

Automated pain spots recognition algorithm provided by a web service-based platform

Corrado Cescon, Giuseppe Landolfi, Niko Bonomi, Marco Derboni, Vincenzo Giuffrida, Andrea Emilio Rizzoli, Paolo Maino, Eva Koetsier, Marco Barbero

Submitted to: JMIR mHealth and uHealth
on: September 26, 2023

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5

Supplementary Files..... 20

0..... 20

Figures 21

Figure 1..... 22

Figure 2..... 23

Figure 3..... 24

Figure 4..... 25

Figure 5..... 26

Figure 6..... 27

Figure 7..... 28

Automated pain spots recognition algorithm provided by a web service-based platform

Corrado Cescon¹ PhD; Giuseppe Landolfi²; Niko Bonomi²; Marco Derboni³; Vincenzo Giuffrida³; Andrea Emilio Rizzoli³; Paolo Maino⁴; Eva Koetsier⁴; Marco Barbero¹

¹University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland Department of Business Economics, Health and Social Care Rehabilitation Research Laboratory 2rLab Manno CH

²Institute of Systems and Technologies for Sustainable Production, ISTEPS Lugano CH

³Dalle Molle Institute for Artificial Intelligence IDSIA, USI-SUPSI Lugano CH

⁴Pain Management Center, Neurocenter of Southern Switzerland Division of Anaesthesiology, Department of Acute Medicine Regional Hospital of Lugano Lugano CH

Corresponding Author:

Corrado Cescon PhD

University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland

Department of Business Economics, Health and Social Care

Rehabilitation Research Laboratory 2rLab

Via Violino 11

Manno

CH

Abstract

Background: Understanding the causes and mechanisms underlying musculoskeletal pain is crucial for developing effective treatments and improving patient outcomes. Self-report measures, such as the Pain Drawing Scale, involve individuals rating their level of pain on a scale. In this technique, individuals color the area where they experience pain, and the resulting picture is rated based on the depicted pain intensity. Analyzing pain drawings typically involves measuring the size of the pain region. However, there is currently no standardized method for scanning pain drawings.

Objective: The objective of this study was to evaluate the accuracy of pain drawing analysis performed by a web platform using various digital scanners. The primary goal was to demonstrate that simple and affordable mobile devices can be used to acquire pain drawings without losing important information.

Methods: Two sets of pain drawings were generated: one with the addition of 216 colored circles, and another composed of various red shapes. These drawings were then scanned using different devices and apps, including three flatbed scanners of different sizes and prices (professional, portable flatbed, and home printer/scanner), three smartphones with varying price ranges, and six virtual scanner apps.

Results: High saturation colors, such as red, cyan, magenta, and yellow, were accurately identified by all devices. The percentage error for small, medium, and large pain spots was consistently below 20% for all devices, with smaller values associated with larger areas. Additionally, a significant negative correlation was observed between the percentage of error and spot size ($R=-0.237$, $p<0.05$).

Conclusions: The proposed platform proved to be robust and reliable for acquiring paper pain drawings using a wide range of scanning devices. In conclusion, this study demonstrates that a web platform can accurately analyze pain drawings acquired through various digital scanners. The findings support the use of simple and cost-effective mobile devices for pain drawing acquisition, without compromising the quality of data. Standardizing the scanning process using the proposed platform can contribute to more efficient and consistent pain drawing analysis in clinical and research settings.

(JMIR Preprints 26/09/2023:53119)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.53119>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.
Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/preprint/53119>



Original Manuscript

TITLE PAGE

Automated pain spots recognition algorithm provided by a web service-based platform.

Corrado Cescon^{1*}, Giuseppe Landolfi², Niko Bonomi², Marco Derboni³, Vincenzo Giuffrida³, Andrea Emilio Rizzoli³, Paolo Maino⁴, Eva Koetsier⁴, and Marco Barbero¹

¹ Rehabilitation Research Laboratory 2rLab, Department of Business Economics, Health and Social Care, University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland, Manno, Switzerland. ² Institute of Systems and Technologies for Sustainable Production, ISTEPS, SUPSI, Lugano, Switzerland. ³ Dalle Molle Institute for Artificial Intelligence, IDSIA, USI-SUPSI, Lugano, Switzerland, ⁴ Pain Management Center, Neurocenter of Southern Switzerland. Division of Anaesthesiology, Department of Acute Medicine, Regional Hospital of Lugano, Switzerland.

Running title: Validation of pain drawing analysis.

Corresponding author:

*Corrado Cescon, Ph.D.

Rehabilitation Research Laboratory 2rLab, Department of Business Economics, Health and Social Care, University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland, Stabile Piazzetta, Via Violino, CH-6928 Manno, Switzerland

T +41 (0)58 666 64 42; e-mail: corrado.cescon@supsi.ch

Keywords: pain drawing, image processing, body charts, scan.

CRedit author statement: Corrado Cescon: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Data curation, Writing- Original draft preparation. Giuseppe Landolfi: Software, Validation. Niko Bonomi: Visualization, Investigation. Vincenzo Giuffrida: Investigation. Marco Derboni: Data Curation. Eva Koetsier: Writing - Review & Editing. Paolo Maino: Supervision. Andrea Emilio Rizzoli: Project administration. Marco Barbero: Conceptualization Funding acquisition Writing-Reviewing and Editing.

