

RVC OPEN ACCESS REPOSITORY – COPYRIGHT NOTICE

This is the author's accepted manuscript of an article published in *Veterinary Anaesthesia and Analgesia*.

© 2019. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

The full details of the published version of the article are as follows:

TITLE: Quantitative sensory testing with Electronic von Frey Anesthesiometer and von Frey filaments in nonpainful cats: a pilot study

AUTHORS: Hanna Machin, Eriko Kato, Chiara Adami

JOURNAL: Food Policy

PUBLISHER: Veterinary Anaesthesia and Analgesia

PUBLICATION DATE: March 2019

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vaa.2018.09.003>

1 **Quantitative sensory testing with Electronic von Frey Anaesthesiometer and von Frey**
2 **filaments in non-painful cats: a pilot study**

3 **Abstract**

4 **Objective** Measurement of sensory thresholds could represent a complementary tool to
5 behavioural pain scores in cats. The aim of this study was to investigate the feasibility of
6 quantitative sensory testing (QST) with the Electronic von Frey Anaesthesiometer (EVF) and
7 the von Frey filaments (VFF) in healthy cats, and to assess the limits of agreement (LOA)
8 between the two devices.

9 **Study design** Prospective clinical study.

10 **Animals** A total of 15 client-owned healthy cats.

11 **Methods** Two investigators (A and B) carried out the measurements independently. The EVF
12 and the VFF were applied on the upper lip and at the level of the medial aspect of the stifle. A
13 1-hour interval was allowed between the sets of measurements taken by investigators A and
14 B; each investigator repeated the entire session of measurements after 24 hours. The LOA
15 between the EVF and the VFF were analysed with the intra-class correlation coefficient
16 (ICC), and with the Bland Altman method.

17 **Results** Quantitative sensory testing with both the EVF and the VFF was feasible in healthy
18 cats; however, the willingness of the cats to cooperate was negatively affected by the
19 repetition of the measurements on the second day. The presence of the cat owners seemed to
20 facilitate the trial. There was a fair agreement between the EVF and the VFF (ICC = 0.49; CI:
21 0.13 – 0.70).

22 **Conclusions and clinical relevance** Our findings indicate that both EVF and VFF may be
23 used for QST in cats. Further trials will be needed to verify the usefulness of QST with EVF
24 and VFF in feline patients suffering from actual chronic pain.

25 **Keywords** Cat, Electronic von Frey, Pain, Quantitative sensory testing, von Frey Filaments

26 **Introduction**

27 Detecting and managing pain is an important duty for owners and veterinary professionals.
28 Whilst acute postoperative pain can be easily anticipated and has, in most species, some
29 recognizable features, chronic pain is subtle in nature and its recognition may be
30 extraordinarily challenging, especially in cats. Chronic conditions that are common in cats
31 (Klinck et al. 2012; Winer et al. 2016; and carry the potential for the development of chronic
32 pain and central sensitization are feline chronic stomato-gingivitis (FCGS) and osteoarthritis
33 (OA).

34 Quantitative sensory testing (QST) allows evaluation of the somatosensory function
35 based on measurement of the mechanical sensory thresholds. Both the von Frey filaments
36 (VFF) and the Electronic von Frey Anaesthesiometer (EVF) may be used for this purpose.
37 The VFF are a set of 20 plastic monofilaments of progressively increasing thickness, which
38 apply a force ranging from 0.008 to 300 grams on the body surface. The EVF represents the
39 electronic version of the VFF and is composed of a control unit and a probe equipped with a
40 rigid tip, capable of applying and measuring a force varying from 0 to 1000 grams. The force
41 at which the target behavioural response is evoked – usually withdrawal or escape in non-
42 verbal patients- is defined as threshold pressure. These devices are commonly used in human
43 medicine to detect and quantify allodynia and hyperalgesia, as well as in laboratory rodents
44 for sensory threshold testing (Lambert et al. 2009; Tena et al. 2010; Moore et al. 2013;
45 Addison and Clements 2017). Recently, one study investigated the use of both VFF and EVF
46 to quantify chronic pain associated to feline OA (Addison and Clements 2017).

