The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

Prehospital Pain Management By Paramedics

Ahmed Aabdillah M Almajnuni [1], Hamed Ehssanalhaq Mohammed [2], Faisal Abdullah Saeed Alzahrani [3], Bader Mohammed Ali Alshareef [4], Rajih Abdullah Saeed Al-Alawi [5], Naif Zainalabdin Alhusini [6], Talal Ali Alshareef [7], Musaad Hamoud Bakr Alshareef [8], Maitham Jawad Nasser Bu Daris [9], Mansoor Sadi Alshammari [10]

[1]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. tmalem3ak2009@hotmail.com
[2]EMS, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. hamjoodi2015@gmail.com
[3]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. F-cam@live.com
[4]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Badralshreef9011@gmail.com
[5]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. sah.seh10@gmail.com
[6]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. nzz2@outlook.com
[7]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. talooo9080@gmail.com
[8]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. mhbal9080@gmail.com
[9]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Maythmjawad@srca.org.sa
[10]EMT, Red Crescent, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. paramedic2030@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Prehospital pain management is a critical component of emergency medical services (EMS), directly influencing patient outcomes, satisfaction, and quality of care. Acute pain is highly prevalent among patients requiring paramedic intervention, yet oligoanalgesia, the under-treatment of pain, remains a persistent global challenge. This review examines the epidemiology, assessment, and management of prehospital pain, alongside the historical evolution of paramedic practice, current pharmacological and non-pharmacological strategies, and the unique needs of special populations. It highlights systemic barriers such as inadequate pain assessment, provider concerns regarding drug safety, and regulatory constraints. Advances in pharmacological options, simulation-based education, and emerging innovations including intranasal delivery, portable infusion technology, digital pain assessment, and telemedicine, are expanding paramedic capabilities. Addressing gaps in training, guideline adherence, and equity in pain treatment is essential to ensure timely, safe, and effective analgesia. This synthesis underscores the ethical and clinical imperative of improving prehospital pain management to enhance patient-centered outcomes and strengthen trust in EMS systems.

Keywords: Prehospital care, Paramedics, Pain management, Analgesia, EMS, Trauma, Non-trauma pain, Patient outcomes, Pharmacological analgesia, Non-pharmacological interventions

INTRODUCTION

Prehospital pain management is a fundamental aspect of emergency care, representing a critical quality-of-care indicator in modern paramedic practice. The following section analyzes the epidemiology and burden of pain in prehospital emergencies, the clinical and ethical imperatives for pain treatment, the historical development of pain management in Emergency Medical Services (EMS), the ongoing global challenge of oligoanalgesia, and the rationale for a focused scientific review of paramedic-delivered pain management. Acute pain is a frequent and significant complaint among individuals requiring EMS intervention. Epidemiological studies show that moderate to severe pain is present in at least 20–47% of prehospital patients, depending on population and methodology. For example, in a multicenter European study, up to 42% of all prehospital cases involved acute pain. Trauma, abdominal, and chest pain are the most commonly reported etiologies, with traumatic pain being particularly prominent among younger patients (Ferri et al., 2022).Patient-reported outcomes underscore the distressing and multifaceted impact

of unrelieved pain, which is linked not only to increased suffering and anxiety but also to worse short- and long-term health outcomes. Inadequate pain relief in the prehospital phase can prolong recovery, increase the risk of persistent pain syndromes, and negatively affect patient satisfaction with EMS services. Timely and effective pain management is therefore not simply a humanitarian goal but a pivotal aspect of high-quality prehospital care (Whitley et al., 2023).

The imperative to assess and relieve pain in the prehospital context is anchored in clinical, ethical, and quality-of-care concerns. Untreated pain can lead to physiological consequences such as increased stress response, tachycardia, hypertension, and impaired immune function. Ethically, EMS practitioners are obligated to minimize suffering, uphold patient dignity, and provide care that respects each individual's rights and preferences. In the current healthcare landscape, pain is recognized as the "fifth vital sign," and pain assessment is now a standard clinical expectation in EMS protocols (Cimino & Braun, 2023).

Paramedics' proficiency in pain management plays a direct role in patient-centered outcomes, trust in EMS systems, and overall patient experience during health emergencies. Regulatory and accrediting bodies increasingly assess quality through pain management indicators, embedding pain relief as an essential quality metric in EMS agencies (Thomson et al., 2024).

Historically, the management of pain in prehospital care has evolved in parallel with the professionalization and clinical scope expansion of paramedics. Early ambulance services, often staffed by non-clinical personnel, rarely administered analgesia; pain relief was mostly deferred to emergency departments. In the latter decades of the 20th century, legislative changes such as the US Controlled Substances Act (1970) gradually permitted EMS providers to administer analgesics under medical direction. Over recent decades, formal training in pain assessment, access to wider analgesic options (opioids, ketamine, nitrous oxide, nonsteroidals), and protocol-driven practice have increasingly equipped paramedics to manage pain effectively in the field (Schwerin & Mohney, 2023a).

Despite robust evidence and greater clinical emphasis on pain management, oligoanalgesia, the under-treatment of pain, remains a widespread international problem in prehospital EMS. Studies consistently report that between 43 and 80% of patients who experience pain prehospitally receive inadequate or no pharmacological treatment for their pain. Factors driving oligoanalgesia include failure to routinely assess pain, provider underestimation of pain severity, concern about masking clinical signs, fear of adverse drug effects, cumbersome regulatory controls on controlled substances, and cultural bias toward stoicism (Ferri et al., 2022).

