Abstract
We conducted a study to ascertain specific patterns of pain in patients with common shoulder disorders and to describe a comprehensive shoulder pain map. We prospectively studied 94 cases involving an upper limb pain map and correlated the maps with the final diagnoses made by 2 clinicians who were blinded to the pain map findings.

Pattern, severity, and type of pain were specific to each common shoulder disorder. In subacromial impingement, pain was predominantly sharp, occurred around the anterior aspect of the shoulder, radiated down the arm, and was associated with dull, aching pain radiating to the hand. A similar pain pattern was found in rotator cuff tears. In acromioclavicular joint pathology, pain was sharp, stabbing, and well localized to the antero-superior shoulder area. Glenohumeral joint arthritis was marked by the most severe pain, which occurred in a mixed pattern and affected the entire arm. Whereas the pain of instability was a mixture of sharp and dull pain, the pain of calcific tendonitis was severe and sharp. Both pains were limited to the upper arm and shoulder.

Pain mapping revealed definitive patterns for shoulder pathologies. We advocate using pain maps as useful diagnostic guides and research tools.

Materials and Methods
We prospectively studied 94 cases of shoulder pain. All patients were new referrals who attended the new patient clinic in an upper limb unit.

Excluded from the study were patients with neck pain symptoms, clinical features indicating neck pathology, previous or multiple shoulder problems, ipsilateral upper limb problems, suspected carpal or cubital tunnel syndrome, or nerve compression.

All patients completed an upper limb pain map before consultation with the clinician. They were given clear verbal, written, and illustrated instructions on how to complete the pain map. The patients who agreed to complete the map were included in the study.

Examining clinicians were blinded to pain map results.

All patients were assessed in an outpatient clinical setting. Assessment involved a detailed history, a physical examination, specific shoulder tests (apprehension test, Hawkins-Kennedy impingement test, Gerber liftoff test), radiography, and ultrasonography. Radiographs included anteroposterior, axillary, and supraspinatus outlet views of the affected shoulder. Ultrasound scans were performed vastly on patients suspected of having a rotator cuff tear, impingement, or calcific tendinitis. Some patients underwent magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), MR arthrography (MRA), and/or arthroscopy later, before their diagnoses were confirmed. Local diag-
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Nosteric injections were made in several cases, particularly in those in which the clinical diagnosis suggested ACJ pathology, impingement, or calcific tendinitis.

The opinions of 2 clinicians were sought in conjunction with the other investigations to help increase the precision of the diagnoses. The definitive diagnoses were not coded to the questionnaire form until all the assessments were completed for each patient.

We used a custom-made upper limb pain map (Figure 1). This map illustrates pain type, severity, and areas of radiation, including the anterior and posterior parts of the arm, and the neck and shoulder. Each side of the arm was divided into 14 sections or cells, giving a total of 28 cells. The areas of the ACJ and the axilla were included among the cells. Patients were asked to indicate on the map which of 4 types of pain they were feeling and to illustrate each with a symbol: sharp, stabbing, or shooting pain (+), burning pain (°), dull, aching pain (•), and pins and needles and numbness (Δ). For analysis, the letters S, B, D, and P, respectively, were used (Figure 1).

Pain severity was assessed with a visual analogue scale (VAS) (Figure 1). Patients rated the intensity of pain on a continuum from “no pain” to “maximal, worst pain imaginable.” The VAS score is the distance from the lowest pain level to the mark made by the patient.

Final diagnoses made by the clinicians, who were blinded to the map questionnaire, were then correlated with the results of the pain maps. Cells where the appropriate symbols had been marked were considered positive. Distribution of pain was correlated with clinical diagnosis to ascertain a relationship between pain site and particular shoulder pathology. These helped increase the strength of the internal validity of the study.

