

How do healthcare workers judge pain in older palliative care patients with delirium near the end of life?*

LUCIA GAGLIESE, PH.D.,^{1–4} REBECCA RODIN, M.SC,^{1,2,6} VINCENT CHAN, M.D.,^{2,4}
BONNIE STEVENS, PH.D.,^{4,5,7} AND CAMILLA ZIMMERMANN, M.D., PH.D.^{3,4}

¹School of Kinesiology and Health Science, York University, Toronto, Canada

²Department of Anesthesia and Pain Management, University Health Network, Toronto, Canada

³Department of Supportive Care and Campbell Family Research Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, Canada

⁴Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

⁵Lawrence S Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

⁶Michael G. DeGroote School of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada

⁷The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada

(RECEIVED May 8, 2015; ACCEPTED June 20, 2015)

ABSTRACT

Objective: Pain and delirium are commonly reported in older people with advanced cancer. However, assessing pain in this population is challenging, and there is currently no validated assessment tool for this task. The present retrospective cohort study was conducted to understand how healthcare workers (HCWs; nurses and physicians) determine that older cancer patients with delirium are in pain.

Method: We reviewed the medical records of consecutive palliative care inpatients, 65 years of age and above ($N = 113$), in order to identify patient-based cues used by HCWs to make pain judgments and to examine how the cues differ by delirium subtype and outcome.

Results: We found that HCWs routinely make judgments about pain in older patients with delirium using a repertoire of strategies that includes patient self-report and observations of spontaneous and evoked behavior. Using these strategies, HCWs judged pain to be highly prevalent in this inpatient palliative care setting.

Significance of results: These novel findings will inform the development of valid and reliable tools to assess pain in older cancer patients with delirium.

KEYWORDS: Cancer pain, Older people, Delirium, Palliative care, Pain assessment, Chart audit

INTRODUCTION

Most older people with advanced cancer report moderate to severe pain that diminishes quality of life (Caltagirone et al., 2010). In the final stages of the disease, up to 85% of older people will also develop delirium (LeGrand, 2012), an acute organic brain disorder marked by impaired consciousness and awareness as well as abnormalities of cognition and

perception (American Psychiatric Association (APA), 2000). There are three subtypes of delirium: hypoactive, which presents with confusion and sedation; hyperactive, which presents with hallucinations, delusions, agitation, and disorientation; and a mixed presentation with features of both the hyperactive and hypoactive subtypes (APA, 2000; Breitbart & Strout, 2000; Leonard et al., 2008). For each of these subtypes, the outcome may be characterized as terminal, in which delirium continues until death, or reversible, in which it resolves before death (Lawlor et al., 2000). Both cancer pain and delirium at the end of life are associated with profound negative psychological and physiological consequences

*Presented, in part, at the 34th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Canadian Pain Society, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, in 2013.

Address correspondence and reprint requests to: Lucia Gagliese, School of Kinesiology and Health Science, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M3J 1P3. E-mail: gagliese@yorku.ca.

for patients (Yennurajalingam et al., 2005), as well as significant distress for family members (Breitbart et al., 2002; Partridge et al., 2013). Despite their high prevalence, the aging of the population (Statistics Canada, 2011), and the recognition that cancer is a disease of older people (Canadian Cancer Society's Steering Committee, 2010), much remains to be learned about cancer pain and delirium.

Furthering our knowledge depends on the availability of validated pain assessment strategies; however, assessing pain in older cancer patients with delirium presents many challenges (Bruera et al., 1992). Primary among these is that delirium may interfere with the self-report of pain. For example, some patients with hypoactive delirium may be unable to communicate verbally. Conversely, some patients with hyperactive delirium, who may be able to verbalize, may provide self-reports that are incoherent or difficult to interpret due to the presence of hallucinations or delusions (Boettger & Breitbart, 2011). Another challenge is that the behavioral manifestations of pain and delirium may overlap, complicating observational assessment. For instance, guarding and grimacing may indicate pain or agitation or both. Differentiation of the underlying cause of behavioral cues is difficult (Husebo et al., 2011). Finally, the ways in which the well-documented repertoire of pain cues (Hadjistavropoulos et al., 2011) may change as a result of the widespread brain dysfunction associated with delirium (Mittal et al., 2011; Vasilevskis et al., 2012) or other changes associated with impending death and advanced disease (Crews, 2007; Kehl & Kowalkowski, 2013) are unknown. Established observational pain scales were not developed for this population and may not be sensitive to these assessment challenges (Herr et al., 2006a). Furthermore, a measure developed and validated specifically for these patients is not currently available.