ABSTRACT

Background

Understanding the causes and mechanisms underlying musculoskeletal pain is crucial for developing effective treatments and improving patient outcomes. Self-report measures, such as the Pain Drawing Scale, involve individuals rating their level of pain on a scale. In this technique, individuals color the area where they experience pain, and the resulting picture is rated based on the depicted pain intensity. Analyzing pain drawings typically involves measuring the size of the pain region. There are several studies focusing on assessing the clinical utility of PDs, and now, with the introduction of digital PDs, the usability and reliability of these platforms needed validation. Comparative studies between traditional and digital PDs have shown good agreement and reliability. The evolution of PD acquisition over the last two decades mirrors the commercialization of digital technologies. However, the pen-on-paper approach seems to be more accepted by patients but there is currently no standardized method for scanning pain drawings.

Objectives

The objective of this study was to evaluate the accuracy of pain drawing analysis performed by a web platform using various digital scanners. The primary goal was to demonstrate that simple and affordable mobile devices can be used to acquire pain drawings without losing important information.

Methods

Two sets of pain drawings were generated: one with the addition of 216 colored circles, and another composed of various red shapes, distributed randomly on a frontal view body chart of an adult male. These drawings were then printed in color on A4 sheets including QR codes at the corners in order to allow automatic alignment and subsequently scanned using different devices and apps. The scanners used were both flatbed scanners of different sizes and prices (professional, portable flatbed, and home printer/scanner), and smartphones with varying price ranges, and six virtual scanner apps. The acquisitions were made under normal light conditions by the same operator.

Results

High saturation colors, such as red, cyan, magenta, and yellow, were accurately identified by all devices. The percentage error for small, medium, and large pain spots was consistently below 20% for all devices, with smaller values associated with larger areas. Additionally, a significant negative correlation was observed between the percentage of error and spot size ($R=-0.237$, $P=0.0402$). The proposed platform proved to be robust and reliable for acquiring paper pain drawings using a wide range of scanning devices. In conclusion, this study demonstrates that a web platform can accurately analyze pain drawings acquired through various digital scanners.

Conclusions

The findings support the use of simple and cost-effective mobile devices for pain drawing acquisition, without compromising the quality of data. Standardizing the scanning process using the proposed platform can contribute to more efficient and consistent pain drawing analysis in clinical and research settings.

INTRODUCTION

Musculoskeletal pain is a frequent problem that affects a significant portion of the population and can have a major impact on quality of life [1]. Understanding the causes and mechanisms underlying musculoskeletal pain is crucial for the development of effective treatments and enhancement of patient outcomes. Moreover, investigating musculoskeletal pain contributes to the advancement of our understanding of anatomy, physiology, and pain mechanisms, with potential implications for comprehending and managing pain [2,3].

There are several methods for measuring muscle pain, including self-report measures, behavioral measures, and physiological measures [4]. Self-report measures involve asking the person to rate their level of pain on a scale, such as the Visual Analog Scale or the Numeric Rating Scale [5]. A promising way of evaluating pain using drawings is known as the Pain Drawing Scale [6–10].

Digital technologies have had a significant influence on the evolution of PDs, with different applications in the field of medical apps [11].

The fields of application of pain drawings range from diagnosis of low back pain disorders, paresthesias evoked by implanted neurological stimulators, depiction of orofacial pain, such as

headaches and toothaches, evaluation of users of electric wheelchairs with pain located in back, and buttocks region, etc.

Body charts can also illustrate other types of sensory experiences such as numbness, tingling, hypoesthesia, or allodynia [12].

While digitally acquired PDs offer advantages, many studies demonstrate sophisticated analyses of scanned or digitized pen-and-paper PDs, showcasing the versatility of digital image processing. This capability enables the digitization and analysis of extensive collections of pen-and-paper pain diagrams, making it adaptable to various settings and needs.

In this technique, the individuals are instructed to color the area where they are experiencing pain, and the picture is then rated on a scale based on the amount of pain depicted [13]. This can be a useful tool for measuring pain in individuals who have difficulty verbalizing their pain experience, such as young children or non-verbal individuals [14]. However, it is important to keep in mind that pain drawings can be subjective and may be influenced by factors such as the person's cultural background or level of education [15]. Pain drawings typically consist of body charts with different views of the human body (dorsal, ventral, side) or subportions (head, hand, etc.), and patients are instructed to color with a marker the area where they experience pain. The body charts can be divided in regions such as the Margolis regions [16]. This technique is used to describe and categorize the location of musculoskeletal pain in the body. The regions are based on anatomical divisions of the body, including neck, upper extremities, low back, and lower extremities [17].

The purpose of the Margolis regions is to provide a standardized and easily understood way to describe the location of musculoskeletal pain, which can help with diagnosis and treatment planning [18,19].

Pain drawings can be analyzed in a variety of ways, depending on the purpose of the analysis and the method used to create the drawings. The most common method of analyzing pain drawings is the measurement of the size of the pain region. This can be done using computer software or manual measurement techniques [20].

There are different software programs available for analyzing pain drawings [21–25]. These programs can be used to perform both qualitative and quantitative analyses of pain drawings, depending on the specific software and the features it offers [26]. Some researchers also introduced sex-specific body charts in order to facilitate the communication of pain for women [17,27,28].