This ongoing gap not only inflicts unnecessary suffering but can contribute to prolonged hospital stays, the development of chronic pain, elevated psychological distress, and decreased trust in EMS systems (Ferri et al., 2022).

Objectives and Rationale for Reviewing Evidence on Paramedic Pain Management

Given the high prevalence of pain in prehospital emergencies, the demonstrable benefits of timely pain relief, and the persistent challenge of oligoanalgesia, there is compelling justification to systematically review and synthesize the evidence on paramedic-delivered pain management. Clear objectives for such a review include:

- Evaluating the effectiveness and safety of current pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions by paramedics.
- Assessing compliance with clinical practice guidelines and identifying systemic barriers to adequate pain care.

- Highlighting best practices and innovative models for optimizing analgesia in diverse EMS systems.
- Informing protocol development, paramedic education, and quality improvement initiatives to close the gap in pain treatment.

A scientific review in this domain is essential not only for enlightening practice and policy but also for ensuring that EMS fulfills its ethical mandate to alleviate suffering and deliver compassionate, evidence-based care at the earliest stage of the emergency care continuum.

Epidemiology of Pain in EMS Patients

Traumatic vs Non-Traumatic Causes

The etiology of pain encountered in prehospital care varies, but traumatic events consistently emerge as a major source. Studies show that as many as 82% of patients presenting with trauma report pain, compared to only 36% of patients with non-traumatic medical conditions. This distinction has direct implications for management, as traumatic injuries often demand rapid analgesic intervention to prevent secondary complications (Scholten et al., 2015).

Recent research in the Netherlands, for example, reports pain prevalence in trauma patients as high as 70–91%, reaffirming trauma as a key driver of prehospital pain. Conversely, musculoskeletal conditions, abdominal pain, and acute coronary syndromes comprise the most common non-traumatic causes identified by EMS (Häske et al., 2024a).

Adult vs Pediatric Prevalence

Age group differences in pain epidemiology are stark. Adults report pain more frequently and with greater intensity compared to pediatric patients. However, the most common primary symptom documented in pediatric EMS encounters is also pain (30.3%), with traumatic injuries representing the main contributor in this population. Despite this, rates of pain score documentation remain significantly lower in pediatric patients compared to adults, highlighting an area for clinical improvement (Diggs et al., 2016).

Adolescents and young adults tend to report higher pain scores, and undertreatment is particularly problematic in these groups, possibly due to challenges with assessment and communication. EMS providers often feel less confident and more emotionally burdened when treating children, contributing to variability in both assessment and management quality (Hauch et al., 2023).

Urban vs Rural Variation in Cases

Epidemiological studies consistently show geographic variation in case profiles and management timelines between urban and rural settings. Urban EMS systems typically boast shorter response and transport times, which may influence both the incidence and treatment of acute pain. Conversely, rural EMS faces longer response intervals and limited resources, with on-scene and prehospital times extended compared to urban counterparts. These operational differences can result in disparities in the documentation and relief of pain, although granular data specifically quantifying urban–rural prevalence differences for pain alone remain limited (Alanazy et al., 2019).

Challenges of Pain Assessment in the Field

Subjectivity of Pain Scores

Pain assessment in the prehospital context relies on patient self-report, making it inherently subjective. Patients' experiences of pain are influenced by individual physiology, psychology, and sociocultural background. For EMS providers, this subjectivity complicates both the initial evaluation and the monitoring of response to interventions (Häske et al., 2024a).

Limited Tools (Verbal, Numerical, Visual Scales)

Paramedics are typically equipped with a limited set of pain assessment tools: verbal rating scales, numerical rating scales (NRS), and visual analog scales (VAS). Each has its benefits and drawbacks. The NRS is a commonly used, simple tool, but it depends upon the patient's ability to comprehend and communicate numerical values. Visual and descriptive scales may offer alternative solutions, though they are still less effective in populations with cognitive or language barriers (Lidauer et al., 2025).

Difficulties With Pediatric, Geriatric, Unconscious, and Language-Barrier Patients

Special populations present unique obstacles for pain assessment. Pediatric patients, especially younger children, may have difficulty quantifying their pain or understanding assessment scales. Pain score documentation is notably less frequent in pediatric cases, and confidence among EMS providers in assessing pediatric pain remains lower than for adults. Similarly, geriatric patients may underreport pain due to cognitive limitations or stoicism (Ramgopal et al., 2018).

Patients who are unconscious or have altered mental status are another high-risk group for underassessment and undertreatment. In these cases, paramedics must rely on indirect signs such as changes in vital signs or nonverbal expressions, which are neither specific nor sensitive for pain recognition. Language barriers can further complicate pain assessment in diverse communities, particularly where interpretation services are unavailable or impractical in the field (Häske et al., 2024a).

Monitoring Dynamic Changes Over Transport Time

Pain status can fluctuate significantly in the prehospital setting due to ongoing injury, movement during transport, or initial analgesic administration. However, studies show reassessment is inconsistent: repeated pain evaluations are performed in less than 30% of EMS cases, leading to insufficient monitoring of treatment efficacy or the evolution of patient status. Factors contributing to this include short transport times, high provider workload, shifting priorities in rapidly evolving emergencies, and a lack of universal protocols for repeat assessments (Lidauer et al., 2025).

Historical Evolution of Prehospital Pain Management

The historical evolution of prehospital pain management by paramedics reflects major shifts in EMS philosophy, skillsets, and policy. This progression spans from bare-bones care prioritizing rapid transport, to sophisticated, protocol-driven analgesia and substantial expansion of the paramedic role.