Despite these assessment challenges, healthcare workers (HCWs) believe that most patients with cancer-related delirium experience pain (Gagnon et al., 2001), and in one study they rated pain during delirium with agitation as more intense than pain during delirium without agitation (Bruera et al., 1992). Importantly, HCWs' pain judgments impacted management, including the administration of opioid analgesics (Bruera et al., 1992; Gagnon et al., 2001). It is not clear how these HCWs judged pain or differentiated it from agitation. Studies in other populations have shown that pain judgments are based on a complex weighting of multiple sources of data, including patient self-report, behavior, and medical evidence (Tait et al., 2009; Bryson et al., 2010; Wandner et al., 2014). Similar complexity would be expected in the present patient population.

Understanding how HCWs determine that older cancer patients with delirium are in pain is a critical first step to improving pain assessment and management for this vulnerable group. To date, studies designed specifically to identify patient-based cues used by HCWs to make pain judgments and to examine how cues differ by delirium subtype and outcome have not been reported. Our retrospective cohort study was conducted to address this knowledge gap by examining HCWs' judgments of cancer pain and delirium in older palliative care inpatients.

METHODS

Participants and Setting

We reviewed the medical records of consecutive patients, 65 years of age and above, admitted to the Harold and Shirley Lederman Palliative Care Centre at the Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, University Health Network, during a one-year period. Patients diagnosed with delirium via clinical interview were eligible for inclusion in our study. The Lederman Centre is a 12-bed acute palliative care inpatient unit for patients with cancer. Approximately 350 patients are admitted yearly, with an average length of stay of 11 days; 50% of patients die on the unit, 30% are discharged home, and 20% are transferred to other units, predominantly community palliative care units or hospices (Bryson et al., 2010).

Data Collection

The data were collected using a uniform electronic data extraction template. Unanticipated scenarios not included in the training were discussed with the research team until a consensus on coding was reached. Abstractors were blind to the study's specific objectives but were aware that it was about pain and delirium. Each chart was reviewed by one abstractor, either a registered nurse or clinical research associate, who received training prior to reviewing the charts, and all categorizations were subsequently reviewed by Dr. Gagliese.

Demographic and Medical Data

The demographic and medical data extracted included age, sex, marital status, education, ethnicity, time since cancer diagnosis, cognitive status at admission, length of admission in days, and medications administered each day. Comorbidities and total number of conditions were recorded. These were further classified into conditions often associated with pain (e.g., osteoarthritis; Merskey & Bogduk, 1994)

and those not usually associated with pain (e.g., hypertension). Strongest analgesic class administered was categorized according to the World Health Organization (WHO) analgesic ladder (Jadad & Browman, 1995): opioid \pm nonopioid (e.g., nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, adjuvants) analgesics, nonopioid analgesics only, and no analgesics. All notes from admission to either discharge or death were reviewed.

Delirium

Patients were classified as having delirium if the notations indicated that the patient received this diagnosis based on clinical interview by a palliative care physician or psychiatrist. All notations regarding type of delirium (hyperactive, hypoactive, or mixed) were recorded. Delirium was further classified as reversed (resolved prior to death or discharge) or terminal (continued until death) based on chart notations subsequent to clinical interviews. Cognitive status was evaluated daily.

Pain

Patients were classified as having pain on any day that the notes indicated that the person was in pain. Multiple notations of pain on the same day were scored as one day in pain. Similar rubrics were used to code “unable to judge pain” and “no pain.” All notes made by nurses or physicians describing pain assessment, characteristics, and behavioral expressions were extracted. This study was approved by the University Health Network Research Ethics Board.

Data Analysis

Prior to analysis of the outcomes of interest, comparisons between the two abstractors on all variables were conducted using *t* tests for continuous variables and chi-square tests for categorical variables to assess consistency of abstraction and identify any systematic abstractor bias. There were no differences between the abstractors on any variable; therefore, all subsequent analyses were conducted pooling across abstractors.

Participant Demographic and Medical Data

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies) were calculated for the demographic and medical variables. The prevalence of delirium, its subtypes, and outcomes were calculated.

