

Gold Coast Health Building a healthier community | Griffith UNIVERSITY | MENZIES HEALTH INSTITUTE | RECOVER INJURY RESEARCH CENTRE | CENTRE OF RESEARCH EXCELLENCE IN RECOVERY FOLLOWING ROAD TRAFFIC INJURIES

### Targeting pro-nociceptive mechanisms to prevent chronic pain after whiplash injury - a randomised controlled trial (ACTRN12617000059369)

**Investigators:**  
 Prof Michele Sterling, MHIQ, Griffith University – physio, expert on whiplash injury  
 Prof Stephan Schug, UWA – anaesthetist & acute pain specialist  
 Prof Geoff Mitchell, UQ – GP & primary care  
 Prof Sam McLean, Uni North Carolina, USA – ED Doctor  
 Prof Luke Connelly, UQ – health economist  
 Prof Steve Gibson, Uni Melb – psychologist  
 Prof Rob Ware, GU – biostatistician  
 Dr Jane Nikles, MHIQ – GP researcher  
 Dr Gerben Keijzers, GCUH – ED doctor  
 Dr J Leou, GCUH – Intern  
 Dr Scott Farrell, MHIQ, Griffith Uni - physio

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Whiplash Associated Disorders

- MSK disorders are the second most common cause of disability worldwide, measured by years lived with disability (YLDs). LBP – 1<sup>st</sup>; neck pain – 4<sup>th</sup> (Global Burden of Disease Study, 2010)
- Whiplash is costly – greater costs than SCI and TBI (MAIC, 2012)
- 50% of people don't recover – have chronic pain & disability (Sterling et al 2005, 2010, 2011)
- Most recovery if it occurs takes place in the first 2-3 months (Sterling et al 2005, 2010, 2011)
- Current treatments aren't very effective – advice/exercise/activity
- Initial pain levels are the strongest predictor of poor outcome – strong evidence – 5 systematic reviews
- The early presence of pro-nociception is predictive of poor recovery – moderate evidence (Goldsmith et al 2012; Sterling et al 2012)
- There have been NO high quality medication trials conducted

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

IASP [www.iasp.com/locate/iasp](http://www.iasp.com/locate/iasp)

Compensation claim lodgement and health outcome developmental trajectories following whiplash injury: A prospective study  
 Michele Sterling<sup>a,\*</sup>, Joan Hendrickz<sup>b</sup>, Justin Kenardy<sup>b</sup>

\*Centre for National Research in Disability and Rehabilitation Medicine (CONRD), Centre for Clinical Excellence in Spinal Pain, Hip and Health, Division of Physiotherapy, The University of Queensland, Australia  
<sup>b</sup>Centre for National Research in Disability and Rehabilitation Medicine (CONRD), The University of Queensland, Australia

Month	Chronic severe (16%)	Moderate (39%)	Mild (45%)
1	65	40	20
2	60	35	18
3	55	32	16
4	52	30	15
5	51	29	14
6	50	28	13
7	50	28	13
8	50	28	13
9	50	28	13
10	50	28	13
11	50	28	13
12	50	28	13
13	50	28	13

2-3 months important

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Why Pregabalin?

- Pregabalin acts to block the development of central sensitisation
- Shows promise to prevent chronic post-surgical pain (Clarke et al, 2012; Mishriky et al, 2015; Eipe et al, 2015)
- Has effects on anxiety
  
- Use of opioids is a concern
  - Can cause hyperalgesia
  - Opioids at the time of traumatic stress such as a road traffic injury worsen pain outcomes (Beaudoin et al, 2017)
  - Potential for misuse

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Why do this study?

- *Can pregabalin, if given early in acute whiplash, prevent chronic pain that develops in 50% of people after a whiplash injury?*
- Enormous implications for health outcomes, costs, productivity etc.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Hypotheses

Can pregabalin prevent the development of chronic pain after whiplash injury?

Hypotheses:

1. Pregabalin and evidence-based advice will be more effective than placebo and the same advice in reducing neck pain intensity.
2. Pregabalin and evidence-based advice will be more effective than placebo and the same advice in reducing disability, depression, posttraumatic stress symptoms, pain catastrophizing and pro-nociception.
3. Pregabalin and advice will be cost-effective

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Methodology

Double blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial comparing

- *pregabalin and evidence-based advice* (intervention) to
  - *placebo and evidence-based advice* (control) for patients with neck pain and VAS of 5 or more.
- Intervention will commence within 12 hours of injury and continue for 5 weeks – monitored by trial GP



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Interventions

#### Active group

- Pregabalin 5 weeks
- Initial dose of 75 mg (x 2 day) titrated over 28 days based on patient response and then weaned (up to max 300mg – 2xday)
- Advice booklet

#### Control group

- Placebo at same dose titration based on response
- Advice booklet



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Inclusion Criteria

- Individuals with neck pain and decreased range of motion and tenderness (WAD II) following road traffic crash
- VAS  $\geq$  5/10 on arrival without fractures or neurological compromise
- Age 18-65
- Proficient in written and spoken English

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Exclusion Criteria

- Known or suspected serious spinal pathology
- Confirmed fracture or dislocation at the time of the injury (WAD IV)
- WAD III (neurological compromise)
- Previous whiplash injury or neck pain condition requiring treatment
- Patient Health Questionnaire-2 score of 3 or more
- Patients using gabapentin/pregabalin
- Patients with known peripheral neuropathy
- Known sensitivity to pregabalin use
- History of renal insufficiency
- Women who are pregnant or breast feeding
- History of psychiatric illness or substance abuse
- Inability to speak or write in English

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Outcome measurement

- Will be performed by blinded assessor
- Primary Outcome**
- neck pain intensity (NRS) at 3 months post randomization
- Secondary Outcomes:**
- Neck Disability Index
  - Pain Catastrophising Scale
  - Posttraumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale
  - DASS
  - Measures of pro-nociception - conditioned pain modulation, temporal summation
  - S-LANSS
  - SF-12\*
  - Proportion of participants who lodge a claim
- Follow-ups:** 5 weeks, 6 & 12 months

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Sample size : The primary outcome is change in neck pain intensity at 3 months post randomisation. A sample size of 180 participants (90/group) will provide 90% power to detect a difference of 1.5 out of 10 units of pain on the NRS, assuming a standard deviation of 2.5, at 5% type 1 error level, and allowing for the possibility of dropout of 30%. We have based the sample-size calculation on a between-group difference of 1.5/10 on the NRS on IMMPACT recommendations for clinical trials of chronic pain prevention

Data analysis: Intention to treat, blinded statistician, linear mixed models

Economic analysis: MBS, PBS and diary data, Sf-12

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Progress to date

- Trial registered
- Protocol publication near finalisation
- ANZMusc review for NHMRC submission
- Ethics, procedures, protocols established at GCUH
- Trial commenced GCUH
- Ipswich Hospital to be added soon

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Issues to date:

Issue	Plan
Recruitment	Add additional site/s – Ipswich, elsewhere
Patient after hours/weekend presentations	Funding issue, some funding for nurses/physios to identify patients Pay/patient RA flexibility with hours
Declined consent – don't want drugs	Intern doctors to now employed to explain trial
Not meeting inclusion criteria	? Extend time frame post injury
Doctors onside	Doing ED audit of presentations In service talks – Sterling, McLean

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---