patients (eg, older children and adolescents) and their caregivers.
- Ensure that all clinicians involved in the care of a child or adolescent are competent to provide pain care within their scope of practice.
- Mitigate stigma—consider labels given to pain that cannot be diagnosed with a known condition, and determine the best communication strategies when talking to children and families with pain to communicate understanding, empathy, and treatment course.
- Improve macro-understanding of the societal forces (eg, cultural, political, and health-care institutions) that influence paediatric pain experiences and management (eg, research funding allocation, political agendas that shape policy and narratives, and an understanding of culturally embedded experiences), and micro-understanding of mechanisms and interventions that leverage social factors (eg, family, friends, peers, and teachers) to improve the experiences of those living with pain (eg, by decreasing stigma and improving social health).

Make pain understood

- Promote a greater understanding of the subjective nature of pain and the multiple and varied inputs at different stages of development that influence nociception and the pain response.
- Abandon concepts that negate the explicit integration of biological, psychological, and social elements that comprise all forms of pain.
- Research and clinical understanding of pain should include the whole biopsychosocial model, eliminating suggestions of dualism between subjective and objective, mind and body, and physiology and psychology.
- Improve understanding of the early experience of pain on later development and behaviour.
- Improve understanding of the factors that contribute to, and mechanisms playing a role in, individual variability in pain perception, somatosensory function, development and persistence of sensitisation processes, transition to chronic pain, and responses to treatments.
- Make use of existing longitudinal studies, and design and do additional longitudinal studies that track individual development and the biological, environmental, psychological, and social factors that affect normal developmental trajectories, including effects on sensory and affective components of the pain response and risk of chronic pain in later life.

Make pain visible

- Assess pain in every child with an acute or chronic condition that is causing pain, regardless of age, ability, or sex.
- Ask all children and parents about the effect of pain on their daily lives.
- Integrate the context of pain measurement by expanding research on social and environmental factors that influence pain assessment.
- Develop measures from a bottom-up manner and provide children and parents a voice when determining relevant outcome measures and whether pain treatments are achieving a clinically meaningful change.
- Use person-centred approaches in pain assessment to help match patients with the level of care needed to optimally address pain and comorbidities.
- Expand the potential of daily life assessments and wearable sensors for both clinical practice and research in paediatric pain.
- Further develop methods to provide robust surrogate pain measures in immature or non-verbal populations.

Make pain better

- Establish a systematic evidence base for pharmacological interventions in children with chronic pain, and innovative solutions in trial design when the randomised controlled trial is not ethical or practical.
- Develop ways to improve existing treatments, such as through understanding the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of analgesics. These improvements could include tailoring treatments for individual children with pain and also attempt to personalise treatments on the basis of known covariates that include pharmacogenomics.
- Establish evidence on how and when to treat children with acute pain to prevent transition to chronic pain, and develop interventions that are effective at providing coping skills to prevent the onset of long-term pain.
- Stop trials in areas where there is sufficient evidence and where further evidence will not change the quality or confidence in the estimate of effect. Start trials for children with complex needs to prevent the onset of long-term pain and address comorbidities.
- Recognise that complexity is the norm and should always be considered when developing and testing treatments to meet the needs of patients.
Inequities in the provision of services need to be addressed. Clinically, there has been growing provision of dedicated child pain centres and many countries have successfully attempted to audit and benchmark practice against a standard. However, there is still a long way to go. Most of these treatment centres are in urbanised areas and staffed with specialists, yet it would be naïve to think that children only experience pain in these settings. There is benefit in gathering such knowledge and specialism in centres, but it can be to the detriment of children experiencing pain elsewhere and to those who cannot always access these specialist centres. When children reach treatment centres, their pain should be managed by health-care professionals who have up-to-date knowledge, such as through regular training, practice reflection, supervision, and resources (eg, time and facilities).

Multidisciplinary management is considered the gold standard of care in paediatric pain, but despite the prevalence of pain in children, the services available to them often lag behind those of adults. There is evidence that chronic pain experienced during childhood is reported in adulthood,122 children do not spontaneously recover from chronic pain once it is reported,123 and that symptoms deteriorate while awaiting interventions or clinic appointments.124 Therefore, funding for sustainable multidisciplinary services is crucial for managing pain in these children and adolescents.

