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**Categories of Manuscripts**

Pain Physician publishes several categories of manuscripts, each with its own requirements. Pain Physician publishes origi-
nal research, technical reviews, editorials, clinical guidelines, position papers, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, clinical opinions, letters to the editor, prospective, and papers regarding health care policy and ethics.

**Ethics Manuscripts**

Papers addressing specific ethical issues that are germane to the profession and practice of pain medicine and interventional pain management are encouraged. Papers can be empirical studies of ethics in pain medicine and interventional pain management, reviews of ethical constructs, speculative proposals for ideas, direction(s), or concepts in the ethics of pain medicine and interventional pain management, as well as more normative and/or speculative papers that propose or discuss the philosophical premises of pain and pain care.

**Health Policy Manuscripts**

*Pain Physician* publishes manuscripts on various non-clinical issues, including political, philosophical, ethical, legal, environmental, economic, historic, and cultural perspectives.

**Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses**

Systematic reviews must systematically find, select, critique, and synthesize evidence relevant to well-defined questions about diagnosis, prognosis, or therapy. All manuscripts or data sources should be selected systematically for inclusion in the review and critically evaluated, and the selection process should be described in the manuscript. Systematic reviews must include more than 2 authors.

Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials should follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) or any such latest version of reporting guidelines (http://www.prisma-statement.org/statement.htm). The checklist for PRISMA is shown in Table 1.

Meta-analysis of observational studies must follow MOOSE reporting guidelines (www.consort-statement.org/resources/downloads/other-instruments/moose-statement-2000.pdf). The checklist for MOOSE is shown in Table 2.

**Prospective**

Prospectives provide expert analysis of and prospective on a specific article or series of manuscripts in *Pain Physician* or other journals, or on a topic of special interest to practitioners in pain management and interventional pain management subspecialties. Prospectives should be well focused, scholarly, and clearly presented. Maximum length: up to 5,000 words of text with maximum of 10 tables or figures and no more than 200 references.

**Narrative Reviews**

Narrative reviews, either focused or general, are suitable for describing cutting-edge and evolving developments, health policy, and discussing those developments in light of underlying theory.

**Clinical Guidelines**

Clinical guidelines are summaries of official or consensus positions on issues related to clinical practice, health care delivery, or public policy.

**Original Research**

Original research consists of multiple types of manuscripts including randomized controlled trials, observational studies, diagnostic studies, and reports of adverse drug effects.

A clinical trial is any research project that prospectively assigns human participants to intervention and comparison arms.
groups to study the cause-and-effect relationship between a medical intervention and a health outcome.

A medical intervention is any intervention used to modify a health outcome and includes, but is not limited to, drugs, surgical procedures, devices, behavioral treatments, and process-of-care changes.

A controlled trial must have at least one prospectively assigned concurrent control or comparison group in order to trigger the requirements to be a controlled trial and also for registration.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval must be obtained and stated in these manuscripts.

Table 3. CONSORT 2010 checklist of items must be included when reporting a randomized trial with placebo control, as well as equivalence and non-inferiority trials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. TITLE &amp; ABSTRACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Trial design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Randomization – sequence generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Randomization – allocation concealment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Randomization – implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Blinding (masking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Statistical methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. RESULTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Participant flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Baseline data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Numbers analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Outcomes and estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Ancillary analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Harms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Generalizability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. OTHER INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Randomized Trials

Randomized trials are considered as the evidence of progress in medicine. In submitting the reports of randomized trials, authors should follow the instructions of the revised Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) 2010 statement for reporting randomized trials (http://www.consort-statement.org/consort-statement/) or any such latest version of CONSORT. You can also use Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT) Checklist. http://www.spirit-statement.org/. Randomized trials must include at least 2 authors.

Controlled clinical trials of health care interventions are either explanatory or pragmatic. A comprehensive review of randomized controlled trials is available at: http://www.painphysicianjournal.com/2008/december/2008;11;717-773.pdf.

Table 3 is a checklist of items that must be included when reporting a randomized trial with placebo control, as well as equivalence and non-inferiority trials. The clinical trials section includes more details.

Nonrandomized Trials or Observational Studies

Nonrandomized trials or observational studies use the standard protocol items: nonrandomized trials or observational studies include reports of cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies of the prevalence, causes, mechanisms, diagnosis, course, treatment, and prevention of disease. All clinical trials must be registered in a public registry prior to submission if they meet the criteria for clinical trials. A clinical trial is any research project that assigns human participants to intervention and comparison groups to study the cause-and-effect relationship between a medical intervention and a health outcome. A medical intervention is any intervention used to modify a health outcome, and includes, but is not limited to drugs, surgical procedures, devices, behavioral treatments, and process-of-care changes. A trial must have at least one assigned concurrent control or comparison group in order to trigger the requirement for registration. Observational studies are not exempt from the registration requirement if they are experimental or performed under research criteria.

