

Human Journals

Research Article

November 2021 Vol.:20, Issue:1

© All rights are reserved by Pramod A. Patil et al.

Prevalence Studies of Chronic Pain Using (MDHAQ) in Wategaon a Developed Village in Western Maharashtra



Pramod A. Patil*¹, Hemant S. Kandle,¹ Ganesh Sarjerao Shelke,² Pravin Tanaji Sathe,² Atul R. Chopade¹

1. *Rajarambapu College of Pharmacy, Kasegaon, Taluka- Walwa, District – Sangli, Maharashtra, 415404. India*

2. *Ashokrao Mane Institute of Pharmacy, Ambap, Kolhapur. India.*

Submitted: 25 October 2021

Accepted: 30 October 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Keywords: Rural, chronic pain, Chronic Pain, MDHAQ, Wategaon, Village, Western Maharashtra

ABSTRACT

The study was performed using multidimensional questionnaire for health assessment to quantify pain prevalence among the rural patients and to describe the potential pain determinants among rural population. The study describes pain prevalence among rural area and analyzes its determinants, as chronic pain is a major problem in the rural community and a detailed knowledge of chronic pain epidemiology is essential for efficient chronic pain management.



HUMAN JOURNALS

www.ijsrm.humanjournals.com

INTRODUCTION:

Pain affects huge number of patients with types of disease, in community and a variety of clinical settings. [1] Chronic pain in elderly people has shown serious scientific consideration. Prevalence pain studies of elderly people have produced more consistent results.

Assessment of chronic pain by self-reported measures play a central role. [2] A multidimensional health assessment questionnaire (MDHAQ) is crucial for care of patients with rheumatic diseases in a busy clinics. [3] Indian HAQ is a reliable, sensitive and valid method to measure disability.

It can be self-administered and was found to be eminently suitable for Indian population both at home and abroad. [4] The aims of this study were to quantify the prevalence of pain among the rural Indian patients and to describe the potential determinants of pain in this population.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Wategaon has an population of 3400 [1800 males & 1600 females] and qualifies itself to be called as a developing village because it contains all the necessities like schools, professional colleges, clinics, transport facilities, banks, etc. The evaluation of pain using the multidimensional health assessment questionnaire was designed to answer two study questions: (a) What is the prevalence and types of pain complaints in rural areas and (b) What is the percentage of home patients with pain that can be assessed using several available pain-intensity scales and a HAQ?. The Indian HAQ comprised of 12 questions (nine basic and three advanced ADL, on the standard HAQ format) relevant to the Indian population. The total score divided by 12 gave the disability Index. An interviewer assisted verbal Marathi translation was also done, for the use of non-English speaking patients. The study was designed by surveying the house residents of Wategaon village. The patients suffering from chronic pain for more than six months evidenced from medical history and aged in the range of 35-100 years were found to be eligible for pain assessment as the cognitive impairment among elderly presents a substantial barrier to pain assessment and management.

The questionnaire was self-administered with minimal instruction and took, on average, about 15 -20 min to complete. Pain Intensity was recorded by Pain Scales viz. Present Pain Intensity McGill (PPI) and Visual Analog Scale (VAS). In addition a six-point combination word number

scale an additional subscale of the McGill Pain Questionnaire was used as an indicator of pain intensity.

Reliability of the construct was checked by administering the questionnaire to 34 patients. The results of this survey are presented together with exploratory analyses that assessed the independent roles of each determinant of pain after adjusting for all the other variables. The details are summarized in Table IA and IB.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overall, 30 out of the 39 evaluated patients suffered pain at the time of interview. All of the patients reported severe back pain problems along with stiffness in the neck and frequent pain in the knees. The most common etiological cause for the chronic pain was found to be Arthritis.

The highest disability scores were recorded in response to item no. 6, 7 and 10 .i.e. squatting in the toilet or sitting cross-legged on the floor, Bend down to pick up clothing from the floor? And Walk three kilometers. Disability index values obtained with 12-ADL HAQ were high the mean Disability index was 5.10. Pain Intensities recorded by McGill (PPI) and (VAS) were found to be 2.311.

An epidemiological approach, of the study describes the prevalence of pain among well-defined rural area and analyzes its determinants, as a significant deterioration in health related quality of life and psychological well being is observed. Evidence reviewed in this paper suggests that a majority of elderly people experience pain of an intensity sufficient to interfere with normal functioning in day to day activities and that a significant proportion of these individuals do not receive appropriate treatment for this pain. The failure to adequately treat the elderly patient may be due to several factors. Three factors contributing for inadequate geriatric pain can be (1) lacking in proper assessment of pain; (2) potential pharmacotherapy risks; and (3) regarding misconception about efficacy strategies of non-pharmacological pain management and elderly attitudes towards pain treatments. It is necessary for proper planning and delivering effective responses to this medical problem as a elderly do not receive adequate pain management.