Early EMS Models: Rapid Transport, Minimal Analgesia

Initial EMS systems, especially those in the Anglo-American tradition, emphasized the swift transport of patients to the hospital with little focus on prehospital interventions, particularly pain relief. Basic interventions, such as splinting and immobilization, prevailed, and pharmacological pain relief was uncommon outside military or physician-led environments. Early civilian ambulance services were often staffed by personnel with only rudimentary medical training, limiting the scope of prehospital analgesia (Purvis, 2018).

Progressive Introduction of Paramedic-Led Pharmacological Interventions

The pivotal change in prehospital pain management coincided with the development of paramedicine in the 1960s and 1970s in response to trauma care needs identified during wartime and major urban emergencies. Initiatives such as the pioneering Belfast cardiac ambulances and U.S. "Medic 1" programs began to train paramedics extensively, including the administration of intravenous medications and later analgesics. By the 1980s, morphine and nitrous oxide were gradually introduced to EMS protocols, especially in advanced life support (ALS) teams (Shah, 2006).

The 1970 Controlled Substances Act in the United States allowed for interpretation that enabled EMS providers, including paramedics, to administer controlled analgesics under medical direction, further catalyzing practice changes. Progressive expansion of protocols followed, allowing paramedic-led pain management as evidence for its safety and efficacy accrued (Schwerin & Mohney, 2023).

Global Differences in Scope of Practice

International EMS models developed with marked differences in approach to pain relief and paramedic autonomy:

- The Anglo-American model ("scoop and run") typically empowers paramedics to provide initial ALS including analgesia, with protocols shaped by system-wide medical control. These systems place the paramedic at the center of prehospital care, transporting patients rapidly to hospital-based physicians for definitive care (Al-Shaqsi, 2010).
- The Franco-German model ("stay and stabilize"), conversely, sends physicians directly to the scene. Here, paramedics may initiate basic interventions, but advanced pharmacological pain relief is more commonly provided by the dispatched physician; paramedic autonomy may be restricted (Al-Shaqsi, 2010).

Both models have adapted over time, with many hybrid systems enhancing paramedic competencies and broadening their pharmacological armamentarium. These international contrasts remain pertinent to discussions about scope of practice and medical governance in EMS (Al-Shaqsi, 2010).

Policy and Guideline Changes Expanding Paramedic Autonomy

From the 1990s onward, mounting evidence and professional advocacy prompted significant reforms in many jurisdictions to improve prehospital pain management. Key developments included (Schwerin & Mohney, 2023):

- Addition of a wider spectrum of analgesics to paramedic protocols, such as fentanyl, ketamine, and NSAIDs, alongside morphine and nitrous oxide, often with dosing and reassessment algorithms.
- Policy modifications such as the UK's 2018 legislative changes authorizing certain paramedics to independently prescribe or administer controlled substances without case-by-case medical orders, increasing access and reducing delays in pain relief.
- Guidance from professional bodies (e.g., American College of Emergency Physicians) recommending timely, protocol-driven, and patient-centered analgesia as a core ALS capability for EMS teams, underscoring the ethical obligation to alleviate suffering.
- Ongoing international efforts to standardize paramedic competencies and extend analgesia protocols in response to emerging research, workforce development, and patient expectations.

Modern EMS training now universally incorporates pain assessment tools, pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic strategies, and elements of shared decision-making with patients and families. Continuous reappraisal of protocols seeks to ensure equitable and evidence-based access to pain relief in the prehospital environment (Lidauer et al., 2025).

Pharmacological Pain Management

Pharmacological pain management by paramedics in the prehospital setting has evolved to include a broad spectrum of options, balancing rapid and effective analgesia with safety considerations, logistics, and training requirements. Below is a detailed review, organized according to the drug groups and interventions most relevant to modern prehospital care (Kiavialaitis et al., 2020).

Opioid Analgesia

Intravenous Morphine: Effectiveness, Safety, Titration Strategies

IV morphine has traditionally served as a staple of prehospital analgesia due to its potent efficacy in treating moderate to severe pain. Studies consistently demonstrate significant reductions in pain scores following morphine administration, with typical doses around 4–4.5 mg achieving a decrease in pain greater than 40% on numeric rating scales. Safety profiles are generally favorable when administered within defined protocols, and opioid-induced respiratory depression requiring intervention is rare with trained paramedic providers. Titration strategies, including incremental dosing and thorough monitoring, mitigate common risks such as hypotension and sedation, though careful patient selection remains critical, especially in elderly or hemodynamically unstable patients (Friesgaard et al., 2022).

Fentanyl: Rapid Onset, Versatility, Safety Profile

Fentanyl offers rapid onset analgesia (peak effect within minutes) and is used both intravenously and intranasally, the latter being especially beneficial for pediatric patients or when IV access is delayed. Its shorter duration of action, ease of titration, and smaller volume make it logistically appealing for prehospital providers. Studies reveal fentanyl to be as effective as morphine for pain relief, with no significant difference in post-treatment pain scores between paramedics and physicians. Adverse effects are minimal when protocols are followed, and antagonization with naloxone is an uncommon necessity (Lindbeck et al., 2023a).

Other Opioids: Hydromorphone, Remifentanil, Regional Differences

Alternative opioids such as hydromorphone, remifentanil, and nalbuphine are gaining ground in select EMS systems, often dictated by local guidelines or formulary availability. Nalbuphine, for instance, shows comparable analgesic potency to morphine but offers a higher ceiling effect for respiratory depression and rapid onset, which can be advantageous in dynamic prehospital settings. Regional differences in analgesic protocols are common, reflecting varying degrees of paramedic autonomy and medical oversight (Lindbeck et al., 2023).