Reports of techniques are also published. However, these must be educational and draw attention to important or unusual clinical situations, novel treatments, new techniques, or complications. These are considered as clinical observations.

Authors should follow the instructions of the Strengthening of the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) (http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/) or any such latest version or the Transparent Reporting of Evaluations with Nonrandomized Designs (TREND) http://www.cdc.gov/trendstatement/TREND_CHECKLIST http://www.cdc.gov/trendstatement/docs/trend_checklist.pdf

For animal studies, authors should follow the instructions of Animal Research: Reporting In Vivo Experiments (ARRIVE). The checklist is available at: https://www.nc3rs.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Guidelines/NC3Rs%20ARRIVE%20Guidelines%20Checklist%20%28fillable%29.pdf


Table 4 shows a modified checklist of items for STROBE.

Diagnostic Accuracy Studies

Diagnostic test studies include reports of Studies of the Accuracy of Diagnostic Tests (STARD) (http://www.stard-statement.org/).
Table 4. Modified checklist of items for STROBE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE AND ABSTRACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background/rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources/measurement/bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other analyses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Modified checklist of items for STARD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. TITLE/ABSTRACT/KEY WORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Test methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Statistical methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. RESULTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Test results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Key results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Generalizability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. OTHER INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If diagnostic studies meet the criteria of a clinical trial, they must be registered at [http://www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov). Please specify IRB approval and clinical trials registration number.

The modified checklist for STARD is shown in Table 5. Authors may utilize the latest version of STARD at [http://www.stard-statement.org](http://www.stard-statement.org).

Cost Effectiveness or Cost Utility Studies

Cost effectiveness or cost utility studies include reports of comparisons of the relative costs and benefits of 2 or more interventions intended to prevent, diagnose, or treat disease.

Letters to the Editor

Letters to the Editor are considered for publication (subject to editing and abridgment) provided they do not contain material that has been submitted or published elsewhere. Letters must not exceed 750 words (excluding references), and must be received within 2 months after publication of the article. A letter can have no more than 15 references and 2 figures or tables.

Manuscript Guidelines

Abstract

A structured abstract of 250-500 words must be provided.

1) Background
2) Objectives
3) Study Design
4) Setting
5) Methods
   Patients
   Intervention
   Measurement
6) Results
7) Limitations
8) Conclusion(s)
   IRB approval and clinical trials registration number must be specified, if applicable.

Key words: Each manuscript should be accompanied by 8-12 key words.

Manuscript Submission

Manuscripts should meet the following criteria:

The material is original; the writing is clear; the study methods are appropriate; the data are valid; the conclusions are reasonable and supported by the data; the information is important; and the topic has interest to interventional pain physicians.

Please provide article word count and abstract word count on title page of manuscript file.

Title Page/Cover Letter

The cover letter should include the name(s), degree(s), and affiliation(s) of the author(s) of the paper. The author(s) should be listed in the order desired. This should be a document separate from the rest of the paper in order to maintain the integrity of the double-blind review.

Brand Names

When citing a brand name, provide the manufacturer’s name and address. Use generic names for all drugs.

Tables and Figures

The manuscript should contain supportive tables and figures that are necessary, but not duplicative. Authors must secure
permission for reproduction of all previously published illustrations, figures or tables without accompanying permission will not be accepted. Tables and figures each should be numbered consecutively using Arabic numerals.

Any images or illustrations submitted must be a minimum of 300 dpi and saved in either a TIF or JPG format.

Pain Physician charges a fee for manuscripts containing color images in the print version of the journal. The authors can opt to have images printed in black and white should they not want to pay the fee. There is no fee for color images in manuscripts printed online only.

**Abbreviations**

Abbreviations are discouraged except for units of measurement. When first used, the abbreviation should be preceded by the words for which it stands.

**MANUSCRIPT REQUIREMENTS**

**Original Research**

(Randomized Trials, Observational Studies, Diagnostic Accuracy Studies, Cost Effectiveness Studies):
3,500 words
100 references
10 tables and figures
flow diagram (if applicable)

**Ethics Manuscripts:**

3,500 words
100 references
10 tables and figures

**Reviews**

(Systematic Reviews, Meta-analysis, Health Policy and Narrative Reviews):
7,500 words
250 references
30 figures and tables

**Letters:**

750 words
15 references
2 tables and figures

**Prospectives:**

5,000 words
200 references
6 tables and figures

**Clinical Guidelines:**

60,000 words
2,500 references
60 tables and figures
All manuscripts must include 8-12 key words.

