

Decade of Natural Language Processing in Chronic Pain: A Systematic Review

Swati Rajwal¹

¹ Department of Biomedical Informatics, Emory University, USA

E-mail: swati.rajwal@emory.edu

Abstract. In recent years, the intersection of Natural Language Processing (NLP) and public health has opened innovative pathways for investigating various domains, including chronic pain in textual datasets. Despite the promise of NLP in chronic pain, the literature is dispersed across various disciplines, and there is a need to consolidate existing knowledge, identify knowledge gaps in the literature, and inform future research directions in this emerging field. This review aims to investigate the state of the research on NLP-based interventions designed for chronic pain research. A search strategy was formulated and executed across PubMed, Web of Science, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, and ACL Anthology to find studies published in English between 2014 and 2024. After screening 132 papers, 26 studies were included in the final review. Key findings from this review underscore the significant potential of NLP techniques to address pressing challenges in chronic pain research. The past 10 years in this field have showcased the utilization of advanced methods (transformers like RoBERTa and BERT) achieving high-performance metrics (e.g., $F_1 > 0.8$) in classification tasks, while unsupervised approaches like Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) and k-means clustering have proven effective for exploratory analyses. Results also reveal persistent challenges such as limited dataset diversity, inadequate sample sizes, and insufficient representation of underrepresented populations. Future research studies should explore multimodal data validation systems, context-aware mechanistic modeling, and the development of standardized evaluation metrics to enhance reproducibility and equity in chronic pain research.

Keywords: Chronic Pain, Natural Language Processing, Systematic Review

1. Introduction

1.1. Rationale

Chronic pain refers to the condition where pain exists for more than 3 months on most days [1]. Approximately 12 million U.S. adults suffer from both chronic pain and significant anxiety or depression. Over half of those with chronic pain also report persistent mental health symptoms, and nearly 70% say health issues limit their work, daily tasks, and social activities [2]. Studies have shown that innovative technologies like Natural Language Processing (NLP) are emerging as promising tools in the field of chronic pain research and treatment [3]. NLP is a branch of artificial intelligence that focuses on the interaction between computers and human language. NLP has shown potential in various aspects of chronic pain management. Recent studies have demonstrated its

effectiveness in analyzing patient-reported outcomes, identifying imaging findings related to low back pain, and even predicting placebo analgesia in chronic pain patients [3, 4].

1.2. Objectives

Despite the promise of NLP in chronic pain, the literature is dispersed, and therefore, a systematic review is necessary to consolidate existing knowledge, identify knowledge gaps in the literature, and inform future research directions in this emerging field. This systematic review has two major objectives. First, to identify and highlight distinct NLP techniques (including Large Language Models) used for tasks related to Chronic pain. The second objective is to report the effectiveness of such techniques/models, identify potential knowledge gaps, and design research questions for future studies.

2. Methods

This systematic review is carried out under the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis) guidelines [5] and the checklist can be found in [Appendix D](#).

2.1. Eligibility Criteria

The eligible publications for this review are restricted to peer-reviewed published literature (observational studies, algorithm validation studies, computational model evaluations, experimental, qualitative), including journal articles and full conference papers. The study must be written in English, although the language of the textual dataset used can vary. The publication period of the included studies was restricted to the last decade, i.e., from 2014 to 2024. To be included, a study should answer a research question(s) on the design, development, and application of NLP in chronic pain.

2.2. Information Sources

A systematic search of the following databases was conducted from 01st January 2014 until 15th September 2024 date across PubMed, Web of Science, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, and ACL Anthology. The selected databases offer comprehensive coverage of both healthcare and NLP research. PubMed and Web of Science provide robust access to biomedical literature on chronic pain, while IEEE Xplore and ACL Anthology focus on technical advancements in NLP. Scopus bridges these disciplines, ensuring an interdisciplinary approach for a thorough systematic review. Preprints (arxiv/biorxiv), forewords, prefaces, table of contents, programs, schedules, indexes, call for papers/participation, lists of reviewers, lists of tutorial abstracts, invited talks, appendices, session information, obituaries, book reviews, newsletters, lists of proceedings, lifetime achievement awards, erratum, systematic reviews, scoping reviews, and notes are excluded. Finally, backward and forward citation chasing was performed on all the selected studies using an R-package called *Citationchaser* as introduced in the study by Haddaway & colleagues [6].