Some of the features offered by pain analysis software may include: image digitization (allowing the conversion of traditional paper drawings into digital format for analysis), image scaling (allowing the adjustment of the size of the pain drawing to match a reference scale), image analysis (using algorithms to automatically identify and quantify features of the pain drawing, such as the size and shape of the pain region) and data visualization (displaying the results of the analysis in a clear and easy-to-understand format, such as graphs or heat maps).

Submitting paper pain drawings to patients is simpler compared to utilizing drawing applications running on tablets. Anyway, the use of pain drawings is not indicated in patients with vision impairment or in preschool children, although some studies investigated the application in teenagers. Being a self-assessed measure the patients should not have cognitive impairments, or diseases including misperception of their body.

While digital drawings can be easily edited and manipulated, and the tools available on a tablet can offer a wider range of color options and effects, paper pain drawings are largely used in clinical settings. This preference stems from the fact that many patients feel more comfortable using the pen-on-paper approach rather than digital devices [29–31].

There are different methods for scanning pain drawings: flatbed scanner: a device that scans flat, thin documents placed on a glass window; handheld scanner: a portable device that can scan images while being moved over them; drum scanner: a high-end scanner that uses a rotating cylinder to capture the image; multi-functional printer scanner: a printer that also includes a scanner function; virtual scanner: a software that can use a camera to scan images.

To date, there is no standardization in scanning pain drawings. The existing softwares for pain drawing acquisition work with specific body charts, and do not allow a direct comparison between using the same drawing. The aim of the present study was to evaluate the accuracy of pain drawing analysis performed by a web platform using different digital scanners. The objective of the present study was to demonstrate that simple and relatively cheap mobile devices can be used to acquire pain drawings without loss of information.

METHODS

Sketch Your Pain (SYP) Platform

The proposed analysis was performed using a web platform. The main features of this distributed web application (currently available on a local server [32]) are:

1. Knowledge-base management: the platform allows the collection of patient's data (biometric, pain history, applied therapies, diagnoses, etc.).
2. Pain drawing acquisition: pain drawings can be uploaded both digitally and from paper (see details in the following section).
3. Basic pain drawing analysis: each pain spot is analyzed individually (i.e.: number of pixels, barycenter, etc.).
4. Smart analysis services: the platform provides a plugin-based mechanism that allows the implementation of additional analysis within the platform. In this way researchers can apply specific innovative tools to the pain drawings stored in the database [33].

A paper pain drawing can be imported in two ways: A) digitally using the specific acquisition tool that allows to draw directly on the tablet using a digital pen on the touch screen (available on a local server [34]). B) manually as PDF file (the platform allows to download a PDF file including empty bodycharts including a unique QR code, which can be printed, filled manually using a color marker, and scanned as PDF file).

When the pain drawing is generated digitally, it is already aligned with the body charts, while for the paper drawings the process is more complex and can be summarized as follows. The body chart, and all related information, is identified thanks to the QR code including the information of protocol, subject ID, gender, and view of the body chart and stored in a database. The platform code and data are stored on a local server. The patient names and sensitive data are anonymized using codes that are only available to the operators.

The scanned image is aligned and cropped using the four markers at the corners as pivots (Figure 1A).




Figure 1. Pain spot detection process. a) the four markers at the corners and the QR code are identified. b) The pain drawing is aligned and scaled. c) The areas outside the body chart are removed. d) Pain drawings are separated from the background and eroded in order to correct the imperfections due to pen drawing. e) Pain spot contours are identified and small holes are removed. f) Each pain spot is analyzed to extract area and position.

The image is resized in order to have the same number of pixels of the body charts stored in the platform (i.e.: 2048x1536 pixels) (Figure 1B). The areas outside the body chart are removed using a mask image. This step also allows to remove all possible out-of-body staining errors (Figure 1C). The pain spots (that should be drawn in color and not in any shade of gray) are identified and isolated from the body chart by computing the standard deviation of each pixel (in this way the SD of black pixels [0,0,0] and white pixels [255,255,255] is equal to 0, while a red pixel [255,0,0] has a SD of 147.2). The optimal threshold for minimum SD (based on preliminary tests) that works best in extracting pain spots from the body chart with different conditions of light and colors is 25. In this way the color image is converted in a boolean matrix where ones correspond to pixels with pain. An algorithm for extrusion and subsequent erosion is applied to the boolean image in order to fill possible gaps that can happen when user is using a sharp marker (Figure 1D). All contours of the pain spots and the potential holes in them are identified by means of Canny edge detection algorithm [35]. The pain spots whose contours contain fewer than 20 points/pixels are removed. Likewise, the holes present in the spots, whose contours contain less than 15 points/pixels are removed. The pain spots smaller than 100 pixels are removed. Likewise, the holes smaller than 150 pixels are removed (Figure 1E). The individual pain spots are identified by an image segmentation algorithm, and for each spot the area in pixel and the coordinates of the centroid are computed. The final result of the process is shown in Figure 1F.

Generation of artificial pain drawings

For the present protocol, two sets of pain drawings were generated with a homemade Matlab code. We decided to test the platform using artificial pain drawings in order to have complete control of the process and of the analysis. For each of the pain spots generated randomly we have information of pain location (barycenter of the pain spot), area in square pixel, shade of color in RGB scale, and with these data we could assess the performance of each of the scanning devices. A preliminary study was conducted on the platform using different scanning devices on pain drawing of real patients with similar results [36].