Pain and Delirium

Content analyses of the clinical notations were undertaken to identify the rates of charting pain, ability

to judge pain, pain assessment strategies employed, and behavioral indicators of pain. The relationship between assessment strategy employed (e.g., patient self-report vs. behavioral observation by an HCW) and pain judgment was assessed using chi-square tests. Pain-related notations were compared across patients with different delirium subtypes and outcomes.

RESULTS

Participants

During the 1-year review period, 169 patients above the age of 65 years were admitted to the Lederman Palliative Care Centre. Twenty (11.8%) were excluded due to missing or incomplete information on cognitive status, and 36 (21.3%) were excluded because the patients did not experience delirium during their admission. Therefore, this paper reports on 113 (66.9%) patients who were diagnosed with delirium (Table 1). The average age was 75.5 ± 6.8 years (range: 65–91 years), and 47.8% were women. A quarter of the patients had delirium on the first day of admission, and the majority had onset within three days. Hypoactive delirium was most common, though hyperactive and mixed presentations were also seen. Most of the patients experienced terminal delirium and died during the admission.

Chart Notation Content Analysis

Clinical notes from 804 admission days were abstracted. On 38 days (4.7%), there were no chart notations about pain. On 58 (7.2%) days, HCWs recorded being unable to assess pain or that the patient was unresponsive. Therefore, 708 assessment days were available for content analyses. Three (0.4%) notes indicated that a family member had reported that the patient was in pain. Information regarding how family members made this judgment or HCWs verified it was not recorded. On a large majority of days (86%, 609/708), assessment was based on patient self-report (e.g., patient “denies,” “reports,” or “does not complain” of pain). On the remaining 13.6% (96/708) of assessment days, observational pain cues guided HCW decisions.

Grouping self-report and observational assessments together, it was more likely for the notes to indicate that patients were experiencing pain than that they were not in pain (61.8 vs. 38.2%, $p \leq 0.0001$). This was maintained when considering self-report and behavioral observation separately (Table 2). However, assessments based on observation were more likely than those based on patient self-report to indicate the patient was in pain (78.1 vs. 59.3%, $p \leq 0.0001$; Table 2).

Table 1. Patient characteristics

Characteristic	
<i>N</i>	113
Age (mean \pm <i>SD</i>)	75.52 \pm 6.83 (range: 65–91 years)
Gender (Female)	54 (47.8%)
Marital status	
Married/cohabitating	73 (64.6%)
Widowed	25 (22.1%)
Single	8 (7.1%)
Divorced/separated	4 (3.5%)
Missing	3 (2.7%)
Ethnicity	
White	44 (38.9%)
Asian	11 (9.7%)
Missing	58 (51.3%)
Cognitive status at admission	
Cognitively intact	77 (68.1%)
Cognitively impaired	28 (24.8%)
Missing	8 (7.1%)
Patient admitted from	
Home	92 (81.4%)
Other hospital	10 (8.8%)
Unit within hospital	7 (6.2%)
Long-term care setting	2 (1.8%)
Missing	2 (1.8%)
Delirium subtype	
Hypoactive	70 (61.9%)
Hyperactive	25 (22.1%)
Mixed	18 (15.9%)
Number of comorbidities (mean \pm <i>SD</i>)	2.56 \pm 1.38 (range: 0–6)
Painful comorbidity	38 (33.6%)
Months since diagnosis (median)	21 (range: 1–324)
Length of admission (median)	8 (range: 1–29 days)
Highest analgesic class	
Opioid \pm nonopioid	87 (77.0%)
Nonopioid only	9 (8.0%)
No analgesic	17 (15.0%)
Disposition	
Died during admission	92 (81.4%)
Discharged home	16 (14.2%)
Transferred to another facility	5 (4.4%)

Examination of pain judgments based on behavioral observation revealed two major assessment strategies: observation of spontaneous behaviors (67.7%, 65/96) and observation of behaviors elicited by potentially painful experiences, such as repositioning or movement (32.3%, 31/96; Table 3). In 42.7% of observational assessments, HCWs did not record the specific cues used to determine the presence of pain. Instead, they wrote general behavioral impres-

sions, such as “no obvious sign of pain” or “looks comfortable” or simply noted that the patient had “pain with repositioning” or “reacts to painful stimuli.”

Specific behavioral pain cues were described in 57.3% of observational assessments and were equally likely whether behaviors were spontaneous or elicited. For both types of assessment, the most common behavioral signs recorded were vocalizations, such as “moaning” or “groaning” (65.5%), and the facial expression “grimacing” (27.3%). See Table 3 for details on specific pain cues. Observational cues did not differ by delirium subtype or outcome.