2.3. Search Strategy

Three keywords were used “chronic pain”, “natural language processing” and “large language model”. The search results across databases are shown in Table B1. The full search strategies for all information sources are provided in Appendix C.

2.4. Selection Process

One reviewer (SR) independently screened each study for eligibility by marking it as a ‘yes’ (for inclusion), ‘no’ (for exclusion), or ‘maybe’ (in case of uncertainty about relevance) in the Covidence platform (<https://app.covidence.org>). Full access to the Covidence platform was provided via Emory University login. In the first stage, the reviewer screened the titles and abstracts of each study as identified in the databases by the search strategies. In the second stage of screening, the full-text manuscripts were screened as per the eligibility criteria. Studies that do not meet the eligibility criteria were moved to an exclusion folder.

2.5. Data Collection Process

One independent researcher (SR) extracted data from the final included full-texts. Before formal data extraction, the data extraction form was piloted with a sample paper to identify and address any issues in the form to ensure it is comprehensive. The data extraction was then conducted on all papers.

2.6. Data Items

For each selected article, data items were extracted, such as year of publication, study design, research question, dataset description, NLP technology used, number of participants and their age range, results, and reproducibility.

2.7. Study risk of bias assessment

The risk of bias in the included studies was assessed using a simplified checklist inspired by the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Tools [7]. The checklist was tailored to evaluate studies employing NLP techniques for tasks related to chronic pain. The checklist included 11 items across four domains: (1) study objectives and context, (2) study design and data, (3) model development and evaluation, and (4) results and interpretation. For each item, studies were rated as “Yes,” “No”, or “Unclear.” A composite score was then calculated to classify the overall risk of bias into three categories: low (≥ 8 ‘Yes’), moderate (5-7 ‘Yes’), or high (≤ 5 ‘Yes’).

2.8. Reporting bias assessment

To assess the risk of bias due to missing results in the synthesis, a customized checklist was developed, inspired by the ROBINS-I tool [8]. This checklist was modified to evaluate reporting bias in studies employing NLP techniques for chronic pain and focused on the

completeness of results reporting selective reporting, and transparency. Each study was assessed using this checklist, with responses recorded as “Yes,” “No,” or “Unclear.” A composite score was calculated for each study to classify the risk of reporting bias as low risk (7–8 “Yes”), moderate risk (4–6 “Yes”), and high risk (<4 “Yes”). No formal statistical methods were applied to detect publication bias due to the heterogeneity of the included studies.

2.9. Study Records

The search query results from each database were exported in RIS format (except for ACL anthology since it has no way to batch export records) and then imported into Covidence Software which removed all the duplicates.

2.10. Ethical Considerations

This review involved the analysis of previously published work and did not require ethical approval or patient consent. Study participants’ confidentiality and anonymity was maintained by reporting aggregated data without individual identifiers - per the included studies.

3. Results

3.1. Study Selection

A total of 127 studies were initially identified through database searching, which included 45 from Scopus, 36 from Web of Science, 32 from ACL Anthology, 8 from PubMed, and 6 from IEEE Xplore. After doing one round of eligibility run, 5 additional studies were added through backward and forward search, showing 132 studies in total. No additional references were identified through citation searching or grey literature sources. After removing 30 duplicates, identified automatically using Covidence, 97 studies remained for screening. During the screening phase, 60 studies were excluded based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. A total of 38 studies were sought for full-text retrieval, and all were successfully retrieved for further eligibility assessment. Of these 38 studies, 12 were excluded for the following reasons: 1 for wrong setting, 2 for wrong outcomes, 8 for wrong indication, and 1 for wrong intervention. Finally, 26 studies were included in the final review. No ongoing studies or studies awaiting classification were identified at the time of this review. The detailed process can be found in the PRISMA flow diagram in Figure 1.

3.2. Study Characteristics

A total of 26 studies were selected after thoroughly screening titles, abstracts, and full texts. These studies were published between 2015 and 2024 (Figure 2). The studies were primarily published in the past three years, highlighting the growing interest in applying NLP techniques to chronic pain. The research spans various topics, including predicting placebo analgesia, developing annotated corpora for pain-related language, identifying




Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram.

language features in placebo studies, and modeling chronic pain experiences using online narratives.

3.3. Risk of bias in studies

The risk of bias was assessed for all 26 included studies using a simplified checklist as discussed in section 2.7. The results of the risk of bias assessment are summarized in Table 1. Of all studies, 23 studies fall under low, 3 under moderate, and 0 under high risk of bias.