Risks of Opioids: Respiratory Depression, Hypotension, Monitoring

Opioids present inherent risks, notably respiratory depression and hypotension, underscoring the necessity of vigilant monitoring and adherence to dosing guidelines. Paramedics utilize pulse oximetry and clinical observation to manage these risks, and incidents requiring reversal agents remain rare in contemporary practice when protocols are followed. Nevertheless, opioid-related adverse events are more common in high-dose situations or among vulnerable populations, emphasizing the value of ongoing education, protocol updates, and alternative agents (Deslandes et al., 2024).

Non-Opioid Analgesics

Paracetamol/Acetaminophen: Indications and Prehospital Use

Acetaminophen is regularly used for mild to moderate pain in the prehospital environment, often in oral or intravenous form. Its relatively benign side-effect profile and broad applicability make it a logical first-line agent, particularly for musculoskeletal injuries or febrile discomfort. Combination therapy with opioids or other non-opioid agents can yield additive analgesic effects, though the opioid-sparing benefit in the prehospital phase requires further study (McArthur et al., 2024).

NSAIDs (Ibuprofen, Ketorolac): Pros and Limitations

NSAIDs such as ibuprofen and ketorolac are effective for inflammatory or musculoskeletal pain and serve as valuable adjuncts or alternatives to opioid therapy. Prehospital NSAID use is subject to logistical constraints, contraindications (renal dysfunction, peptic ulcer disease), and concerns about bleeding in

trauma cases. Despite these limitations, NSAIDs compare favorably to opioids for analgesic efficacy and cause fewer side effects, such as nausea and dizziness (McArthur et al., 2024).

Ketamine (Sub-Dissociative Analgesia): Rising Popularity and Advantages

Ketamine, employed in sub-dissociative doses for pain relief, is increasingly recognized for its rapid analgesic onset and minimal risk of respiratory depression. This profile makes it especially valuable in trauma scenarios involving hypotensive patients, where opioids could induce hemodynamic instability. Although ketamine's adverse effects include dysphoria and emergence phenomena, these are rare at analgesic doses in the prehospital setting (Sobieraj et al., 2019).

Adjuncts for Severe Pain and Special Situations

Entonox (Nitrous Oxide): Use, Limitations, Logistics

Entonox (a 50:50 nitrous oxide/oxygen mixture) is widely used for short-term analgesia in prehospital care, especially for trauma, fracture manipulation, and pediatric procedures. Self-administered via mask or mouthpiece, Entonox is favored for its rapid onset, ease of titration, and lack of profound sedation. Limitations include logistical challenges in supplying and storing gas cylinders, contraindications in patients with pneumothorax or impaired consciousness, and reduced effectiveness in cold environments. Common side effects are limited to drowsiness and mild nausea, with minimal risk of major complications (Ducassé et al., 2013).

Non-Pharmacological Pain Management

Non-pharmacological pain management is a critical component of prehospital care delivered by paramedics, offering effective adjuncts and alternatives to medications, especially when pharmacologic options are limited or contraindicated. This section will examine best practices, techniques, and considerations in immobilization, splinting, positioning, environmental measures (ice, heat, wound coverings), psychological support strategies, and cultural or patient preference adaptation (Pak et al., 2015a).

Immobilization, Splinting, and Positioning

Immobilization and splinting are foundational interventions for managing traumatic pain in the prehospital environment. Proper immobilization of fractures and suspected spinal injuries prevents further tissue damage, minimizes movement-induced pain, and reduces anxiety. Techniques include the use of spinal immobilization devices (e.g., cervical collars, backboards), extremity splints, and pelvic stabilizers. The correct application involves:

- Assessing distal circulation, sensation, and movement before and after splinting (Feller et al., 2022).
- Padding joints and filling voids to enhance comfort and decrease pain (Feller et al., 2022).
- Gentle realignment of angulated fractures when distal neurovascular status is compromised and no resistance is encountered (Feller et al., 2022).
- Selecting the appropriate device (e.g., scoop stretcher, vacuum splint) based on injury location, patient condition, and extrication needs (Feller et al., 2022).

Patient positioning is also crucial; for example, placing patients supine with legs elevated for shock, or allowing a comfortable semi-upright position for respiratory compromise. Maintaining spinal precautions remains a key principle when indicated (Feller et al., 2022).

Ice, Heat, Wound Coverings, and Basic Measures

Local application of ice or cold packs is widely used for acute musculoskeletal injuries to limit inflammation, reduce swelling, and provide analgesia, provided there are no contraindications such as open fractures or vascular compromise. However, care must be taken to avoid direct application of ice, which can cause tissue damage or hypothermia, particularly in children and extensive trauma (Shrivastava & Goel, 2010).

For burns, prompt and sustained cooling with clean running water (ideally for 10–20 minutes) is a guideline-recommended first-aid measure, immediately followed by applying sterile wound coverings to reduce pain by protecting exposed nerve endings and minimizing contamination. In resource-limited settings, hydrogel-based dressings can serve as an effective cooling and protective intervention. Heat packs may be used for certain non-traumatic pain syndromes, such as muscle spasm, but are less frequently deployed prehospitally and should be guided by local protocols. Basic measures also include wound covering and protection for traumatic injuries to minimize further irritation and pain during movement (Pak et al., 2015).