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine HCWs’ judgments about pain in older cancer patients with delirium on each day of admission to an acute palliative care unit. We found that the judgments were based primarily on self-report when patients were able to verbally communicate, and on observation of behavioral cues, such as vocalizations and facial expressions, when patients could not verbally self-report. Both spontaneous behaviors and those exhibited during potentially painful experiences, such as repositioning or movement, were considered in assessments. These strategies did not differ by delirium subtype or outcome and were consistent with clinical guidelines (Herr et al., 2006b) regarding pain judgments in other nonverbal populations.

Consistent with our previous studies in the palliative care setting (Cheung et al., 2011), most of the patients were judged to have pain at some point during their admission. Presence of pain did not differ by delirium subtype. Interestingly, Bruera et al. (1992) reported differences in nurses’ pain intensity ratings by delirium subtype, with more intense pain attributed to patients with than those without agitation. However, their study is not directly comparable to the present one, as different aspects of pain were examined. Bruera et al. (1992) examined HCWs’ judgments of pain intensity, whereas we examined their judgments of presence or absence of pain. It is possible that the strategies used to judge these aspects of pain differ (Chang et al., 2011; Martel et al., 2011). Therefore, these seemingly discrepant results may reflect the assessment of different pain-related constructs. The cognitive strategies used to assess different pain characteristics is an important area for future research.

We found that, when judging the presence of pain, the most common strategy was to elicit patient self-report. However, the validity and reliability of self-reports for this patient population have not been established. A small study of intensive care unit patients suggested that, even when verbal

Table 2. Pain judgment by assessment strategy or informant

HCW Judgment	Assessment Strategy		
	Patient Self-Report ^a (<i>n</i> = 609)	Behavioral Observation ^a (<i>n</i> = 96)	Total ^a (<i>n</i> = 705)
Patient has pain (days)	361 (59.3%)	75 (78.1%) ^b	436 (61.8%)
Patient does not have pain (days)	248 (40.7%)	21 (21.9%)	269 (38.2%)

^a $p \leq 0.0001$ for column-wise comparisons; ^b $p \leq 0.0001$ for comparison across assessment strategies.

ability was preserved, the rate of symptom reporting decreased during delirium, possibly challenging reliance on self-report (Tate et al., 2013). Comparable data from the palliative care setting are not currently available. The ability of people with other types of cognitive impairment to verbally self-report pain has received more research attention and debate. For instance, among older people with mild dementia, there is some evidence that training and simplified protocols can lead to reliable self-report (Chibnall & Tait, 2001), but there is also evidence of poor reliability and considerable difficulties with self-report (Feldt et al., 1998). In our study, self-reports were more likely to indicate that patients were in pain than free from pain, consistent with the high prevalence of pain documented in cognitively intact palliative care populations (Cheung et al., 2011). This may indirectly support the validity of these self-reports. However, the prevalence was lower than that detected by behavioral observation. While this may suggest that behavioral observation is more sensitive for this group, it may also reflect poor specificity, in particular the difficulties differen-

tiating pain from symptoms of delirium. Unfortunately, the lack of chart notations describing how self-reports were obtained limits conclusions. The feasibility and psychometric properties of self-report pain scales for cancer patients with delirium remain to be evaluated.

When patients were unable to provide verbal self-reports, HCWs relied on behavioral cues, particularly vocalizations and facial expressions, to judge pain. Although the primacy of vocalizations and facial expressions is consistent with the literature on other patients with impaired ability to report pain verbally (Herr et al., 2006b), the validity and reliability of these cues for this particular group of patients has not been established. This is critical, given the potential for behavioral overlap. For instance, patients may exhibit the same behaviors, such as grimacing and yelling, because of delirium, pain, or both (Bruera et al., 1992). This overlap has important implications for symptom identification and management, including the potential risk of misattribution of symptoms (Breitbart & Alici, 2008; Partridge et al., 2013). The chart notations were silent on how