Figure 2: Number of articles per year considered in this review.

Table 1: Risk of Bias Assessment for Included Studies.

✓ = ‘Yes’, ✗ = ‘No’, ● = ‘Unclear’, ↓ = ‘Low risk of bias’, ≈ = ‘Moderate risk of bias’.

	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]	[13]	[14]	[15]	[16]	[17]	[18]	[19]	[20]	[21]	[22]	[23]	[24]	[25]	[26]	[27]	[28]	[29]	[30]	[31]	[32]	[33]	[34]
Is study aim clearly stated?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Is the study relevant to chronic pain and NLP?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Is study design appropriate for evaluating the NLP technique?	✓	●	✓	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	●	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Are the data sources described adequately?	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Is the NLP technique adequately described?	✓	✓	✓	●	✓	●	●	●	●	✓	✓	●	●	●	●	✓	●	✓	●	✓	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓
Are evaluation metrics clearly reported?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	●	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	●	✓
Does the study address potential biases in data or analysis?	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	●	✓	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	●	✓
Are the results clearly presented and supported by the data?	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Are limitations of the study acknowledged?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Are the conclusions consistent with the results?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Total ‘Y’	10	6	10	9	9	7	9	8	8	9	10	8	9	9	9	10	9	10	9	10	10	7	9	10	8	10
Risk Category	↓	≈	↓	↓	↓	≈	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	≈	↓	↓	↓	↓

3.4. Results of individual studies

Tables 3 and 4 show data extraction results from individual studies. The studies reviewed span a range of topics and applications focusing on advancing automated methods in healthcare and analyzing treatment efficacy.

3.5. Reporting biases

Table 2 provides the risk of bias assessment specific to missing results and reporting bias. A total of 9 studies were classified as low risk, 17 as moderate risk, and 0 as high risk. Several plausible biases were found for the studies included in this literature review, such as the lack of pre-registration for the study or the reference to a pre-registered protocol. This shows a gap in ensuring transparency in research design and execution. Additionally, many studies failed to provide access to supplementary materials, which limited the replicability and verification of reported findings. These findings emphasize the importance of adhering to open science practices to mitigate risks of reporting bias. These findings highlight variability in reporting practices, underscoring the need for consistent adherence to robust reporting standards in chronic pain research.

Table 2: Risk of Reporting Bias and Missing Results.

✓ = ‘Yes’, × = ‘No’, ● = ‘Unclear’, ↓ = ‘Low risk of bias’, ≈ = ‘Moderate risk of bias’.

	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]	[13]	[14]	[15]	[16]	[17]	[18]	[19]	[20]	[21]	[22]	[23]	[24]	[25]	[26]	[27]	[28]	[29]	[30]	[31]	[32]	[33]	[34]
Are all datasets described in the methods section also reported in the results section?	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Are all evaluation metrics listed in the methods section reported in the results?	✓	×	×	×	✓	✓	×	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	✓
Does the study report results for all intended tasks or objectives?	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓
Are the results for negative or null findings explicitly reported?	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	×
Is there consistency between the study’s objectives and its results?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Does the study acknowledge any missing results or limitations in reporting?	●	✓	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Was the study pre-registered, or does it reference a pre-registered protocol?	×	×	×	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	×	×	×	✓	×	×	×	×	×	●	×	✓	×	×	×	✓	×
Does the study provide access to supplementary material or raw data?	×	✓	●	●	✓	×	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	●	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	✓	×	✓	●	×
Total ‘Y’	5	4	4	4	7	7	5	6	7	6	7	6	7	6	7	7	5	6	6	7	4	6	5	7	6	5
Risk Category	≈	≈	≈	≈	↓	↓	≈	≈	↓	≈	↓	≈	↓	≈	↓	↓	≈	≈	≈	↓	≈	≈	≈	↓	≈	≈

Table 3: Summary of the 26 included Studies.