47 The aims of the present study were:

- 48 • To investigate the feasibility of QST performed with the EVF and the VFF, applied at
49 the stifle joint and at the upper lip of healthy cats, with the assumption that these

50 anatomical sites might be used in future trials to measure pain associated to OA and
51 FCSG, respectively; and

- 52 • To assess the limits of agreement (LOA) between EVF and VFF.

53 It was hypothesised that QST with both the EVF and the VFF is feasible in cats, and
54 that the LOA between the two devices would be high.

55

56 **Materials and Methods**

57 A total of 15 client-owned cats were enrolled in this trial. Exclusion criteria were the
58 presence of any disease that may cause pain, as well as any analgesic treatment that could
59 influence the response to the QST. This study was conducted under approval of the Clinical
60 Research Ethical Review Board of the Royal Veterinary College (license number: URN 2016
61 1647-3) and signed informed owner consent.

62 Two investigators (investigators A and B) carried out the measurements in a quiet
63 room of the hospital. Fifteen minutes of acclimatization, during which the cats were left
64 undisturbed to explore the environment, were allowed before commencing the measurements.
65 Cat owners were encouraged to attend the clinical trial, if they wished.

66 The cats were assessed with both the VFF (von Frey Filaments; Bioseb, France) and
67 the EVF (von Frey Anaesthesiometer Type 2390; IICT Life Science, CA, USA) while in a
68 standing or sitting position or sternal recumbency, either on a consult table or on the floor
69 depending on where physical restraint could be kept to a minimum. Both devices were
70 applied at two anatomical sites: the superior lip, at the level of the right canine tooth, and at
71 the medial aspect of the right stifle joint.

72 The investigators tested the two sites independently, always starting with the VFF.
73 The order by which the two sites were tested, as well as which investigator performed the
74 measurements first, was decided based on simple randomization (flipping of a coin). A time

75 interval of one hour was allowed between subsequent sets of measurements. Each
76 investigator tested both sites once a day. The entire sessions were then repeated after 24
77 hours, on day 2.

78 The measurements with the VFF were carried out as follows: filaments of
79 progressively increasing thickness, starting with 0.008 g, were applied consecutively to each
80 anatomical site, perpendicular to the skin surface, until either the filament bended or a
81 behavioral response was evoked. If the cat reacted to a specific filament with limb/head
82 withdrawal, head turning, watching the site of application, vocalization, hissing, or attempts
83 to bite/scratch, then the same filament was re-applied twice to verify that the behavioural
84 response was consistent. In order to avoid temporal summation, a minimal time interval of 30
85 seconds was allowed between subsequent applications (Nie et al. 2005). The size of the
86 filament that evoked a consistent behavioral response was recorded as threshold.

87 The measurements with the EVF were carried out as follows: the 1000 g probe was
88 equipped with the rigid tip. The latter was then perpendicularly applied to the skin surface of
89 the two sites of interest. The force of application was progressively increased until a
90 behavioral response could be evoked as for the VFF. As for the VFF, three subsequent
91 measurements were taken, with 30 second-interval between each. The mean of the obtained
92 values was recorded as threshold.

93

94 **Statistical analysis**

95 Normality of data was assessed with the D'Agostino, Skewness and Kurtosis tests.

96 The Spearman correlation coefficient (SCC) was used to analyse the degree of correlation
97 between the measurements obtained with the two devices. According to the guidelines
98 provided by the manufacturer of the statistic software used, for both analyses a result of 0 -0.19
99 was interpreted as very weak correlation, 0.20-0.39 as weak correlation, 0.40-0.59 as moderate

100 correlation, 0.60-0.79 as strong correlation; and 0.80-1.0 as very strong correlation (Systat
101 website, 2018). Additionally, the LA between the EVF and the VFF were analysed with the
102 intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) and with the Bland-Altman analysis, used to define the
103 95% confidence intervals (CI; upper and lower bounds). The inter-device limits of agreement
104 were scored as follows: ICC < 0.40 = poor; ICC between 0.40 and 0.59 = fair; ICC between
105 0.60 and 0,74 = good; and ICC between 0.75 and 1= excellent (Cicchetti 1994). For the Bland-
106 Altman method, the number of standard deviations was set at 1.96, with 95% confidential
107 interval (Bland and Altman 1986).