Distraction, Reassurance, and Psychological Support

Pain is not solely a sensory experience; emotional distress, fear, and anxiety can exacerbate perceived pain. Paramedics play a vital role in providing psychological support through effective communication, reassurance, and distraction techniques. Key strategies include:

- Clearly explaining assessments, procedures, and transport plans to promote trust and reduce anxiety.
- Using distraction during painful procedures or extrications, especially in pediatric or highly anxious patients, to reduce pain focus.
- Offering continuous reassurance and displaying a confident, compassionate demeanor, which can break the pain-anxiety cycle and improve overall patient experience.

Such measures are integral adjuncts to analgesic therapy, and in some cases, may sufficiently reduce pain to obviate immediate pharmacological interventions (Pak et al., 2015).

Cultural and Patient Preference Considerations

Cultural factors and individual patient preferences significantly influence pain expression and response to non-pharmacological interventions. Evidence indicates that sociocultural background shapes both the communication of pain and receptivity to certain pain management strategies in the prehospital setting. Paramedics should:

- Avoid bias and ensure equitable assessment and treatment irrespective of patient background, mitigating health disparities (Rantala et al., 2025).
- Incorporate awareness of cultural beliefs regarding pain, injury, gender roles, or specific comfort measures, and adapt interventions when possible (Häske et al., 2024).
- Engage patients (or caregivers) in decisions about immobilization, exposure, and handling, respecting their values and preferences as far as safety allows (Häske et al., 2024).

Special Populations

Special populations present unique challenges and considerations in prehospital pain management conducted by paramedics, necessitating tailored strategies and heightened awareness of risk factors and barriers. Effective pain management improves patient outcomes, but disparities persist across age groups, conditions, and operational environments.

Pediatric Patients

Management of pain in pediatric patients faces barriers including communication difficulties, risk of dosing errors, and consistent underestimation of pain severity. Pain assessment tools may not be adapted to children or used consistently, resulting in up to 66–96% of cases lacking proper pain assessment documentation. Fear of side effects and challenges with intravenous access further limit analgesic delivery, especially in children under five years old. Safe and effective analgesic options in the prehospital setting include intranasal fentanyl, inhaled methoxyflurane, and intravenous morphine, each demonstrating efficacy with acceptable adverse event profiles when administered properly. Non-pharmacological approaches, such as distraction, comforting communication, and child-friendly interventions, complement pharmacological strategies. Timely and adequate pain management is critical in pediatric populations, as inadequate analgesia can contribute to delayed recovery, development of chronic pain, and psychological sequelae (Abebe et al., 2021).

Geriatric Patients

Older adults present additional complexities for paramedics due to comorbidities, polypharmacy, frailty, and an increased risk of adverse effects from analgesics. Pain is frequently underrecognized and undertreated, leading to worse health outcomes in this group. Cognitive impairments and atypical pain presentations compound assessment challenges, often resulting in elderly patients particularly those aged 65–85 receiving little or no analgesic intervention in prehospital settings. Careful consideration of the patient's clinical history, medication profile, and functional status is vital before administering analgesia, to minimize risks of drug interactions, oversedation, and respiratory depression. Training paramedics in geriatric assessment, personalized pain management protocols, and communication improves outcomes and safety (Platts-Mills et al., 2013).

Trauma vs Medical Pain

Traumatic injuries, such as fractures, burns, or significant soft tissue injuries, are more likely to prompt the administration of analgesics compared to pain of medical origin, such as abdominal pain, renal colic, or sickle cell crises. In trauma, visible injury and clear pain etiology foster professional confidence in pharmacological intervention, driving more frequent and robust pain management than in cases of internal or non-traumatic medical pain. Paramedics face decisional challenges in distinguishing pain severity and origin, often erring on the side of caution for less overt, medical causes due to concerns about masking symptoms, differential diagnosis, or drug interactions. Individualized pain management strategies aligned to the cause, such as opioids for severe trauma or nonsteroidal agents for medical pain, are recommended, with continuous reassessment for efficacy and adverse effects (Ferri et al., 2022).

Military, Disaster, and Austere Environments

Pain management in military, disaster, and austere settings is complicated by limited resources, prolonged evacuation times, and competing tactical priorities. Field analgesia may require improvisation, with reliance on portable, easy-to-administer agents such as oral morphine, intranasal fentanyl, or inhaled nitrous oxide when available. When supply caches are exhausted or patient evacuation is delayed, non-pharmacological approaches and pain relief improvisations such as nerve blockade or field-expedient splinting can supplement care. Standardized trauma training increases awareness and utilization of early pain management techniques, leading to measurable improvements in the administration of analgesics to casualties. Nonetheless, the realities of the high-threat environment mean tradeoffs are sometimes necessary: prioritizing life-preserving interventions, maintaining patient alertness, and modifying analgesic regimens based on tactical necessity (Butson, 2024).

Education, Training, and Competency

Paramedic education and training in pain management have advanced significantly, reflecting the critical role paramedics play in alleviating prehospital pain. Current paramedic curricula include foundational knowledge on pain physiology, assessment, pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions, and patient-centered pain management principles. Repeated educational interventions have shown to improve paramedics' knowledge, perceptions, and clinical management of pain, with measurable improvements in pain assessment and analgesic administration documented post-training. Procedural training distinguishes between various analgesic administration routes, primarily intravenous (IV) and intranasal (IN) methods. IV administration requires robust skills in venous access and aseptic technique, traditionally emphasized in paramedic training. However, intranasal administration has gained traction due to its ease of use, rapid onset, and avoidance of needle-associated complications. Training protocols now incorporate specific competencies surrounding IN analgesics, emphasizing patient selection, dosing accuracy, and understanding of pharmacokinetics unique to this route (French et al., 2013).