Table I. Diagnoses, Mean Age, and Sex of Study Patients (N = 94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>No. of Patients</th>
<th>No. of Female Patients</th>
<th>No. of Male Patients</th>
<th>Mean Age, y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impingement syndrome</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotator cuff tear</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenohumeral joint arthritis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acromioclavicular joint patho</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcific tendinitis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Pain Types and Radiation Areas, Both Anterior and Posterior, According to Patient Diagnosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Predominant Pain Type(^{a})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Around Shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S     B   D   P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impingement syndrome</td>
<td>18    4    6   —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotator cuff tear</td>
<td>15    —    7   —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenohumeral joint arthritis</td>
<td>3     1    2   —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>8     1    9   —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acromioclavicular joint patho</td>
<td>12    1    1   —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcific tendinitis</td>
<td>5     —    1   —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)No. of patients with sharp, stabbing, or shooting pain (S), burning pain (B), dull, aching pain (D), or pins and needles and numbness (P).

\(^{b}\)These patients, who described pins and needles mainly on the dorsum of their hands, were particularly assessed to exclude other distal upper limb problems (eg, carpal tunnel and nerve compression disorders).

Figure 1. Sample map to be marked by patients.
Ethical opinion was sought and obtained from the local Research and Development department for the study. Statistical analysis, performed with SPSS 16.0 for Windows (SPSS, Chicago, Illinois), included probability-probability plot for distribution and Pearson correlation tests.

**RESULTS**

In this study, subacromial impingement and rotator cuff tear were the most common shoulder conditions. Younger patients predominantly had shoulder instability, including superior labrum from anterior to posterior (SLAP) and Bankart lesions. Mean age was 34.4 years in the instability group, 46.5 years in the calcific tendinitis group, and 69.8 years in the GHJ arthritis group (Table I). The GHJ arthritis group was the oldest.

In subacromial impingement, rotator cuff tear, and GHJ arthritis, pain radiated to the forearm (Table II; Figures 2A–2C). In shoulder instability, calcific tendinitis, and ACJ pathology, pain was more localized around the shoulder and upper arm (Table II; Figures 2D–2F).

GHJ arthritis had a mixed pattern of pain that was described as sharp, shooting, burning, and dull aching that affected the entire arm from shoulder to hand (Figure 2C). Patients with subacromial impingement had predominantly sharp pain around the front of the shoulder and dull, aching pain affecting the rest of the arm and forearm. In addition, 7 patients described pins and needles around the hand (Tables II, III; Figure 2A).

Pain from ACJ pathology was predominantly sharp and stabbing and localized to the anterior aspect of the shoulder, and it did not radiate down the forearm (Tables II, IV, V; Figure 2E).

The pain pattern for patients with rotator cuff tears was very similar to that for patients with impingement syndrome (Figure 2B). Patients with calcific tendinitis described a shooting pain in the area of the shoulder with no radiation to elbow or hand, whereas patients with instability described a mixture of sharp and dull pain without radiation to forearm (Tables II–IV; Figures 2D, 2F).

Pins and needles and numbness in the hands were described only in subacromial impingement (7/28 cells). Burning sensations were rare and described mainly in impingement and GHJ arthritis (Table II; Figures 2A, 2C).

The probability-probability plot for distribution showed that both pain severity and number of areas
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**Table III. Shoulder/Upper Arm Disorders With Below-Elbow Pain Radiation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoulder/Upper Arm Disorder</th>
<th>No. of Patients With Disorder</th>
<th>No. (%) of Patients With Below Elbow Pain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impingement syndrome</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13 (46.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotator cuff tear</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12 (54.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenohumeral joint arthritis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table IV. Shoulder/Upper Arm Disorders With Pain Predominantly in Shoulder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoulder/Upper Arm Disorder</th>
<th>No. of Patients With Disorder</th>
<th>No. (%) of Patients With Below Elbow Pain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instability, including SLAP/Bankart lesion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acromioclavicular joint pathology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcific tendinitis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table V. Mean No. of Cells Marked by Patients With any Type of Pain, and Pain Severity in Each Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Mean No. of Cells (N = 28)</th>
<th>Mean VAS score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impingement syndrome</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotator cuff tear</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenohumeral joint arthritis</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acromioclavicular joint pathology</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcific tendinitis</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviation:** SLAP, superior labrum from anterior to posterior.