Year Ref.	Study Design	Research Question	Dataset	NLP Tech.	Participant Count	Age (Years)	Results
[27]	2015 Observational, longitudinal	Can EHR data predict problem opioid use in chronic opioid therapy?	2,752 noncancer pain patients from Health Cooperative (2008-2010)	Regular Expression	2,752 (train: 1,449 & Val: 1,303)	18+	C-statistic: 0.739 (95% CI = .688, .790); Sensitivity: 60.1%; Specificity: 71.6%; PPV: 11.4%; NPV: 96.7%
[26]	2019 Observational, Secondary data analysis	How text mining & visual analytics reveal engagement in adolescent pain interventions?	123 adolescents with chronic idiopathic pain & their parents in an internet-based CBT intervention	LDA k-means clustering	273	11-17	Participants' messages acc: 76.5%, Coaches' messages acc: 99.3%
[29]	2019 retrospective cohort, observational	What are the frequency and predictors of CIH therapy use in veterans with chronic pain?	Retrospective cohort of 530,216 younger veterans with chronic MSK pain (2010-2013, VHA)	SVM	530,216	18-40	AUC ranged from 82.8% to 91.8%, Accuracy ranged from 79.8% to 85.8%
[34]	2020 Observational, retrospective	How can DL & NLP improve disorder classification from discharge summaries?	MIMIC-III	Word and sentence-level CNN, SVM with id-iff & word embedding	1610	N/A	The averaged metrics are Precision: 82.30%, Recall: 20.72%, ROCAUC: 60.00%, and F1: 31.89%
[28]	2021 Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled	Can patient discourse features identify placebo responders in back pain?	Exit interviews from 66 chronic back pain patients (NCT02013427)	Logistic Regression, Linear SVM, L1 (lasso) regularization, L2 (ridge) regularization	125	18+ Men Avg.: 48.8±1.9 & Women Avg.: 41.84±2.7	Accuracy: 79%, Sensitivity: 0.82, Specificity: 0.75 (SVM with L1 regularization)
[31]	2021 Retrospective	What job issues do nurses face before suicide?	NVDERS (2003-2017, CDC) data on 203 nurse suicides	LDA, Treebank Word Tokenizer, WordNet Lemmatizer	203 nurses	21+	N/A
[30]	2021 Observational, exploratory analysis	How is pain described, & which texts aid in creating a pain lexicon?	CRIS, MIMIC-III, Twitter ('chronic pain' tweets), Reddit (chronic pain subreddit)	word2vec, FastText	200 documents (50 per dataset)	N/A	N/A
[24]	2021 Retrospective observational pilot	How can data-driven methods in EHRs identify problematic opioid use?	Vanderbilt's BioVU biorepository	Text-based Score using ScispaCy	29868	20+	AUC for Text-based score: 0.79, AUC for Comorbidity score: 0.76
[33]	2022 Observational	What do chronic pain patients discuss on Reddit?	937 text posts from 'ChronicPain' subreddit (collected via PRAW on 6 Sept 2021)	LDA Bag-of-words model	709 unique authors	N/A	N/A
[16]	2022 cross-sectional observational	How often does stigmatizing language in admission notes vary by condition and race?	48651 admission notes (2018) from a large urban medical center	Tokenization into unigrams & bigrams, Porter2 stemming algorithm	29,783 patients 1,932 clinicians	Mean: 46.9 SD: 27.6	N/A
[32]	2022 Double-blind, placebo-controlled	Can language predict placebo response and distinguish drug from placebo responders?	Two RCTs (NCT02013427) on chronic pain w/ language interviews	Linguistic Inquiry Word Count Semantic proximity	Study 1: 66 Study 2: 50	Mean: 45.3 SD: 2.3	Placebo arm: AUC 0.708, F1 0.65, Precision 0.68, Recall 0.65, Balanced Acc. 67%
[21]	2023 randomized, placebo-controlled	Does reattributing back pain to mind/brain processes relieve pain in PRT?	Chronic back pain adults responses on pain causes (NCT03294148, 2017-2019)	Text scaling (LSA/PCA) Rule-based (keywords matching)	151	21-70	Cohen κ at: pretreatment: 0.42 posttreatment: 0.68
[25]	2023 Observational, retrospective	How can we create a labeled pain corpus from mental health EHRs for NLP?	CRIS A manually annotated corpus of pain mentions in mental health EHRs	KNN SVM BERT	723 patients	≤20: 10%, 21-40: 21% 41-60: 25%, 61-80: 33%, >80: 10%	F1: 0.98 (95% CI 0.98-0.99)
[11]	2023 Observational	How can the RRCP dataset model chronic pain experiences on Reddit?	Reddit Reports of Chronic Pain (RRCP) 86537 submissions (2013-2020) from chronic pain-related subreddits	K-Means LDA VADER sentiment analysis	44,815 unique authors	13+	N/A

Table 4: Summary of the 26 included studies, cont'd.