**REFERENCES**

References must be the most recent and up to date available. References from a single journal or a single author must be limited to 30% of total references which includes Pain Physician and primary author references.

Each journal reference should include the following, in this order:

1. Author(s) last name(s) and initials
2. Title of the article
3. Journal name (abbreviated according to Index Medicus)
4. Year of publication
5. Volume number
6. First and last pages

Please note that all author names and initials must be listed for each reference. The use of “et al” is not allowed.

Contributors are responsible for providing complete and accurate references. References are to be numbered in the order that they appear in the text. References should be cited in the text in their order of appearance and be listed by number in parentheses.

When data are from an unpublished source, give complete information, including name of the researcher and location. If the work is in progress, provide the journal or book publisher by which it will be published. Please check your references carefully.

**Examples**

**Journal:**


**Website:**

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services: www.cms.hhs.gov

**Press Release:**


**Newspaper:**


**Book:**


**Book Chapter:**


**Personal Communications and Unpublished Data**

Any inclusion of personal communications and unpublished data in the manuscript must be accompanied by a signed statement of permission from each individual identified as a source of information in a personal communication or as a source for unpublished data. Further, the specific date of communication and the type of communication (written or oral) must be provided.

**ADDITONAL INFORMATION**

**Ethical Considerations and Informed Consent**

Human and animal studies require IRB approval. This should be described in the Methods section of the manuscript. For those investigators who do not have an IRB, the guidelines
Registration of Clinical Trials

To be considered for publication, the authors must provide evidence of registration in a public trials registry. Trials must register at or before the onset of patient enrollment. This policy applies to any clinical trial beginning enrollment after July 1, 2005.

Evaluation of Misconduct

Misconduct and unethical behavior may be identified and brought to the attention of the editor and publisher at any time, by anyone. Whoever informs the editor or publisher of misconduct must provide sufficient evidence or documentation for an investigation to be initiated. Journal editors have primary authority and responsibility for investigations into misconduct, and they should consult with or seek advice from the publisher as appropriate. Investigations should be undertaken discreetly, with all caution necessary to avoid spreading rumor or allegations beyond those individuals who need to know.

The editor, in consultation with the publisher and society, is responsible for the final decision regarding actions for any identified misconduct, including whether the employers of the accused be notified of the breach.

Possible outcomes include:

- Informing or educating the author or reviewer where there appears to be a misunderstanding or misapplication of standards.
- Strongly worded written communication to the author or reviewer as a warning against future behavior.
- Formal retraction of a publication from the journal, in conjunction with informing appropriate department heads, abstracting and indexing services, and the readership of the publication.
- Imposition of a formal embargo on contributions from an individual for a defined period.

Manuscript Checklist

Please review manuscript for accuracy and style to follow Pain Physician guidelines.

☐ Transmittal letter with information on authorship, level of funding and with author(s) signature.

☐ Disclosure information including any corporate sponsorship (please see section for complete details).

☐ References checked for accuracy and duplication. Be sure all are cited within the text (none in the abstract) and are numbered as they appear in the text. Make sure 30% or fewer references from same journal or author.

☐ Identify the corresponding author and provide complete identifying information.

☐ Each author’s affiliation information including title(s), place of affiliation, address, and e-mail address.

☐ Word count for manuscript and abstract included on first page of article file.

☐ Written permission from publisher(s) and author(s) to reproduce any figures or tables that have been published previously. Oral permission from only one party is insufficient. Permission must be from the primary source, unless unavailable.

Final Manuscript

You may be requested to make appropriate corrections and to resubmit the corrected manuscript after the review. Please use the online submission form to handle all submissions and revisions.

Submission of Manuscript

Manuscripts are reviewed by blind peer review. Therefore, all author information should be included in a separate file. Do not include author(s), name(s), or institution(s) on each page or on the illustrations.

Manuscript submissions should include an abstract (structured or unstructured) of no less than 250 words and no more than 500 words. A structured abstract is required for all manuscripts, except for editorials and letters to the editor.

Please submit manuscripts through our online submission web site at www.painphysicianjournal.com.

Make sure no author information is in the manuscript document. All author information should be submitted in a separate file. Go to www.painphysicianjournal.com and click on “submit manuscripts online.” Follow the step-by-step procedures to easily download your manuscript and author information.

Questions may be directed to hlong@asipp.org