108 Commercially available software were used (IBM SPSS Statistics 24, IBM
109 Corporation, NY, USA; and SigmaPlot 14 and SigmaStat 4, SYSTAT Software Inc, CA,
110 USA).

111

112 **Results**

113 A total of 15 mixed breed neutered cats, three females (20%) and 12 males (80%), aged $5.8 \pm$
114 4.7 years, were enrolled in the study. Only 4 out of the 15 cats were assessed in the presence
115 of their owner.

116 All the cats tolerated to complete one set of measurements. However, 11 cats became
117 less cooperative on day 2 and required a break longer than 30 seconds between subsequent
118 applications of the algometers. These cats were allowed to rest unrestrained for about 5
119 minutes. The remaining 4 cats were the ones whose owners were present throughout the
120 whole experimental session.

121 The data for VFF applied at the lip showed a two-sided distribution, with the 60 g and
122 300 g filaments being the sizes mostly recorded as threshold (10% and 44% of the cases,
123 corresponding to 6 and 25 out of 58 measurements, respectively). Regarding the

124 measurements carried out with the VFF at the stifle, the 300 g filament was recorded as
125 threshold in 87% of the cases (51 out of 58 measurements).

126 Overall, there was a fair agreement between the EVF and the VFF (ICC = 0.49; CI =
127 0.13 – 0.70; LOA = -188 +280; Bias = 47). The thresholds obtained for each pair of
128 measurements, as well as the values for SCC, ICC and 95% CI are presented in Table 1.

129

130 **Discussion**

131 The main finding of this study is that performing QST in cats with both the EVF and the VFF
132 is feasible, and that the sensory thresholds measured at the lip and at the stifle with these two
133 algometers are comparable, indicating a fair inter-device agreement. However, owing to
134 practicability, wider range of numerical outcome, and need for less subsequent applications,
135 the EVF may be regarded superior for QST in cats than its mechanical counterpart.

136 Our findings suggest that the uncooperative nature of cats may be exacerbated after
137 repeated assessments, a drawback that would affect feasibility after the first set of
138 measurements, and that time intervals longer than 24 hours may be needed between
139 subsequent evaluations. As the assessments progressed, most cats decreased their tolerance to
140 the procedure and returned inconsistent responses to the stimuli, sometimes anticipating the
141 application of the filament/probe with an escape reaction. On the other hand, some cats
142 showed instead some degree of habituation and seemed to get used to the measurements. In
143 these cats, the thresholds recorded on day 2 were higher than on day 1. These different
144 responses may be due to the personality of each individual cat.

145 Beside the repetition of the measurements and the individual personality of each cat,
146 other factors, such as the environment and the presence of the cat owner during the trial,
147 seemed to determine an effect on the attitude of the cats. The cats physically restrained by
148 their owner during the measurements were perceived as more cooperative and tolerant to the

149 procedure than those restrained by one of the investigators. Unfortunately, as most cat owners
150 were not willing to assist during the trial, this variable could not be standardized.
151 Nevertheless, it should be considered that the current study was designed with the purpose of
152 future applications for assessing chronic pain in clinical patients, which is more likely to
153 happen in a clinical scenario, without the cat owners being present.