Year Ref.	Study Design	Research Question	Dataset	NLP Tech.	Participant Count	Age (Years)	Results
2023 [22]	retrospective cohort, observational	Are mental health conditions linked to pain care quality in VHA primary care?	VHA CDW linked to MSD cohort w/ EHR data from 134,508 visits with moderate/severe MSK pain (2017)	Rule-based NLP	62,721 Veterans	Avg.: 50.5 yrs SD: 16.6	F-measure: 0.92
2023 [23]	Observational, retrospective	What circumstances precede female firearm suicide in coroner & police reports?	NVDRS (2014–2018) data on female firearm suicides (40 states, Puerto Rico)	Naive Bayes, Random Forest SVM, Gradient Boosting Lemmatization, TF-IDF	1462	Mean: 47 SD: 6.9	SVM: Specificity 98.1%, Sensitivity 70.5%, F ₁ 79.1, PPV 90.5%, AUC-ROC 84.3% GB: Specificity 98.7%, PPV 93.2%.
2023 [20]	Retrospective cross-sectional	Do pain screening and reports differ between LGBT and non-LGBT Veterans?	VHA CDW (FY 2010–2019), covering over 9 million Veterans	Keywords based (Regex)	1,149,486 (LGBT: 218,154)	10-year age groups: <25 to ≥75	Sensitivity: 88.2% Specificity: 91.5%
2023 [18]	Observational, single-site, proof-of-concept	How can NLP estimate pain intensity from patient narratives?	Interviews with chronic pain patients from Centro Hospitalar Universitário de São João (Oct 2019–Oct 2020)	TF-IDF, POS TF-IDF, SVM, DT	94	Avg: 56.4 ± 12.7	SVM F ₁ : 0.60 Classification acc.: 92% mild, 42% moderate, 13% severe
2023 [19]	Observational, retrospective, stratified analysis	Does Twitter language predict community pain and its variations beyond demographics?	Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index CTLB (~1.5B county-level tweets) ~LSM pain-related tweets matched to Gallup counties	Extra Tree Classifier RF Content Specific LDA	2,541,688 spouses	N/A	RF: AUC 0.86, F ₁ 0.64, Precision 0.85, Recall 0.61 ETC: AUC 0.86, F ₁ 0.66, Precision 0.84, Recall 0.62
2023 [10]	exploratory methodological	How can LLMs, SGs, & KGs synthesize literature to aid chronic back pain research?	83 LBP literature	GPT3 & GPT4 SGs, KGs	N/A	N/A	Acc: 60%; F ₁ : 0.70 (biomechanics), 0.70 (psychology), 0.36 (both), 0.46 (neither)
2023 [15]	Observational study	How can Twitter reveal chronic pain experiences & alternative therapies?	4,998 annotated tweets with chronic pain hashtags/keywords, labeled for self-reported chronic pain experiences	RoBERTa, SciBERT BioClinicalBERT, BERTweet BioBERT, ClinicalKB.BERT	22,795 Twitter users	N/A	RoBERTa F ₁ : 0.84 (95% CI: 0.80–0.89)
2024 [13]	retrospective observational	Can LLM sentiment analysis aid fibromyalgia (FM) diagnosis via pain patterns?	Patients with and without FM (per 2016 ACR criteria) chronic pain from a rheumatology clinic (Jan 8–20, 2024).	Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 HuggingFace Transformers API for attention weight analysis	80 (FM: 40, non-FM pain controls: 40)	~38.76 to 57.68	Prompt-engineered: Acc. 0.87, Precision 0.92, Recall 0.84, Specificity 0.82, AUROC 0.86
2024 [9]	Observational, retrospective	Do online peer support users align their pain language with others?	Reddit users' comment histories in a chronic pain support community (10 years, 68,206 interactions) with ≥100 posts per user	Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) dictionary VADER	199 users	N/A	t(198)=4.02, p < .001, d=0.40 (common power)
2024 [12]	observational, cross-sectional, retrospective	What are the demographics and diagnoses of pain in mental health records, and how do they overlap in care?	CRIS Lambeth DataNet (primary care records), linked for patient-level analysis across care settings	SapBERT MedCATTrainer for NER	27211	18+ Mean: 44 IQR: 29-55	F ₁ for: Pain classification: 0.98 Anatomy identification: 0.94
2024 [14]	longitudinal, observational	How can sentiment analysis track health in chronic pain patients?	ENVISION Study (NCT03240588) on chronic back/leg pain: 34,447 free-text samples (Nov 2019–2023)	Sentence Transformers, Watson NLU, k-means clustering Hugging Face hub Transformers	242	N/A	N/A
2024 [17]	Prospective, observational	How can text and audio from chronic pain patients infer well-being?	Text & voice responses from chronic pain patients in NAVITAS & ENVISION studies (Dec 2019–July 2023, 30 U.S. sites)	RoBERTa, GeMAPS v2.0, Whisper Open AI, Lasso regression, Ridge regression, SVM	166	Text responses: 49.6–73.2; Voice responses: 52–74	ρ : Mood (text) r=0.46, Pain (text) r=0.44, Sleep (text) r=0.40, Pain (voice) r=0.45, Alertness (voice) r=0.42