Simulation-based training is increasingly incorporated to enhance paramedics' competence in pain assessment and analgesic dosing. Simulation scenarios mimic real-life emergencies incorporating trauma and acute pain, allowing paramedics to practice pain scoring, decision-making for analgesia initiation, and monitoring efficacy in a controlled environment. Studies in emergency nursing and paramedic education have demonstrated that combining theoretical instruction with simulation leads to better pain management outcomes and higher practitioner confidence. Lifelong learning is vital in maintaining paramedic competency amidst evolving pain management guidelines and emerging evidence. Continuing medical education (CME) programs, online tutorials, and refreshers focused on pain assessment methods, new analgesic agents, and safe dosing protocols ensure paramedics stay updated. Structured continuing professional development frameworks centered on core pain management competencies facilitate the ongoing assessment of paramedic knowledge, skills, and application in clinical practice. Regular guideline refreshers are particularly crucial given updates in protocols that permit expanded analgesic use by paramedics in prehospital settings, often supported by quality improvement projects and knowledge reinforcement (Devonshire & Nicholas, 2018).

Emerging Innovations

Innovations in prehospital pain management technology and methodologies are shaping paramedic practice. Intranasal (IN) and inhaled routes have emerged as safe, rapid alternatives to traditional analgesic administration, increasing accessibility and timeliness of pain relief. IN fentanyl is the most studied agent, showing comparable efficacy and safety to IV and subcutaneous routes while diminishing the need for vascular access and improving patient comfort. Additionally, IN administration is particularly useful in pediatric populations and challenging IV access scenarios. Portable infusion pumps designed for EMS use, such as the Sapphire Infusion Pump, support precision delivery of analgesics and other medications during transport. These devices are lightweight, user-friendly, and designed for uninterrupted operation in ground and air EMS environments. They enable paramedics to administer controlled continuous infusions or patient-controlled analgesia (PCA), a potential future advance in prehospital care that could enhance individualized pain control (Tanguay et al., 2020).

Digital pain assessment tools incorporating artificial intelligence (AI) are at the forefront of innovation. AI-driven systems can analyze facial expressions, vocal cues, and physiological data to objectively score pain intensity in real time, bypassing subjective biases inherent in self-report and observer scales. These technologies promise to improve accuracy in pain recognition and monitoring, optimizing analgesic dosing and timing (Akhtar, 2025).

Telemedicine integration allows paramedics to consult remotely with anesthetists or pain specialists for complex cases, facilitating real-time expert guidance on analgesic selection and dosing. Studies demonstrated that telemedically supported analgesia results in safe, effective pain control comparable to onsite physician administration, expanding paramedic capabilities where local regulations limit analgesic use (Brokmann et al., 2016).

Paramedic research continues to explore alternative analgesics and administration routes to improve safety and efficacy. Investigations into non-opioid agents, ketamine variants administered intranasally, and multimodal analgesia protocols seek to overcome limitations of current therapies, such as opioid side effects and regulatory restrictions. Continued research and incorporation of new evidence into training and protocols will be key to advancing prehospital pain care (O'Connor et al., 2020).

CONCLUSION

Pain management in the prehospital environment is both an ethical obligation and a clinical necessity for paramedics. While significant progress has been made through expanded pharmacological protocols, non-pharmacological strategies, and enhanced training, substantial disparities and barriers remain. Oligoanalgesia continues to undermine patient care, particularly among pediatric, geriatric, and medically complex populations. The integration of innovative technologies, multimodal approaches, and standardized education offers promising pathways to close these gaps. Ultimately, optimizing pain management in EMS requires a multifaceted effort: strengthening guideline implementation, expanding paramedic autonomy where safe, fostering continuous professional development, and promoting research-driven innovation. By prioritizing pain relief as a core quality metric, EMS systems can improve clinical outcomes, reduce suffering, and advance the delivery of compassionate, evidence-based emergency care.

REFERENCES

1. Abebe, Y., Hetmann, F., Sumera, K., Holland, M., & Staff, T. (2021). The effectiveness and safety of paediatric prehospital pain management: A systematic review. Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine, 29, 170. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13049-021-00974-3
2. Akhtar, Z. B. (2025). Exploring AI for pain research management: A deep dive investigative exploration. Journal of Pain Research and Management, Volume 1(Issue 1), 28–42. https://doi.org/10.46439/Painresearch.1.004
3. Alanazy, A. R. M., Wark, S., Fraser, J., & Nagle, A. (2019). Factors Impacting Patient Outcomes Associated with Use of Emergency Medical Services Operating in Urban Versus Rural Areas: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16(10), 1728. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16101728
4. Al-Shaqsi, S. (2010). Models of International Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Systems. Oman Medical Journal, 25(4), 320–323. https://doi.org/10.5001/omj.2010.92
5. Brokmann, J. C., Rossaint, R., Hirsch, F., Beckers, S. K., Czaplik, M., Chowanetz, M., Tamm, M., & Bergrath, S. (2016). Analgesia by telemedically supported paramedics compared with physician-administered analgesia: A prospective, interventional, multicentre trial. European Journal of Pain (London, England), 20(7), 1176–1184. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejp.843
6. Butson, B. (2024). Pain management in the austere, high threat environment. Are regional anaesthetic and nerve blockade techniques a good option for more of our forward care providers? The Journal of High Threat and Austere Medicine, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.33235/JHTAM.6.1.14-16
7. Cimino, J., & Braun, C. (2023). Clinical Research in Prehospital Care: Current and Future Challenges. Clinics and Practice, 13(5), 1266–1285. https://doi.org/10.3390/clinpract13050114
8. Deslandes, M., Deicke, M., Grannemann, J. J., Hinkelbein, J., Hoyer, A., Kalmbach, M., Kobiella, A., Strickmann, B., Plappert, T., & Jansen, G. (2024). Effectiveness and safety of prehospital analgesia with nalbuphine and paracetamol versus morphine by paramedics—An observational study. Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine, 32(1), 41. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13049-024-01215-z
9. Devonshire, E., & Nicholas, M. K. (2018). Continuing education in pain management: Using a competency framework to guide professional development. Pain Reports, 3(5), e688. https://doi.org/10.1097/PR9.0000000000000688