---
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were normally distributed. Analysis of VAS scores showed that patients with GHJ arthritis had the most severe pain (mean score, 7.83/10), followed closely by patients with impingement (mean score, 7.80). The least severe pain (mean score, 6.43) was described by patients with ACJ pathology. Similarly, patients with instability had a mean score of 6.72. The other mean scores were 7.05 for rotator cuff tears and 7.50 for calcific tendinitis (Table V). There was no statistically significant difference in range of pain between the diagnoses ($F_{5,87} = 1.138; P = .347$).

The pain map consisted of a total of 28 marked sections or cells, 14 on each side of the arm (Figure 1). Analysis showed how well the pain was localized for each particular shoulder condition (Table V). The mean pain score ranged from 3.86 for ACJ pathology to 12.5 for GHJ arthritis, indicating the diffuse nature of pain from GHJ arthritis and the pinpoint nature of pain from ACJ pathology.

Pearson correlation tests demonstrated statistically weak correlation between number of areas and pain severity ($r = 0.194, P = .64$), but 1-way analysis of variance showed a meaningful difference in number of areas marked by patients between groups ($F_{5,87} = 3.550; P = .006$). Post hoc multiple comparisons showed meaningful differences, particularly between GHJ arthritis and rotator cuff tears ($P = .014$) and between GHJ arthritis and ACJ pathology ($P = .002$).

### Discussion

Pain is the most common symptom in orthopedics, and a variety of terms are used to describe it. There are clear differences between the throbbing pain of an abscess, the aching pain of chronic arthritis, the burning pain of neuralgia, and the stabbing pain of a ruptured tendon. The precise location of pain is important in orthopedics but does not always correlate with the site of pathology. Pain arising in or near the skin is usually localized accurately, as is pain from intrinsic shoulder pathology. Pain arising in deeper structures is more diffuse, and in some cases, it has an unexpected distribution. One explanation for the unexpected pain distribution in the shoulder is the proximal location in the sclerotome and the extensive convergence of afferent signals from this area to the dorsal horn of the spinal cord. The sclerotome is defined as pain arising within the periosteum and muscle innervated by a spinal segment.

Pain patterns can be broadly distributed to the deltoid, the trapezius, and the posterior scapular area. Location of symptoms may or may not correspond to proximity of pain generator. Cervical disk disease commonly presents with pain referred to the shoulder. This pain is most often referred to the posterior aspect of the shoulder and the trapezius and occasionally to the forearm or the hand. Other examples of referred pain involving the shoulder...
include pain caused by stimulation of the diaphragmatic tendon center.\textsuperscript{12}

Likewise, shoulder pain with radiation to arm and hand in an ulna nerve distribution could be an indicator of the existence of a Pancoast tumor.\textsuperscript{13} Pain from the sternoclavicular joint can be referred to areas distant from the joint.\textsuperscript{14} Many different shoulder disorders cause similar symptoms and pain patterns.\textsuperscript{15} The results from our pain-mapping study correlate with this for certain shoulder conditions, such as instability, calcific tendinitis, and ACJ pathology. Pain was radiated much farther in subacromial impingement, torn rotator cuffs, and GHJ arthritis.

Although the diagnosis of shoulder disorders should not be based on clinical examination alone, some of the tests performed with suggested standardizations are highly reproducible and therefore reliable to use in clinical practice.\textsuperscript{16-18} The Neer impingement sign, the Hawkins-Kennedy impingement test, and the Jobe supraspinatus test are well described. The O’Brien sign is helpful in diagnosing superior labral detachment.\textsuperscript{19}

One of the major groups of patients in our study was diagnosed with impingement syndrome. The combination of the Hawkins-Kennedy impingement sign, the painful arc sign, and the infraspinatus muscle test yielded the best posttest probability, up to 95\%, for any degree of impingement syndrome.\textsuperscript{20} Steroid injection is used for both diagnostic and treatment purposes in impingement syndrome.\textsuperscript{21} In our study, all physical tests were extensively used by clinicians, and injection helped to diagnose mainly impingement syndrome and ACJ pathology.

