



Short Form McGill Pain Questionnaire (SF-MPQ)

Introduction/Background

A short form version of the McGill Pain Questionnaire (SF-MPQ) was developed in 1987¹. This contains a total of 15 descriptors (4 affective and 11 sensory) which are rated on an intensity scale:

0	=	None
1	=	Mild
2	=	Moderate
3	=	Severe

In total, three pain scores are derived:

- The sum of the intensity rank values for sensory words chosen
- The sum of the intensity rank values for the affective words chosen
- The total of the descriptors

In addition, the Present Pain Intensity (PPI) index is present as in the standard McGill Pain Questionnaire, and a visual analogue scale. The SF-MPQ has been shown to have sufficient levels of sensitivity to demonstrate differences due to treatment at statistical levels comparable to those obtained with the standard MPQ. However, qualitative information in this version is absent: qualitative information is desired and the PPI and VAS are inadequate¹. Comparisons between the SF-MPQ and the standard version with other outcome measures have been undertaken also. This work has shown that correlations between two different patient populations were consistently high and significant. SF-MPQ has been used in a variety of clinical settings including assessment of labour pain, chronic pelvic pain, and systemic sclerosis^{2,3,4}.

In 2009, Dworkin et al revised and expanded the SF-MPQ by adding symptoms relevant to neuropathic pain, and by modification of the response format to include a 0-10 numerical rating scale⁵. The validity, reliability, and subscale structure of the revised SF-MPQ, termed the SF-MPQ-2, were examined from the responses of patients with a range of diverse chronic pain syndromes (N=882), and painful diabetic neuropathy (N=226). The data suggest that the SF-MPQ-2 has excellent validity and reliability. Confirmatory factor analyses provided support for four readily interpretable subscales-continuous pain, intermittent pain, predominantly neuropathic pain, and affective descriptors. Dworkin et al, 2009 suggest that these results provide a basis for use of the SF-MPQ-2 in future clinical research, including clinical trials of treatments for neuropathic and non-neuropathic pain conditions.

Validity and reliability

When the SF-MPQ was examined for reliability and responsiveness to change, the study indicated mostly satisfactory test-retest reliability and responsiveness values of the Norwegian Short Form-MPQ (NSF-MPQ), but shows that the measurement properties vary between different groups of patients with pain (rheumatic and musculoskeletal)⁶.

Translations

The SF-MPQ has been translated and validated into a range of different values including Greek, Swedish, Thai, and Korean^{7,8,9,10}.

Conditions of use (at 14.11.2012)

Use of the McGill Short Form Questionnaire-2 is administered by the MAPI Research Trust. In academic research and individual clinical practice it is available free of charge¹¹. Information concerning a limited use agreement is available also¹².

In commercial studies involving "for-profit" organisations and academic studies funded by commercial companies, fees are required¹³.

References

1. Melzack R. the short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire. *Pain*. 1987;30(2):191-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3670870>
2. Chang MY, Chen CH, Huang KF. A comparison of massage effects on labor pain using the McGill Pain Questionnaire. *Journal of Nursing Research*. 2006;14(3):190-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16967401>
3. Droz J, Howard FM. Use of the Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire as a diagnostic tool in women with chronic pelvic pain. *Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology*. 2011;18(2):211-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21354067>
4. El-Baalbaki G, Lober J, Hudson M, et al. Measuring pain in systemic sclerosis: comparison of the short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire versus a single-item measure of pain. *Journal of Rheumatology*. 2011;38(12):2581-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21965643>
5. Strand LI, Ljunggren AE, Bogen B, et al. The Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire as an outcome measure: test-retest reliability and responsiveness to change. *European Journal of Pain*. 2008;12(7):917-25. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18289893>
6. Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Revicki DA, et al. Development and initial validation of an expanded and revised version of the Short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire (SF-MPQ-2). *Pain*. 2009;144(1-2):35-42. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19356853>
7. Georgoudis G, Watson PJ, Oldham JA. The development and validation of a Greek version of the short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire. *European Journal of Pain*. 2000;4(3):275-281. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10985871>
8. Buckhardt CS, Bjelle A. A Swedish Version of the Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire. *Scandinavian Journal of Rheumatology*. 1994;23(2):77-81. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8165442>
9. Kitisomprayoongkul W, Klaphajone J, Kovindha A. Thai Short-form McGill Pain Questionnaire. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand*. 2006 Jun;89(6):846-53. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16850687>

10. Lee H, Nicholson LL, Adams RD, et al. Development and psychometric testing of Korean language versions of 4 neck pain and disability questionnaires. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2006;31(16):1841-5. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16845361>
11. MAPI Research Trust: <http://www.mapi-trust.org/services/questionnairelicensing/catalog-questionnaires/126-sf-mpq-2>. (Accessed 14-11-2012)
12. Limited use agreement: <http://www.mapi-trust.org/questionnaires/61>. (Accessed 14-11-2012)
13. Academic , and not-for-profit use of SF-MPQ
http://www.proqolid.org/instruments/short_form_mcgill_pain_questionnaire_sf_mpq_2
(Accessed 14-11-2012)