154 The anatomical sites were chosen in perspective of possible future applications, being
155 the stifle and the lip commonly affected by conditions potentially associated to chronic pain
156 in cats. The choice of the lip as anatomical site for the measurements, however, posed some
157 important limitations. The presence of the whiskers, crucial for feline tactile perception
158 (Williams and Kramer 2010), may increase the sensitivity especially to the VFF, as the
159 smaller filaments may generate a prickling sensation, thus evoking a behavioural response
160 caused by discomfort rather than pain. Some of the cats enrolled in the study, indeed, showed
161 a rubbing gesture when the filaments were applied on the lips. Moreover, measuring
162 thresholds at the lip implies that the cat is able to see the probe, which may itself affect its
163 behavioral response. The medial aspect of the stifle posed some limitations as well, as this
164 area is difficult to reach in standing cats.

165 In most cats, at the level of the stifle the thickest VFF was recorded as threshold, and
166 this may be interpreted as a pitfall of the measuring instrument. There is, indeed, a large step
167 between the second to last and the last filaments (from 180 g to 300 g), which may jeopardize
168 the ability of the operator to detect small differences in thresholds. In that respect, EVF may
169 represent a better choice than the mechanical filaments in feline patients.

170 Another important limitation of the present study is the animal model used.
171 Presumably, the presence of chronic pain would decrease the sensory thresholds compared to
172 the study population, composed of healthy cats. This may allow the investigator to better
173 detect small differences in sensitivity between subjects, especially when using the VFF. Still

174 regarding the study population, a sample size calculation could have been performed by using
175 the means obtained from pilot measurements carried out by both operators before
176 commencing the trial. Since a pre-study trial could not be conducted, the number of cats to be
177 enrolled in the project was decided based on previously published literature. As a result, a too
178 small sample size cannot be excluded.

179

180 **Conclusion**

181 Quantitative sensory testing are feasible in cats with both the EVF and the VFF, as
182 long as the measurements are not repeated within a short time interval. Further trials are
183 needed to determine the usefulness of QST with EVF and VFF in feline patients suffering
184 from actual chronic pain.

185 **References**

186

187 Addison E, Clements D (2017) Repeatability of quantitative sensory testing in healthy cats in
188 a clinical setting with comparison to cats with osteoarthritis. *J Feline Med Surg* 19,
189 1274-1282.

190 Bland J, Altman D (1986) Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods
191 of clinical measurement. *Lancet* 1, 307–310.

192 Cicchetti DV (1994) Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and
193 standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment* 6, 284–
194 290.

195 Klinck M, Frank D, Guillot M et al. (2012) Owner-perceived signs and veterinary diagnosis
196 in 50 cases of feline osteoarthritis. *Can Vet J* 53, 1181–1186.

197 Lambert G, Mallos G, Zagami AS et al. (2009) Von Frey’s hairs – a review of their
198 technology and use – a novel automated von Frey device for improved testing for
199 hyperalgesia. *J Neurosci Methods* 177, 420–426.

200 Moore S, Hettlich BF, Waln A (2013) The use of an electronic von Frey device for
201 evaluation of sensory threshold in neurologically normal dogs and those with acute
202 spinal cord injury. *Vet J* 197, 216–219.

203 Nie H, Arendt-Nielsen L, Andersen H (2005) Temporal summation of pain evoked by
204 mechanical stimulation in deep and superficial tissue. *J Pain* 2005; 6: 348-355.

205 Tena B, Escobar B, Arguis MJ et al. (2012) Reproducibility of electronic Von Frey and Von
206 Frey monofilaments testing. *Clin J Pain* 28, 318-223.

207 Williams C, Kramer EM, (2010) The Advantages of a Tapered Whisker. *PLoS One* 20, 5;
208 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0008806. *PLoS One*, 5, e8806.

209 Winer JN, Arzi B, Verstraete FJ et al (2016) Therapeutic Management of Feline Chronic
210 Gingivostomatitis: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Front Vet Sci* 3, 54; doi:
211 10.3389/fvets.2016.00054<http://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2016.00054>.
212 Website: Systat. <https://systatsoftware.com/products/sigmastat/> Last accessed 7 February
213 2018.