On the other hand, shoulder pain associated with rotator cuff disorders and glenohumeral osteoarthritis can be diagnosed in the majority of patients on the basis of medical history, focused physical examination, and plain radiographs.\textsuperscript{22} Anteroposterior, axillary, and supraspinatus outlet plain radiographs of the affected shoulder were part of our assessment for each patient and were specifically more helpful in diagnosing ACJ pathology and GHJ arthritis. In addition, positive results of radiographs can be helpful in diagnosing calcific tendinitis.\textsuperscript{23}

Advanced investigations to diagnose shoulder disorders include MRI, MRA, ultrasound, and computed tomography (CT). Whereas the preferred test for diagnosing rotator cuff disorders is MRI,\textsuperscript{24} MRA has become the preferred test for the imaging of suspected labral pathology.\textsuperscript{23,25} Ultrasound also could be more cost-effective in a specialist hospital setting for identification of full-thickness tears.\textsuperscript{24} In our series, ultrasound was used in addition to MRI or MRA for each patient when rotator cuff tears, calcific tendinitis, or impingement was suspected in the outpatient setting. No patient underwent CT for pain mapping. In addition, all diagnostic coding was done before arthroscopic procedures.

For accurate clinical diagnosis, overall evaluation by an experienced clinician is necessary.\textsuperscript{9} In our clinical setting, all initial assessments are performed by experienced specialist clinicians and with baseline investigations.

Gerber and colleagues\textsuperscript{26} tried to ascertain the distribution of ACJ and subacromial impingement pain by injecting hypertonic saline into the ACJ and subacromial spaces of normal patients. ACJ irritation resulted in burning pain felt over the joint, deep in the supraspinatus fossa, and in the upper trapezius. This is similar to our findings in the mapping of ACJ pain, where pain was mainly localized to the anterior and dorsal aspects of the shoulder, but differs in the distribution of pain down the posterior aspect of the arm. The pain was mainly the stabbing type but also had dull and burning components. Subacromial irritation in the article by Gerber and colleagues\textsuperscript{26} resulted in an intense pain, mainly in the lateral border of the acromion and the lateral portion of the deltoid muscle. Pain mapping of subacromial impingement has similar features, with predominantly sharp pain around the front of the shoulder and down the posterior aspect of the arm with additional features of a dull, aching, and burning pain anteriorly that radiates to the hand. Toomingas\textsuperscript{27} examined chronic and severe pain and correlated it with patients’ pain drawings. The drawings made by patients with more chronic or severe pain symptoms occupied a larger area. As suggested, our study also showed the same correlation between pain severity and radiation area. The most severe pain occurred in GHJ arthritis patients, who marked a mean of 12.5 of 28 cells on the pain map (the most cells marked by any of the groups). Moreover, pain from ACJ pathology was the most pinpointed. Patients with ACJ pathology marked a mean of only 3.9 areas, and their pain (mean VAS score, 6.43) was the least severe.

The primary types of self-reported pain measures are theVAS, the verbal rating scale, the numerical rating scale, and pain drawings. Each method has its advantages and disadvantages.\textsuperscript{28} The VAS and the numerical rating scale create ratio-level data that are more easily comparable. In our study, we used VAS to compare pain severity.

The medical literature describes pain maps for neck, face, back, and hip pain,\textsuperscript{27,29,30} but not for shoulder disorders. This is the first study to describe use of shoulder pain maps. A definitive pattern of pain distribution and specific types of pain in common shoulder pathologies has been demonstrated. We advocate using pain maps as diagnostic tools in shoulder clinics. Pain maps can be further expanded as diagnostic aids in combined neck-and-shoulder pathology and in multiple shoulder pathologies.

After interventions such as subacromial injection, ACJ injection, physiotherapy, and arthroscopic shoulder surgery, pain maps can provide a more objective indicator of improvement in pain symptoms. Our study can be expanded by surgeons who complete pain maps after taking patients’ histories to find out whether a correla-
tion exists between pain maps drawn by surgeons and those drawn by patients.
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