10. Diggs, L. A., Sheth-Chandra, M., & De Leo, G. (2016). Epidemiology of Pediatric Prehospital Basic Life Support Care in the United States. Prehospital Emergency Care, 20(2), 230–238. https://doi.org/10.3109/10903127.2015.1076099
11. Ducassé, J., Siksik, G., Durand-Béchu, M., Couarraze, S., Vallé, B., Lecoules, N., Marco, P., Lacombe, T., & Bounes, V. (2013). Nitrous Oxide for Early Analgesia in the Emergency Setting: A Randomized, Double-blind Multicenter Prehospital Trial. Academic Emergency Medicine, 20(2), 178–184. https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.12072
12. Feller, R., Furin, M., Alloush, A., & Reynolds, C. (2022). EMS Immobilization Techniques. In StatPearls [Internet]. StatPearls Publishing. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK459341/
13. Ferri, P., Gambaretto, C., Alberti, S., Parogni, P., Rovesti, S., Di Lorenzo, R., Sollami, A., & Bargellini, A. (2022a). Pain Management in a Prehospital Emergency Setting: A Retrospective Observational Study. Journal of Pain Research, 15, 3433–3445. https://doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S376586
14. Ferri, P., Gambaretto, C., Alberti, S., Parogni, P., Rovesti, S., Di Lorenzo, R., Sollami, A., & Bargellini, A. (2022b). Pain Management in a Prehospital Emergency Setting: A Retrospective Observational Study. Journal of Pain Research, 15, 3433–3445. https://doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S376586
15. Ferri, P., Gambaretto, C., Alberti, S., Parogni, P., Rovesti, S., Di Lorenzo, R., Sollami, A., & Bargellini, A. (2022c). Pain Management in a Prehospital Emergency Setting: A Retrospective Observational Study. Journal of Pain Research, 15, 3433–3445. https://doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S376586
16. Ferri, P., Gambaretto, C., Alberti, S., Parogni, P., Rovesti, S., Di Lorenzo, R., Sollami, A., & Bargellini, A. (2022d). Pain Management in a Prehospital Emergency Setting: A Retrospective Observational Study. Journal of Pain Research, 15, 3433–3445. https://doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S376586
17. French, S. C., Chan, S. B., & Ramaker, J. (2013). Education On Prehospital Pain Management: A Follow-Up Study. Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, 14(2), 96–102. https://doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2012.7.6678
18. Friesgaard, K. D., Vist, G. E., Hyldmo, P. K., Raatiniemi, L., Kurola, J., Larsen, R., Kongstad, P., Magnusson, V., Sandberg, M., Rehn, M., & Rognås, L. (2022). Opioids for Treatment of Pre-hospital Acute Pain: A Systematic Review. Pain and Therapy, 11(1), 17–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40122-021-00346-w
19. Häske, D., Dorau, W., Eppler, F., Heinemann, N., Metzger, F., & Schempf, B. (2024a). Prevalence of prehospital pain and pain assessment difference between patients and paramedics: A prospective cross-sectional observational study. Scientific Reports, 14(1), 5613. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-56072-8
20. Häske, D., Dorau, W., Eppler, F., Heinemann, N., Metzger, F., & Schempf, B. (2024b). Prevalence of prehospital pain and pain assessment difference between patients and paramedics: A prospective cross-sectional observational study. Scientific Reports, 14(1), 5613. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-56072-8
21. Hauch, H., El Mohaui, N., Vaillant, V., Sander, M., Kriwy, P., Rohde, M., Wolff, J., Berthold, D., & Schneck, E. (2023). Prehospital emergency medicine for children receiving palliative home care in Germany—A cross-sectional, exploratory study of EMS providers. Frontiers in Pediatrics, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2023.1104655
22. Kiavialaitis, G. E., Müller, S., Braun, J., Rössler, J., Spahn, D. R., Stein, P., & Kaserer, A. (2020). Clinical practice of pre-hospital analgesia: An observational study of 20,978 missions in Switzerland. The American Journal of Emergency Medicine, 38(11), 2318–2323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2019.10.033
23. Lidauer, S. M., Hoppu, S., Kaartinen, K., Lidauer, M. H., & Kalliomäki, M. (2025a). Pain Assessment and Its Effect on Pain Management During Emergency Medical Services—A Descriptive Study in the Tampere University Hospital Area of Finland. Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica, 69(6), e70047. https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.70047
24. Lidauer, S. M., Hoppu, S., Kaartinen, K., Lidauer, M. H., & Kalliomäki, M. (2025b). Pain Assessment and Its Effect on Pain Management During Emergency Medical Services—A Descriptive