The body chart selected was male frontal, representing the contours of a male full body in frontal view with dimensions 1536x2048 pixels.

Color analysis

The first artificial pain drawing was generated adding 216 colored circles of 33 pixels diameter within the body chart map. The circles were randomly positioned within the body chart in order to be non-overlapping and not touching each other. The colors were chosen in order to span uniformly the RGB color cube using six different intensities for each color. Since the color depth was defined on a range from 0 to 255 (one byte), the values of each color were [0, 51, 102, 153, 204, 255]. In this way the total number of colors was $6^3 = 216$, ranging from black [0,0,0] to white [255,255,255] and including all combinations of RGB (i.e. [0,0,0], [0,0,51], [0,0,102], ... [51,0,0], ... [255,255,255]) (Figure 2A).

Area and location analysis

The second set of pain drawings was composed of five artificial pain drawings generated by adding to the same body chart several red shapes (ellipses, rectangles, and triangles) generated with random size, orientation and position, and could overlap and be partially outside the body chart mask (Figure 2B). The red color was chosen mainly because it can be easily associated with pain in a body chart. Additionally, in the RGB cube is one of the corners (i.e. the highest value of SD of the triplet of RGB values, together with yellow, magenta, cyan, blue and green), and also because it is easy to find red pens or markers in common shops.

Each of the two sets was printed in color using the same printer (Sharp MX-7580) in 11 copies, adding markers at the four corners and a QR code at the bottom left side. The markers and the QR code were included in order to allow the platform to align the images and add the pain drawings to the internal database.




Figure 2. Representation of the artificial pain drawings generated with Matlab. a) 216 colored circles with 30 pixel diameter were randomly located within the area of the body chart. The colors were uniformly distributed in the RGB color cube. b) Five body charts with randomly generated shapes.

Selection of scanning devices

The 11 sets of drawings were then scanned using different devices and apps (Table 1).

We selected three flatbed scanners with different size and price: one professional office printer/scanner that was available in our university (Sharp MX-4070, price about 5000USD), one portable flatbed scanner (Canon Lide 220, ~ 50USD) and a home printer/scanner (HP Envy 4500, ~300USD).

In addition, we selected three smartphones with different price range: iPhone 12 (~1000USD), Samsung Galaxy (~400USD) and Ulefone Armor (~100USD). All the three devices were using the same app for scanning images (vFlat scan), in order to compare only the hardware of the devices.

Moreover, for the cheapest smartphone we selected six free Apps available in the android apps google play repository. The apps were selected according to their popularity and ranking based on users' comments.

Table 1. List of devices used to scan the artificial pain drawings. The flatbed devices generated the PDF files using proprietary software, while smartphones needed an App to generate the PDF using the camera.

Type	Device model	Resolution	Price	App
Flatbed	Sharp MX-4070	300dpi	~5000\$	-
Flatbed	Canon Lide 220	300dpi	~50\$	-
Flatbed	HP Envy 4500	300dpi	~300\$	-
Smartphone	iPhone 12	12Mpx	~1000\$	vFlat Scan
Smartphone	Samsung Galaxy S10 Lite	32Mpx	~400\$	vFlat Scan
Smartphone	Ulefone Armor-X	13Mpx	~100\$	vFlat Scan
Smartphone	Ulefone Armor-X	13Mpx	~100\$	TapScanner
Smartphone	Ulefone Armor-X	13Mpx	~100\$	Simple Scan
Smartphone	Ulefone Armor-X	13Mpx	~100\$	Fast Scanner
Smartphone	Ulefone Armor-X	13Mpx	~100\$	CamScanner
Smartphone	Ulefone Armor-X	13Mpx	~100\$	TurboScan

For each scanner a PDF file was generated including the corresponding set of images (one with colored circles and five with red shapes). The PDF files were uploaded in the SYP platform [32].

Image processing

The original area of each pain spot generated with Matlab was computed as well as the coordinates of the centroid of each pain spot. The SYP platform identified the QR codes and allowed the processing of each identified pain spot providing area in pixels and coordinates of the centroid.

For the analysis of colors, we analyzed whether the platform was able to identify a pain spot in correspondence of each of the locations where colored circles were generated. If the area of the identified pain spot was larger than a fixed threshold (90% of the theoretical area – e.g. 450 out of 500 pixels), then the pain spot was counted (Figure 3B).




Figure 3. Examples of identification of pain spots from colored circles. a) The original drawing and the output of platform algorithm for three different devices are shown. b) Green color represents identified pain spot. The purple circle on the bottom left corner (indicated with the thick arrow) was not identified by iPhone and sharp scanner, but it was identified by the Armor phone. The black circle on the neck (indicated with the thin arrow) was not identified by any of the devices.

Statistical analysis

The variables used for the statistics were the area (A) of pain spots in square pixels and the coordinates of the centroid (x,y) of each pain spot in pixels. The variables computed for each scanning device, were compared to the variables computed on the corresponding pain spots on the original artificial pain drawings generated with Matlab. The percentage area error (E) was computed as the difference between the two areas divided by the area computed on original pain drawing and expressed in percentage. The distance (D) between the theoretical centroid of the pain spot computed on original image and the centroid of the pain spot identified by each device was also computed and expressed in pixels.

Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) estimates and their 95% confident intervals of pain area and barycenter coordinates were calculated using Matlab using a 1-way mixed-effects model.

In addition, standard error of the measurement (SEM) and minimal clinical differences were computed for pain area and barycenter position.

Descriptive statistics is presented with box whisker plots with median and IQR values.

RESULTS

Color analysis

A Boolean table with the results of pain spot identification was generated with 216 lines (one for each color) and 11 columns (one for each scanner). A graphical representation of the table is represented in figure 4.




Fig 4

Figure 4. Representation of the performance of the algorithm in identifying different color circles. The middle diagonal (from white to black where RGB components are equal) and the colors located close to the central diagonal are not identified by the algorithm, while colors like red, magenta and yellow were identified by all devices.

Each color is represented by a circle in the 3D color cube, and the size of each circle is proportional to the number of scanners that were able to identify that color (i.e., if the area of the identified pain spot was larger than 90% of the printed circle). The maximum circle diameter was set to 2/3 of the spacing between adjacent circles. In this way it is easy to see which colors are best for pain drawings. As expected, the colors with identical values in RGB triplets (i.e., shades of gray, black, white) were never identified by the software, and colors with low values of SD in RGB triplets (e.g., low saturation colors) were not identified with most devices. The colors that were identified with all devices are located close to the corners of the color cube (i.e., high saturation colors, such as red, cyan, magenta, and yellow).

Area and location analysis

Figure 5 shows the distribution of areas of the pain spots generated artificially and randomly distributed on each of the five body charts. The pain spots were divided into three categories according to their area in square pixels ($A < 50^2$: small; $50^2 \leq A < 100^2$: medium; $A \geq 100^2$: large).




Fig 5

Figure 5. Representation of the distribution of shapes according to their size. The three colors are used to represent the three categories that were used for further analysis. The image in the legend shows the thresholds used to divide the categories (as square shapes).

The ICC for pain area was 0.99 with 95% confident interval = 0.99-0.99 (F: 1.44e+04 - df1: 74 - df2: 750). In addition, also ICC and CI values for barycenter coordinates were above 0.99 (F: 4.55e+05 - df1: 84 - df2: 930 for X-Coordinate, and F: 5.12e+05 - df1: 103 - df2: 843 for Y-Coordinate).

Table 2 shows the SEM and MDC values for each device compared to the theoretical value.

Table 2. Standard error of the measurements (SEM) and Minimal detectable change (MDC) for the identification of pain area and for the barycenter distance for each device compared to the theoretical value.

Device model	Area SEM	Area	B.Distance	B.Distance
--------------	----------	------	------------	------------

	(px ²)	MDC (px ²)	SEM (px)	MDC (px)
Sharp MX-4070	262	513	1.5	2.9
Canon Lide 220	348	682	1.5	3.0
HP Envy 4500	219	429	1.5	3.0
iPhone - vFlat	134	262	1.0	2.1
Galaxy S10 lite - vFlat	172	336	1.4	2.6
Armor X - vFlat	182	356	1.3	2.5
Armor X - TapScanner	247	485	2.1	4.2
Armor X - Simple Scan	251	491	2.6	5.1
Armor X - Fast Scanner	287	563	2.4	4.8
Armor X - CamScanner	227	444	2.0	3.8
Armor X - TurboScan	505	989	4.0	7.8

Figure 6A shows the percentage error of pain extent for each device for the three categories of pain spot areas. For all devices, the percentage error was below 20% for small, medium, and big pain spots, with lower values associated to bigger areas. A significant negative correlation was observed between percentage of error and spot size ($R=-0.237$, $P=0.0402$) (Figure 6b).




Figure 6. a) Distribution of errors in identifying the pain spot areas expressed in percentage. The three color box whiskers plots for each device represent the distribution of area error for each of the three categories (small, medium large pain spots). b) Correlation between percentage of error and spot size (the regression line is indicated as dashed line).

Figure 7 shows the percentage error of distance between the theoretical location of the centroid of each pain spot and the location of the centroid of the identified pain spot. The distribution of the distances was always below 5 pixels except for the Armor device with Turboscan app (11th column).




Figure 7. Distribution of errors in the location of the pain spots expressed in pixels. The three color box whiskers plots for each device represent the distribution of area error for each of the three categories (small, medium large pain spots). The image of the eye shows the actual dimensions of 5 pixels in the full body chart (paper dimensions: 2048x1536 px).

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study showed that the paper pen drawings can be imported and processed with negligible differences using different devices. To our knowledge, there were no other studies focusing on the acquisition of paper pen drawings using mobile devices. Before conducting this study, we were largely using our platform asking patients to use the red marker because we suspected that blue markers would be mistaken as black. As expected, indeed the red color is the best choice for multiple reasons: the red color is associated with inflammatory process, thus it is easy for a patient visualize its own pain as a red spot (compared to green or blue for example). Moreover, in shops, markers labeled as “red” are very similar to the theoretical value of [255, 0, 0], while markers labeled as “green”, or “blue” can have different darker or lighter shades.

Surprisingly, in our results blue and green were identified only with few devices (mostly flatbed). One of the reasons could be the ink of the printer, whose color was slightly different from what expected. The illumination of the room could have also an impact, since the light emitted by different bulbs or neon could carry different wavelengths in different proportions. The light sensors of cameras and scanners could have different sensitivity to different wavelengths, and probably the red-light sensors have higher sensitivity.