4. Discussion

4.1. Central Findings

4.1.1. Methodological Approach : Based on the results tables 3 & 4 provided, it is clear that the integration of NLP techniques in healthcare, particularly in chronic pain research, has evolved significantly over time. Early studies (e.g., 2015, 2019) often relied on rule-based methods like regular expressions and simple machine learning models such as SVMs, while more recent research has shifted toward advanced deep learning techniques, including BERT [35] and RoBERTa [36]. This evolution reflects a growing sophistication in the field that is leveraging larger datasets, such as MIMIC-III [37] and VHA, and unstructured sources like Reddit and Twitter to gain deeper insights into patient experiences.

The findings across studies reveal promising results in using automated and computational methods for health analysis. For example, the use of NLP in Hylan et al. [27] allowed for improved surveillance of opioid use which showcases the potential of data-driven solutions in addressing specific health crises. Another key insight is the effectiveness of machine learning models, such as the ws-CNN used in Yang et al. [34], which enhances classification accuracy in patient phenotyping. Despite different intervention types, a recurring outcome is the growing evidence supporting automated methods for healthcare, highlighting increased accuracy and predictive capacity as consistent themes across the papers.

4.1.2. Types of Research Problems : Many studies aim to predict health outcomes, such as opioid misuse [27], placebo responders [28] or fibromyalgia diagnosis. These studies emphasize classification metrics (AUC, F₁-score) to validate their models' effectiveness. However, a significant subset of studies [33, 31] explores patient narratives to understand broader themes, such as the language of chronic pain on Reddit or the factors contributing to nurse suicides. These studies are less focused on prediction and more on identifying patterns or building resources, such as pain lexicons. Finally, studies targeting specific populations, such as Chen et al. [26] for adolescents or Gordon et al. [20] for LGBT veterans, tailor their research to demographic or population-specific datasets, leading to unique methodological adaptations.

4.1.3. Data Sources : The studies highlight a diverse range of data sources, emphasizing the distinction between structured and unstructured datasets. Structured clinical datasets, such as MIMIC-III [34] and Vanderbilt's BioVU [24], are often used for predictive analytics due to their predefined fields and compatibility with rule-based or feature-based methods. Conversely, unstructured data sources like Reddit [11, 33] and Twitter [15] require advanced NLP techniques to process free-text narratives effectively, enabling insights into public discourse and patient experiences. The scale of datasets also varies widely; large-scale clinical datasets, such as those used in [29] with over 530,000 patients, support robust model training, while smaller datasets, such as the 66 participants in [32], offer qualitative depth but face limitations in generalizability.

4.1.4. *Large Language Model (LLM)* : Lotz et al. [10] explored GPT-3 and GPT-4 for synthesizing chronic back pain literature, categorizing findings across biomechanics and psychology, though modest F_1 (0.46 for combined domains) revealed challenges in interdisciplinary understanding. Venerito and Iannone [13] used prompt-engineered sentiment analysis with Mistral-7B for fibromyalgia diagnosis, achieving high accuracy (0.87) but limited to a single application. Similarly, C. Agurto et al. [17] combined textual and audio data using RoBERTa and Whisper models, identifying correlations between mood, pain, and alertness but struggling to integrate these insights into clinical workflows. The number of studies utilizing LLMs in this review is limited. However, notably, all three studies involving LLMs were published in 2024, which indicates that their adoption in the field is gaining traction.