Table 3. Pain cues by type of behavioral observation

Pain Cue	Observation of Spontaneous Behavior (<i>n</i> = 65)	Observation of Behavior in Response to Potentially Painful Experience (<i>n</i> = 31)	Total (<i>n</i> = 96)
Specific cue not described	27 (41.5 %)	14 (45.2%)	41 (42.7%)
Specific cues described	38 (58.5%)	17 (54.8%)	55 (57.3%)
Vocalizations			
Moans/groans	25 (65.8%)	11 (64.7%)	36 (65.5%)
Cries out	–	1 (5.9%)	1 (1.8%)
Facial expression			
Grimaces	10 (26.3%)	5 (29.4%)	15 (27.3%)
Winces	1 (2.6%)	–	1 (1.8 %)
Actions			
Holds a body part	1 (2.6%)	–	1 (1.8%)
Clenches fists	1 (2.6%)	–	1 (1.8%)

For the rows, “specific cues described” and “specific cues not described,” the denominator is the *n* for that column. For the three subcategories “vocalizations,” “facial expressions,” and “actions,” the denominator is that column’s value for “specific cues described.”

HCWs disentangled these overlapping behavioral presentations. Prospective research examining the cognitive processes HCWs use to make these important clinical distinctions would provide essential information for the development of a standardized assessment protocol that could be used with this population.

An important finding was that, despite the lack of such a protocol, HCWs assessed both spontaneous and evoked pain, with the same pain cues (grimacing and moaning/groaning) most commonly described for both. This reflects the well-known distinction between background and incident pain in cancer patients (Breivik et al., 2009; Haugen et al., 2010). It also suggests that HCWs were taking a proactive, hypothesis-testing approach to pain assessment. It is tempting to conclude that behaviors elicited during a potentially painful experience are due to pain, but the validity of this conclusion can be challenged. It is also possible that the potentially painful experience increases agitation or anxiety, whose behavioral expression is misattributed to pain. Nonetheless, consideration of evoked pain is critical, and an effective and clinically useful assessment protocol for these patients must capture and differentiate these two types of pain.

The development of such a protocol will depend on research focused specifically on pain in older cancer patients with delirium. It is not appropriate to generalize from other cognitively impaired groups because clinical differences between them may impact on behavior in unique ways (Herr et al., 2006b). For instance, acute cognitive dysfunction, advanced cancer, impending death, high symptom burden, and polypharmacy, which characterize older palliative care inpatients (van Lancker & van Hecke, 2014), may impact on pain behaviors in ways that are not comparable to older people with dementia in a long-term care setting. Consistent with this, observational pain scales developed for older people with dementia in a long-term care setting have been shown to perform poorly when used with older people with comorbid dementia and delirium (Hadjistavropoulos et al., 2008). Similarly, pain assessment tools developed for people with delirium in the postoperative (Feldt, 2000) or intensive care (Gelin et al., 2006) setting may be limited in applicability. These measures do not consider delirium subtypes and outcomes, the interpretation of nonspecific behavioral cues, or the differentiation of evoked from background pain. Furthermore, it is increasingly recognized that delirium may have different pathophysiology and symptom presentation across patient populations, also limiting generalizations (Leonard et al., 2008; Mittal et al., 2011; Vasilevskis et al., 2012). As such, research into cancer pain

assessment in older people in the palliative care setting is urgently needed.

Although it is preliminary, our study provides novel information regarding judging pain in this group of patients and is an important first step in the development of a standardized pain assessment protocol. However, the results must be interpreted in light of a number of limitations. Chief among them is that the data are based solely on review of HCWs' chart notations, which may be incomplete or inaccurate (Wu & Ashton, 1997). We took several steps to maximize the rigor of our chart abstraction, including training data abstractors, using a standardized abstraction protocol, and discussing ambiguous notes or situations (Wu & Ashton, 1997; Gearing et al., 2006). Importantly, chart review may have been particularly suitable for our objectives, as it provides rich naturalistic source data about HCWs' practices in a nonselected sample of patients free of response biases that may operate in the context of a research study (Wu & Ashton, 1997; Gearing et al., 2006). In particular, HCWs made their notations without knowledge of their future use in research about pain.

A related limitation is that the study took place in a single, highly specialized, acute palliative care unit with a relatively small sample size, possibly threatening the generalizability of the results. This may be especially relevant to our finding of consistency of pain cues and assessment strategies across delirium subtypes, as relatively few cases of hyperactive and mixed delirium were included in the analysis, and the diagnosis of delirium was based on clinical interview rather than a standardized measure. However, our findings regarding the prevalence of delirium, its subtypes, and its outcomes are consistent with larger studies designed to systematically evaluate these issues (LeGrand, 2012). This supports the representativeness of our sample and increases confidence in our findings. Nonetheless, replication in larger and more diverse clinical settings is welcome.