Observing the printed page, we noticed that the blue ink was slightly darker than what we observed on the PC monitor, but it was difficult to objectively evaluate which one was correct as we did not have a gold standard for each color. In summary, the results confirmed our initial prediction: the red marker is the optimal choice for pain drawings. However, in cases where the patient does not have a red marker available, we recommend using a flatbed scanner to generate the PDF to import in the platform. This approach helps minimize the bias resulting from external factors such as lights or photo LED sensitivity.

Regarding the accuracy of the pain spot identification, all the devices showed similar performance when using red color. The cheapest flatbed scanner showed larger errors probably due to the distortion of the image. When observing the digital image, we noticed that the proportions were slightly distorted (maybe due to the calibration of the motor or due to friction of the transmission chain). For this reason, the alignment process of the algorithm could not perfectly align the four markers in the corner, thus the pain spot location had larger errors, as well as their extension.

As expected, the smaller pain spots showed larger percentage errors but no differences in the barycenter location error, because of the distortion of pain spots due to erosion process. The choice of the APP for the mobile device had a significant effect on the percentage errors. In particular, the app named V-Flat, showed better results than the others (when installed on the cheapest mobile device), leading to results comparable to high rank mobile devices. The V-Flat app includes an

algorithm that recognizes the corners of the paper and compensates the distortions of the camera and even the distortions due to bent paper. For this reason, the results were as good as flatbed professional scanners (<5% of error). In general the errors in identification of pain extent (<5%) and pain location (<5pixel) were much lower than the precision of a subject in drawing or identifying its own pain, thus lower than the minimum clinical significance of pain drawings [17,37,38].

Limitations

The present study has some limitations that may introduce bias into the results. Firstly, the acquisitions made with mobile devices were not conducted under controlled lighting conditions. Although all acquisitions took place during daylight hours without direct sunlight on the paper, variations in the time of day and weather conditions could have affected the colors identified by the devices. Additionally, we did not calibrate the "white level" of the mobile phone camera. While some apps offered advanced camera settings for optimizing virtual scanners, we chose to use the default settings to maintain as close to a real-life environment as possible. As a result, we did not test under unusual lighting conditions (e.g., candlelight, colored lamps, neon lights, etc.).

Another limitation is that we could not directly compare the performance of our platform with other existing methods, since the body charts are specific for each existing app.

Furthermore, we only tested one printer to print all the artificial pain drawings, which introduces potential bias. The colored circles in the first part of the study were positioned within the body chart but in different locations. This variation in placement could impact the results, as colors farther from the center of the paper may experience greater distortion due to misalignment. However, this approach was necessary to avoid printing an excessive number of papers.

The decision of using artificial pain drawings is due to the fact that we conducted two studies in parallel. The first study involved the use of actual pain drawings generated by humans [36], while in the present study we wanted to investigate different colors in order to investigate all the RGB space. In addition the pain drawings generated by humans are located in body areas depending on the pathology of patients, while in this case we preferred to have a uniform distribution of pain spots with a priori known size and location. Both studies showed that the platform has excellent results, but in the present study we were able to quantify the error since we knew the theoretical pain spot areas.

The sample size of mobile devices and flatbed scanners is small. However, the objective of the study was not to provide an exhaustive sample of devices, but rather to demonstrate that even inexpensive devices are sufficient for accurately acquiring paper pain drawings.

Similarly, the sample of scan apps is also limited, and some of them are no longer available for free as of the manuscript submission. The app market is continuously evolving, with new apps being released regularly. Our intention was to find a selection of free virtual scanners available in the play store, and again, our aim was to show that various apps perform similarly.

The system was already tested in real clinical settings and showed to be easy to implement, easy to use and well accepted. The acquisition of paper pain drawings using the proposed platform has been demonstrated to be robust and reliable across a wide range of scanning devices. The accuracy of pain extent and location analysis consistently falls within the error measurement range of pain drawings. The utilization of the proposed algorithm will enable the use of pain drawing analysis in various clinical settings.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors had no competing interests to declare.