There needs to be a shift to make leadership of both health-care professionals and organisations take charge of patient care and increase accountability. As we have advocated, all pain should be assessed and treated. When that does not happen, a failure of care has occurred. When pain is unassessed or untreated, intolerance needs to replace tolerance. Children are in pain now, across the world, and more should be done to manage that pain. This goal includes making pain visible by targeting funding and policy to children who have been ignored or who have received inequity in pain management. We are not talking about equal access to all resources, but equitable access to shared resource base on need. Research funding is needed to illuminate inequity within health-care and community settings to help rectify this issue.

Diverse leadership at an organisational level is crucial for dealing with local child pain challenges that present within an institution or a region. Patient-partners are important to include in these leadership teams as they provide a different perspective to other professionals, as well as a voice to those who are subject to assessments and interventions. Increasing awareness of pain across the developmental lifespan and developing solutions at local levels is important.

With leadership will come novel innovation, including new models of care. For example, the so-called small data innovation (ie, the collection of day-to-day data traces) has yet to be seen and used.125 As more sensors are put in clothing, homes, vehicles, and in almost every object, it is possible to capture data for all behaviour. When these novel data are combined with data captured actively as children volunteer information about their personal experience on social media, then what was once painstakingly and expensively done in the laboratory is now accessible as part of the daily life of children in this data revolution.126

Information does not guarantee knowledge. The intellectual task is to explore how both passive and actively captured data can be combined in statistical models to predict personal outcomes. Despite having sufficient engineering capability, there are marked deficiencies in our understanding of behavioural science that can help us to look for the right patterns of data and interpret behaviour as meaningful. However, children and adolescents are generally positive about the use of technology in health care and expect such care to be personalised and relevant. There are ethical considerations to the collection, storage, and use of such personal data, which needs to be thoughtfully managed.127 Clinically, in paediatric pain, our current thinking about technology deployment (which focuses on establishing concordance with conventional methods) could be leapfrogged, and instead the assessment could be adapted to match what is being freely given, using
media to capture experience (eg, location and movement data).

Beyond assessment, patients cannot wait for the establishment of evidence bases, which are likely to take a generation to be funded, created, accumulated, and disseminated. Many children, throughout the developmental spectrum, are in pain now. The evidence-based research that is available should be implemented in practice more frequently. To achieve our ambitions in accessibility and scale, more pain clinics are needed, and they should be focused on the patient, with personalised management that recognises complexity. However, these centres should aim to be geographically diverse and not consolidate the centralisation of specialist pain knowledge identified in goal 1. Use of technology in this revolution will be essential.

In expanding how pain management services are delivered, knowledge redesign should be considered. Rather than considering the expert as the intelligence of the system, the means of production, and the quality control process, these functions can be separated. First, the expert should be allowed to manage a system of knowledge, including access to technology, current evidence, peer support, and technical skills, instead of each individual attempting to hold all of the expertise, and knowledge should be moved from the individual to an integrated computerised knowledge system (ie, machine learning). Second, collection of small data from individual patients can potentially be matched with insights from big data on the experience of others and with evidence from clinical studies to improve management. Third, by providing multiple local healthcare providers in the community with appropriate training to deliver the specific intervention under supervision from peers or experts, specialists can be relieved of these duties. Ultimately, the goal would be to shift the location of production, the delivery of assessment and treatment, and the timing of the treatment to where and when the patient needs it, rather than where and when it can be currently managed (figure 8).

**Conclusion**

This Commission has covered four important goals that we believe will advance the field of paediatric pain over the next 10 years. We have set out goals and priorities to improve research and practice, but it will take the entire research and clinical community, in collaboration with funders and policy makers, to achieve these goals. It was not possible to cover everything in this Commission. We have focused on high-income and middle-income countries but recognise that there are different challenges for low-income settings. We also have not focused much on the importance of experimental research, theoretical development, and the need for their closer union.
It is time for change. To achieve our first goal of making pain matter, the social and personal forces that traditionally silence pain complaints, put them out of sight, and allow pain management to be ignored need to be exposed. There is a long way to go in the study of pain mechanisms to achieve our second goal of making pain understood, and investment and support for multi-disciplinary collaboration will be key to successful and rapid progress. For our third goal, to make pain visible, we advocate for the need to develop an intolerance for the absence of assessment and to equip everyone working with children in pain with the ability to navigate the inferential process of determining a patient’s pain status. Lastly, to make pain better, better treatments and better access to these treatments are needed for more people by making optimal use of technological innovation and by creating new treatment models built around individual contextualised experience.
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