Study in the Tampere University Hospital Area of Finland. Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica, 69(6), e70047. https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.70047
25. Lindbeck, G., Shah, M. I., Braithwaite, S., Powell, J. R., Panchal, A. R., Browne, L. R., Lang, E. S., Burton, B., Coughenour, J., Crowe, R. P., Degn, H., Hedges, M., Gasper, J., Guild, K., Mattera, C., Nasca, S., Taillac, P., & Warth, M. (2023a). Evidence-Based Guidelines for Prehospital Pain Management: Recommendations. Prehospital Emergency Care, 27(2), 144–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2021.2018073
26. Lindbeck, G., Shah, M. I., Braithwaite, S., Powell, J. R., Panchal, A. R., Browne, L. R., Lang, E. S., Burton, B., Coughenour, J., Crowe, R. P., Degn, H., Hedges, M., Gasper, J., Guild, K., Mattera, C., Nasca, S., Taillac, P., & Warth, M. (2023b). Evidence-Based Guidelines for Prehospital Pain Management: Recommendations. Prehospital Emergency Care, 27(2), 144–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2021.2018073
27. McArthur, R., Cash, R. E., Rafique, Z., Dickson, R., Crocker, K., Crowe, R. P., Wells, M., Chu, K., Nguyen, J., & Patrick, C. (2024). Intravenous Acetaminophen Versus Ketorolac for Prehospital Analgesia: A Retrospective Data Review. The Journal of Emergency Medicine, 67(3), e259–e267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemermed.2024.04.007
28. O'Connor, L., Dugas, J., Brady, J., Kamilaris, A., Shiba, S. K., Kue, R. C., & Broach, J. P. (2020). Paramedic Pain Management Practice with Introduction of a Non-opiate Treatment Protocol. Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, 21(5), 1234–1241. https://doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2020.6.47032
29. Pak, S. C., Micalos, P. S., Maria, S. J., & Lord, B. (2015a). Nonpharmacological Interventions for Pain Management in Paramedicine and the Emergency Setting: A Review of the Literature. Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine : eCAM, 2015, 873039. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/873039
30. Pak, S. C., Micalos, P. S., Maria, S. J., & Lord, B. (2015b). Nonpharmacological Interventions for Pain Management in Paramedicine and the Emergency Setting: A Review of the Literature. Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine : eCAM, 2015, 873039. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/873039
31. Platts-Mills, T. F., Hunold, K. M., Weaver, M. A., Dickey, R. M., Fernandez, A. R., Fillingim, R. B., Cairns, C. B., & McLean, S. A. (2013). Pain Treatment for Older Adults During Prehospital Emergency Care: Variations by Patient Gender and Pain Severity. The Journal of Pain : Official Journal of the American Pain Society, 14(9), 966–974. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2013.03.014
32. Purvis, J. (2018). THE EVOLUTION OF PRE-HOSPITAL EMERGENCY CARE: BELFAST AND BEYOND. The Ulster Medical Journal, 87(1), 67.
33. Ramgopal, S., Elmer, J., Escajeda, J., & Martin-Gill, C. (2018). Differences in prehospital patient assessments for pediatric versus adult patients. The Journal of Pediatrics, 199, 200-205.e6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2018.03.069
34. Rantala, I.-M., Nikander, E., Kankkunen, P., & Hämäläinen, J. (2025). Paramedics' attitudes and self-assessed competencies for acute pain management: A cross-sectional study. International Emergency Nursing, 81, 101649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ienj.2025.101649
35. Scholten, A. C., Berben, S. A. A., Westmaas, A. H., van Grunsven, P. M., de Vaal, E. T., Rood, P. P. M., Hoogerwerf, N., Doggen, C. J. M., & Schoonhoven, L. (2015). Pain management in trauma patients in (pre)hospital based emergency care: Current practice versus new guideline. Injury, 46(5), 798–806. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2014.10.045
36. Schwerin, D. L., & Mohney, S. (2023a). EMS Pain Assessment And Management. In StatPearls [Internet]. StatPearls Publishing. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK554543/
37. Schwerin, D. L., & Mohney, S. (2023b). EMS Pain Assessment And Management. In StatPearls [Internet]. StatPearls Publishing. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK554543/
38. Shah, M. N. (2006). The Formation of the Emergency Medical Services System. American Journal of Public Health, 96(3), 414–423. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2004.048793

39. Shrivastava, P., & Goel, A. (2010). Pre-hospital care in burn injury. Indian Journal of Plastic Surgery : Official Publication of the Association of Plastic Surgeons of India, 43(Suppl), S15–S22. https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-0358.70720
40. Sobieraj, D. M., Baker, W. L., Martinez, B. K., Miao, B., Hernandez, A. V., Coleman, C. I., Cicero, M. X., & Kamin, R. A. (2019). Evidence Summary. In Comparative Effectiveness of Analgesics To Reduce Acute Pain in the Prehospital Setting [Internet]. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US). https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK546207/
41. Tanguay, A., Lebon, J., Hébert, D., & Bégin, F. (2020). Intranasal Fentanyl versus Subcutaneous Fentanyl for Pain Management in Prehospital Patients with Acute Pain: A Retrospective Analysis. Prehospital Emergency Care, 24(6), 760–768. https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2019.1704323
42. Thomson, M., Simpson, P., Pap, R., & Munn, Z. (2024). Clinical practice guidelines in prehospital pain management for paramedics: A systematic review protocol. JBI Evidence Synthesis, 22(3), 461–471. https://doi.org/10.11124/JBIES-23-00128
43. Whitley, G. A., Wijegoonewardene, N., Nelson, D., Curtis, F., Ortega, M., & Siriwardena, A. N. (2023). Patient, family member, and ambulance staff experiences of prehospital acute pain management in adults: A systematic review and meta-synthesis. Journal of the American College of Emergency Physicians Open, 4(2), e12940. https://doi.org/10.1002/emp2.12940