REFERENCES

1. Puntillo F, Giglio M, Paladini A, Perchiazzi G, Viswanath O, Urits I, Sabbà C, Varrassi G, Brienza N. Pathophysiology of musculoskeletal pain: a narrative review. *Therapeutic advances in musculoskeletal disease* 2021;13:1759720X21995067. PMID:33737965
2. Ekman EF, Koman LA. Acute pain following musculoskeletal injuries and orthopaedic surgery: mechanisms and management. *Instructional course lectures* 2005;54:21–33. PMID:15948432
3. Graven-Nielsen T. Mechanisms and manifestations in musculoskeletal pain: from experimental to clinical pain settings. *Pain* 2022 Nov;163(Suppl 1):S29–S45. PMID:35984370
4. Roulin M-J, Ramelet A-S. Pain indicators in brain-injured critical care adults: an integrative review. *Australian critical care : official journal of the Confederation of Australian Critical Care Nurses* 2012 May;25(2):110–8. PMID:22104632
5. Shafshak TS, Elnemr R. The Visual Analogue Scale Versus Numerical Rating Scale in Measuring Pain Severity and Predicting Disability in Low Back Pain. *Journal of clinical rheumatology : practical reports on rheumatic & musculoskeletal diseases* 2021 Oct;27(7):282–285. PMID:31985722
6. Galer BS, Jensen MP. Development and preliminary validation of a pain measure specific to neuropathic pain: The Neuropathic Pain Scale. *Neurology* 1997 Feb;48(2):332–338. doi: 10.1212/WNL.48.2.332
7. Gracely RH, Kwilosz DM. The Descriptor Differential Scale: applying psychophysical principles to clinical pain assessment. *Pain* 1988 Dec;35(3):279–288. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(88)90138-8
8. McCaffery M, Pasero C. Pain: Clinical manual. In: Portenoy R, Tanner R, editors. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 2nd ed St. Louis: Mosby, Inc.; 1999. p. 650–650. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2702.2000.0374c.x
9. Melzack R, Katz J. McGill Pain Questionnaire. *Encyclopedia of Pain* Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 1971. p. 1792–1794. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-28753-4_2298
10. Wong DL, Hockenberry MJ, Wilson D, Winkelstein ML, Schwartz P. *Wong's Essentials of Pediatric Nursing*. 6th ed. St. Louis: Mosby, Inc.; 2001. ISBN:978-0-323-00989-8
11. Shaballout N, Neubert T-A, Boudreau S, Beissner F. From Paper to Digital Applications of the Pain Drawing: Systematic Review of Methodological Milestones. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth* 2019 Sep 5;7(9):e14569. PMID:31489841
12. Schmid AB, Ridgway L, Hailey L, Tachrount M, Probert F, Martin KR, Scott W, Crombez G, Price C, Robinson C, Koushesh S, Ather S, Tampin B, Barbero M, Nanz D, Clare S, Fairbank J, Baskozos G. Factors predicting the transition from acute to persistent pain in people with “sciatica”: the FORECAST longitudinal prognostic factor cohort study protocol. *BMJ Open* 2023 Apr 5;13(4):e072832. PMID:37019481
13. Suvinen T, Kemppainen P, Le Bell Y, Kauko T, Forssell H. Assessment of Pain Drawings and Self-Reported Comorbid Pains as Part of the Biopsychosocial Profiling of Temporomandibular Disorder Pain Patients. *J Oral Facial Pain Headache* 2016 Oct;287–295. doi:

10.11607/ofph.1589

14. Unruh A, McGrath P, Cunningham JS, Humphreys P. Children's drawings of their pain: Pain 1983 Dec;17(4):385–392. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(83)90170-7
15. Grunnesjö M, Bogefeldt J, Blomberg S, Delaney H, Svärdsudd K. The course of pain drawings during a 10-week treatment period in patients with acute and sub-acute low back pain. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2006 Dec;7(1):65. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-7-65
16. Margolis RB, Tait RC, Krause SJ. A rating system for use with patient pain drawings. Pain 1986 Jan;24(1):57–65. PMID:2937007
17. Barbero M, Moresi F, Leoni D, Gatti R, Egloff M, Falla D. Test-retest reliability of pain extent and pain location using a novel method for pain drawing analysis. EJP 2015 Sep;19(8):1129–1138. doi: 10.1002/ejp.636
18. Balasch-Bernat M, Dueñas L, Aguilar-Rodríguez M, Falla D, Schneebeli A, Navarro-Bosch M, Lluch E, Barbero M. The Spatial Extent of Pain Is Associated with Pain Intensity, Catastrophizing and Some Measures of Central Sensitization in People with Frozen Shoulder. JCM 2021 Dec 28;11(1):154. doi: 10.3390/jcm11010154
19. Ginzburg BM, Merskey H, Lau CL. The relationship between pain drawings and the psychological state. Pain 1988 Nov;35(2):141–146. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(88)90221-7
20. Türp JC, Kowalski CJ, O'Leary N, Stohler CS. Pain maps from facial pain patients indicate a broad pain geography. Journal of dental research 1998 Jun;77(6):1465–72. PMID:9649175
21. Ali SM, Lau WJ, McBeth J, Dixon WG, van der Veer SN. Digital manikins to self-report pain on a smartphone: A systematic review of mobile apps. Eur J Pain 2021 Feb;25(2):327–338. doi: 10.1002/ejp.1688
22. Boudreau SA. Visualizing and quantifying spatial and qualitative pain sensations. Scandinavian Journal of Pain 2022 Oct 26;22(4):681–683. doi: 10.1515/sjpain-2022-0098
23. Kanellopoulos AK, Kanellopoulos EK, Dimitriadis Z, Strimpakos NS, Koufogianni A, Kellari AA, Poulis IA. Novel Software for Pain Drawing Analysis. Cureus 2021 Dec 14; doi: 10.7759/cureus.20422
24. Neubert T-A, Dusch M, Karst M, Beissner F. Designing a Tablet-Based Software App for Mapping Bodily Symptoms: Usability Evaluation and Reproducibility Analysis. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth 2018 May 30;6(5):e127. doi: 10.2196/mhealth.8409
25. Shaballout N, Aloumar A, Neubert T-A, Dusch M, Beissner F. Digital Pain Drawings Can Improve Doctors' Understanding of Acute Pain Patients: Survey and Pain Drawing Analysis (Preprint). JMIR mHealth and uHealth; 2018 Jun. doi: 10.2196/preprints.11412
26. Dixit A, Lee M. Quantification of Digital Body Maps for Pain: Development and Application of an Algorithm for Generating Pain Frequency Maps. JMIR Form Res 2022 Jun 24;6(6):e36687. PMID:35749160
27. Galve Villa M, S Pálsson T, Cid Royo A, R Bjarkam C, Boudreau SA. Digital Pain Mapping and Tracking in Patients With Chronic Pain: Longitudinal Study. J Med Internet Res 2020 Oct