The key conclusion from this study is that HCWs routinely made judgments about pain in older patients with delirium using a repertoire of strategies that included patient self-report and observation of spontaneous and evoked behavior. Using these strategies, HCWs judged pain to be highly prevalent in the palliative care inpatient setting. Given these findings, it is critical that research and clinical attention be brought to the careful development of a valid, reliable, and clinically feasible assessment protocol. Improved pain assessment will contribute to enhanced pain management as well as improved quality of life and better death and dying in this especially vulnerable group of patients.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank the members of the Cancer Pain Research Unit Writing Seminar for valuable feedback on earlier drafts of this manuscript.

DISCLOSURES

This project was supported by an operating grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (MOP-230863) to Lucia Gagliese. Rebecca Rodin was supported by a research studentship from the Government of Ontario Summer Experience Program. There are no conflicts of interest to declare. The funding sources had no role in study design; in the collection, analysis, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the article for publication.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association (APA). (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, 4th ed. (DSM-IV). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Boettger, S. & Breitbart, W. (2011). Phenomenology of the subtypes of delirium: Phenomenological differences between hyperactive and hypoactive delirium. *Palliative & Supportive Care*, 9(2), 129–135.
- Breitbart, W. & Alici, Y. (2008). Agitation and delirium at the end of life: “We couldn’t manage him.” *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 300(24), 2898–2910.
- Breitbart, W. & Strout, D. (2000). Delirium in the terminally ill. *Clinics in Geriatric Medicine*, 16(2), 357–372.
- Breitbart, W., Gibson, C. & Tremblay, A. (2002). The delirium experience: Delirium recall and delirium-related distress in hospitalized patients with cancer, their spouses/caregivers, and their nurses. *Psychosomatics*, 43(3), 183–194.
- Breivik, H., Cherny, N., Collett, B., et al. (2009). Cancer-related pain: A pan-European survey of prevalence, treatment, and patient attitudes. *Annals of Oncology*, 20(8), 1420–1433.
- Bruera, E., Fainsinger, R.L., Miller, M.J., et al. (1992). The assessment of pain intensity in patients with cognitive failure: A preliminary report. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 7(5), 267.
- Bryson, J., Coe, G., Swami, N., et al. (2010). Administrative outcomes five years after opening an acute palliative care unit at a comprehensive cancer center. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*, 13(5), 559–565.
- Caltagirone, C., Spoletini, I., Gianni, W., et al. (2010). Inadequate pain relief and consequences in oncological elderly patients. *Surgical Oncology*, 19(3), 178–183.
- Canadian Cancer Society’s Steering Committee (2010). *Canadian cancer statistics 2010*. Toronto: Canadian Cancer Society.
- Chang, S.O., Oh, Y., Park, E.Y., et al. (2011). Concept analysis of nurses’ identification of pain in demented patients in a nursing home: Development of a hybrid model. *Pain Management Nursing*, 12(2), 61–69.
- Cheung, W.Y., Le, L.W., Gagliese, L., et al. (2011). Age and gender differences in symptom intensity and symptom clusters among patients with metastatic cancer. *Supportive Care in Cancer*, 19(3), 417–423.
- Chibnall, J.T. & Tait, R.C. (2001). Pain assessment in cognitively impaired and unimpaired older adults: A comparison of four scales. *Pain*, 92(1–2), 173–186.
- Crews, D.E. (2007). Senescence, aging, and disease. *Journal of Physiological Anthropology*, 26(3), 365–372.
- Feldt, K.S. (2000). The Checklist of Nonverbal Pain Indicators (CNPI). *Pain Management Nursing*, 1(1), 13.
- Feldt, K.S., Ryden, M.B. & Miles, S. (1998). Treatment of pain in cognitively impaired compared with cognitively intact older patients with hip fracture. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 46, 1079–1085.
- Gagnon, B., Lawlor, P.G., Mancini, I.L., et al. (2001). The impact of delirium on the circadian distribution of breakthrough analgesia in advanced cancer patients. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 22(4), 826–833.
- Gearing, R.E., Mian, I.A., Barber, J., et al. (2006). A methodology for conducting retrospective chart review research in child and adolescent psychiatry. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 15(3), 126–34.
- Gelinas, C., Fillion, L., Puntillo, K.A., et al. (2006). Validation of the Critical-Care Pain Observation Tool in adult patients. *American Journal of Critical Care*, 15(4), 420–427.
- Hadjistavropoulos, T., Voyer, P., Sharpe, D., et al. (2008). Assessing pain in dementia patients with comorbid delirium and/or depression. *Pain Management Nursing*, 9(2), 48–54.
- Hadjistavropoulos, T., Breau, L.M. & Craig, K.D. (2011). Assessment of pain in adults and children with limited ability to communicate. In *Handbook of pain assessment*. D.C. Turk & R. Melzack (eds.), pp. 280–542. New York: Guilford Press.
- Haugen, D.F., Hjermstad, M.J., Hagen, N., et al. (2010). Assessment and classification of cancer breakthrough pain: A systematic literature review. *Pain*, 149(3), 476–482.
- Herr, K., Bjoro, K. & Decker, S. (2006a). Tools for assessment of pain in nonverbal older adults with dementia: A state-of-the-science review. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 31(2), 170–192.
- Herr, K., Coyne, P.J., Key, T., et al. (2006b). Pain assessment in the nonverbal patient: Position statement with clinical practice recommendations. *Pain Management Nursing*, 7(2), 44–52.
- Husebo, B.S., Ballard, C. & Aarsland, D. (2011). Pain treatment of agitation in patients with dementia: A systematic review. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 26(10), 1012–1018.
- Jadad, A.R. & Browman, G.P. (1995). The WHO analgesic ladder for cancer pain management. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 274(23), 1870.
- Kehl, K.A. & Kowalkowski, J.A. (2013). A systematic review of the prevalence of signs of impending death and symptoms in the last two weeks of life. *The American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Care*, 30(6), 601–616.
- Lawlor, P.G., Gagnon, B., Mancini, I.L., et al. (2000). Occurrence, causes, and outcome of delirium in patients with advanced cancer: A prospective study. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 160(6), 786–794.
- LeGrand, S.B. (2012). Delirium in palliative medicine: A review. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 44(4), 583–594.