CONCLUSION:

The pain intensity increases as the age increases that are the pain is more severe in old person than that of young person. To conclude chronic pain in rural community needs detailed understanding for efficient primary chronic pain management.

Acknowledgement- All authors would like to thank management and administrative staff of Rajarambapu College of Pharmacy, Kasegaon.

Conflict of Interest- All authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Funding Information- None to report.

REFERENCES:

1. Elliott AM, Smith BH, Penny KI, Smith WC and Chambers WA. The epidemiology of chronic pain in the community. *Lancet*. 1999; 354: 1248–52.
2. Nicholas M K, Asghari A and Blyth FM. What do the numbers mean? Normative data in chronic pain measures. *Pain* 2008; 134: 158–73.
3. Pincus T and Sokka T Can a Multi-Dimensional Health Assessment Questionnaire (MDHAQ) and Routine Assessment of Patient Index Data (RAPID) scores be informative in patients with all rheumatic diseases? *Best Practice & Research Clinical Rheumatology*. 2007; 21: 733–53
4. Kumar A, Malaviya A N, Pandhi A and Singh R. Validation of an Indian version of the Health Assessment Questionnaire in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *Rheumatology* 2002; 41:1457–59.

Table 1- Population census of the participants of pain survey

Name of Village	No. of Patients				Total no. of Patients
	Age Below 50		Age Above 50		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Wategaon	6	4	20	9	39

Table No IA Demographic Data, Pain Location, and Etiology of Pain Complaints Identified from Medical Record (N = 39)

Characteristics	Value
Age in years (mean ; range)	55.82 [35-92]
Sex (mean ; range)	
Male	26 [37-87]
Female	13 [40-79]
*Pain Location	Frequency N (%)
Normal no. of patient	5 (17.70%)
Back	8 (23.52%)
Knee	10 (29.41%)
Foot/ankle	6 (17.64%)
Shoulder	3 (8.52%)
Neck	2 (5.88%)
Wrist	1 (2.94%)
Headache	1 (2.94%)
Hip and Abdomen	3 (8.52%)
Chest wall	1 (2.94%)
Elbow	1 (2.94%)
Heart/Angina	10 (29.41%)
Rectal/Pelvic	0 (0%)
Face/Jaw	0 (0%)
Etiology	Frequency N (%)
Diabetes	12 (35.29%)
Arthritis	1 (2.94%)
Migraine	1 (2.94%)
Asthma	0 (0%)
Old fractures	1 (2.94%)
Malignancy	0 (0%)
Muscle spam	1 (2.94%)
Paralysis	1 (2.94%)

Table IB ADL-wise mean score for rural HAQ and pain intensity scores measured by McGill pain intensity subscale (PPI) and visual analog scale.

Activity of daily living (ADL): Are you able to:	Mean scores (%)	Number (%) with scores of 1 to 3
1.Dress yourself, including tying sari / salwar /dhoti / pyjama and doing buttons?	1[2.91]	1[2.91]
2.Get in and out of bed ?	2[5.88]	2[5.88]
3.Lift a full cup or glass to your mouth ?	0[0]	0[0]
4.Walk outdoors on flat ground ?	5[14.70]	5[14.70]
5.Wash and dry your entire body ?	5[14.70]	5[14.70]
6.Squat in the toilet or sit cross-legged on the floor ?	4[11.76]	4[11.76]
7.Bend down to pick up clothing from the floor ?	5[14.70]	5[14.70]
8.Turn a tap on and off ?	0[0]	0[0]
9.Get in and out of auto rickshaw / car ?	6[17.64]	6[17.64]
10.Walk one – two kilometers ?	11[32.35]	11[32.35]
11.Shop in a vegetable market ?	7[20.58]	7[20.58]
12.Climb a flight of stairs ?	12[35.29]	11[32.35]
Total mean score	5.10[15.55]	5.94[15.31]

Pain Intensity as measured By McGill Pain Intensity Subscale

Scale	0	1	2	3	4	5
Feature	No Pain	Mild	Discomforting	Distressing	Horrible	Excruciating
Total	4	33	8	3	0	0
%	0	71.03	31.22	6.14	0	0

(McGill PPI) = 27.41

II] 100mm Visual Analog Scale for assessment of severity pain

No pain [-----] Very severe pain

VAS = 2.311