26;22(10):e21475. PMID:33104012

28. Egsgaard LL, Christensen TS, Petersen IM, Brønnum DS, Boudreau SA. Do Gender-Specific and High-Resolution Three Dimensional Body Charts Facilitate the Communication of Pain for Women? A Quantitative and Qualitative Study. *JMIR Hum Factors* 2016 Jul 20;3(2):e19. PMID:27440737
29. Campbell N, Ali F, Finlay AY, Salek SS. Equivalence of electronic and paper-based patient-reported outcome measures. *Qual Life Res* 2015 Aug;24(8):1949–1961. doi: 10.1007/s11136-015-0937-3
30. Noyes JM, Garland KJ. Computer- vs. paper-based tasks: Are they equivalent? *Ergonomics* 2008 Sep;51(9):1352–1375. doi: 10.1080/00140130802170387
31. Touvier M, Méjean C, Kesse-Guyot E, Pollet C, Malon A, Castetbon K, Hercberg S. Comparison between web-based and paper versions of a self-administered anthropometric questionnaire. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2010 May;25(5):287–296. doi: 10.1007/s10654-010-9433-9
32. Sketch Your Pain. SUPSI; 2020. Available from: <https://syp.spslab.ch>
33. Luque-Suarez A, Falla D, Barbero M, Pineda-Galan C, Marco D, Giuffrida V, Martinez-Calderon J. Digital pain extent is associated with pain intensity but not with pain-related cognitions and disability in people with chronic musculoskeletal pain: a cross-sectional study. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders* 2022 Jul;23(1):727. PMID:35906575
34. Sketch Your Pain - Tablet. SUPSI; 2020. Available from: <https://syp.spslab.ch/tablet>
35. Canny J. A Computational Approach to Edge Detection. *IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell* 1986 Nov;PAMI-8(6):679–698. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.1986.4767851
36. Barbero M, Cescon C, Schneebeli A, Falla D, Landolfi G, Derboni M, Giuffrida V, Rizzoli AE, Maino P, Koetsier E. Reliability of the Pen-on-Paper Pain Drawing Analysis Using Different Scanning Procedures. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2024 Feb;67(2):e129–e136. PMID:37898312
37. Abichandani D, Barbero M, Cescon C, Gallace A, Punt D, Sanchis-Sanchez E, Falla D. Can People with Chronic Neck Pain Recognize Their Own Digital Pain Drawing? *Pain Physician* 2020 Mar;23(2):E231–E240. PMID:32214308
38. Leoni D, Falla D, Heitz C, Capra G, Clijsen R, Egloff M, Cescon C, Baeyens J-P, Barbero M. Test-retest Reliability in Reporting the Pain Induced by a Pain Provocation Test: Further Validation of a Novel Approach for Pain Drawing Acquisition and Analysis. *Pain Pract* 2017 Feb;17(2):176–184. doi: 10.1111/papr.12429


Supplementary Files

Revised Manuscript with Highlited changes.


URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/f7209c3fc0889bc84bc6864136d5c67d.docx>

Figures


Pain spot detection process. A) the four markers at the corners and the QR code are identified B) The pain drawing is aligned and scaled C) The areas outside the body chart are removed D) Pain drawings are separated from the background and eroded in order to correct the imperfections due to pen drawing E) Pain spot contours are identified and small holes are removed F) Each pain spot is analyzed to extract area and position.




Representation of the artificial pain drawings generated with Matlab. A) 216 colored circles with 30 pixel diameter were randomly located within the area of the body chart. The colors were uniformly distributed in the RGB color cube. B) Five body charts with randomly generated shapes.




Examples of identification of pain spots from colored circles. The original drawing (A) and the output of platform algorithm for three different devices (B) are shown. Green color represents identified pain spot. The purple circle on the bottom left corner (indicated with the thick arrow) was not identified by iPhone and sharp scanner, but it was identified by the Armor phone. The black circle on the neck (indicated with the thin arrow) was not identified by any of the devices.




Representation of the performance of the algorithm in identifying different color circles. The middle diagonal (from white to black where RGB components are equal) and the colors located close to the central diagonal are not identified by the algorithm, while colors like red, magenta and yellow were identified by all devices.



Representation of the distribution of shapes according to their size. The three colors are used to represent the three categories that were used for further analysis. The image in the legend shows the thresholds used to divide the categories (as square shapes).



A) Distribution of errors in identifying the pain spot areas expressed in percentage. The three color box whiskers plots for each device represent the distribution of area error for each of the three categories (small, medium large pain spots). B) Correlation between percentage of error and spot size (the regression line is indicated as dashed line).



Distribution of errors in the location of the pain spots expressed in pixels. The three color box whiskers plots for each device represent the distribution of area error for each of the three categories (small, medium large pain spots). The image of the eye shows the actual dimensions of 5 pixels in the full body chart (paper dimensions: 2048x1536 px).