- Leonard, M., Agar, M., Mason, C., et al. (2008). Delirium issues in palliative care settings. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 65(3), 289–298.
- Martel, M.O., Thibault, P. & Sullivan, M.J.L. (2011). Judgments about pain intensity and pain genuineness: The role of pain behavior and judgmental heuristics. *The Journal of Pain*, 12(4), 468–475.
- Merskey, H. & Bogduk, N. (1994). *Classification of chronic pain: Descriptions of chronic pain syndromes and definitions of pain terms*. Seattle: International Association for the Study of Pain Press.
- Mittal, V., Muralee, S., Williamson, D., et al. (2011). Delirium in the elderly: A comprehensive review. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementias*, 26(2), 97–109.
- Partridge, J.S.L., Martin, F.C., Harari, D., et al. (2013). The delirium experience: What is the effect on patients, relatives and staff and what can be done to modify this? *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 28(8), 804–812.
- Statistics Canada (2011). *Age and sex structure: Canada, provinces and territories, 2010*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 91-209-X. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Tait, R.C., Chibnall, J.T. & Kalauokalani, D. (2009). Provider judgments of patients in pain: Seeking symptom certainty. *Pain Medicine*, 10(1), 11–34.
- Tate, J.A., Sereika, S., Divirgilio, D., et al. (2013). Symptom communication during critical illness: the impact of age, delirium, and delirium presentation. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*, 39(8), 28–38.
- van Lancker, A., Velghe, A., van Hecke, A., et al. (2014). Prevalence of symptoms in older cancer patients receiving palliative care: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 47(1), 90–104.
- Vasilevskis, E.E., Han, J.H., Hughes, C.G., et al. (2012). Epidemiology and risk factors for delirium across hospital settings. *Best Practice & Research. Clinical Anaesthesiology*, 26(3), 277–287.
- Wandner, L.D., Heft, M.W., Lok, B.C., et al. (2014). The impact of patients' gender, race, and age on health care professionals' pain management decisions: An online survey using virtual human technology. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 51(5), 726–733.
- Wu, L. & Ashton, C.M. (1997). Chart review: A need for reappraisal. *Evaluation & The Health Professions*, 20(2), 146–163.
- Yennurajalingam, S., Braiteh, F. & Bruera, E. (2005). Pain and terminal delirium research in the elderly. *Clinics in Geriatric Medicine*, 21(1), 93–119.