4.2. Research Gap

4.2.1. *Dataset size & diversity* : One pervasive issue is the lack of validation and generalization of findings across diverse populations. Venerito and Iannone [13] highlighted the need for extensive validation in large-scale studies to confirm the reliability of observed outcomes. This aligns with earlier observations by Yang et al. [34], who pointed to inadequate sample sizes that undermine the statistical power and generalizability of many studies. The representation of diverse populations in studies remains insufficient, posing a challenge to the equity and applicability of findings. Studies such as those by Taylor et al. [29] and Chaturvedi et al. [12] emphasized the need to include diverse demographic, cultural, and socioeconomic groups. Without this inclusivity, research risks producing interventions that fail to address the needs of underserved populations, perpetuating health disparities.

4.2.2. *Context-specific insights* : Mechanistic understanding and context-specific insights also remain underexplored. For instance, Chen et al. [26] stressed the importance of identifying the mechanisms driving intervention efficacy, including the “how” and “why” of their success in specific contexts. Nécaise and Amon [9] further underscored the role of social dynamics in shaping intervention outcomes, which has been largely overlooked. Similarly, Chaturvedi et al. [12] highlighted the challenge of differentiating interventions that actively influence outcomes from those merely correlated with behavioral changes. This lack of clarity in mechanisms calls for future studies that delve deeper into contextual and cultural nuances, ensuring that interventions are both targeted and effective for specific subgroups.

4.2.3. *Standard evaluation metrics* : Measurement challenges present another significant barrier. Berger et al. [28] pointed to difficulties in standardizing metrics, such as those for placebo responses in clinical trials, which complicate cross-study comparisons. J. M. Reinen et al. [14] emphasized the need to assess the balance of positive versus negative inputs in digital health interventions, a largely neglected area. Furthermore, C. Agurto et al. [17] highlighted the potential of unstructured speech data in chronic pain research, yet its integration into clinical studies remains limited due to a lack of

methodological tools. Overcoming these challenges requires the development of validated, standardized measurement techniques that enhance consistency across diverse research contexts.

4.2.4. Reproducibility : It has been found that out of all the studies reviewed, only three open-sourced their analysis code-base for other researchers to utilize [11, 12, 30]. This highlights a significant gap in reproducibility and the broader accessibility of methodological advancements.

4.3. Limitations

While the systematic review employed a robust methodology to ensure comprehensive coverage, several limitations should be acknowledged. The reliance on specific databases (PubMed, Web of Science, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, and ACL Anthology) may have excluded relevant studies published in other niche or non-indexed sources, potentially introducing a selection bias. Additionally, the exclusion of certain publication types, such as preprints and gray literature, might have omitted emerging or unconventional perspectives that are not yet peer-reviewed [38]. Although backward and forward citation chasing using Citationchaser aimed to minimize gaps, this process depends on the completeness and accuracy of citation networks, which can vary across studies. Furthermore, restricting the search to articles published between January 2014 and September 2024 may have excluded foundational work or older studies that remain pertinent to the field. Finally, the manual screening of studies (despite following predefined inclusion criteria) is inherently subjective and could be influenced by the reviewers' interpretation, which underscores the need for critical appraisal in systematic reviews. These limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of this review.

4.4. Future Research Directions

4.4.1. Cross-institute validation : NLP has demonstrated its utility as an end-to-end process for classifying and identifying class labels using chronic pain-related textual dataset(s). It will continue to be used for solving more chronic pain-related research questions and is likely to be used as a default approach along with many other models (as discussed in Tables 3 & 4) giving the best reliability. Overall, the body of evidence underscores the need for methodological rigor, innovative measurement approaches, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Validation through large-scale inter-university/hospital studies and a stronger focus on contextual and cultural sensitivity are critical priorities for future research. Addressing these gaps will not only strengthen the theoretical foundations of intervention design but also ensure practical applications that are inclusive and impactful.

4.4.2. Promoting Transparency and Accessibility : Future researchers should make an attempt to publicize their code on popularly used version-controlling platforms such as Github, Zenodo and others. Only 11% of the studies in our review have shared code base

[11, 12, 30]. Sharing the codebase will not only allow fellow researchers to reproduce the models and contribute in as many ways as possible but also ensure the reliability of the results presented in the study. Including details like training and test datasets, code to generate the model, dependencies used, parameters used, and the computational capacity used to train the model would help other researchers improve upon the existing models.

4.4.3. Addressing Cross-Linguistic : The results demonstrate that advanced methods generally achieve higher precision and recall, with some models, like RoBERTa and semantic proximity approaches, achieving F_1 scores above 0.8. However, certain gaps remain, such as limited attention to cross-linguistic and multimodal datasets and the underrepresentation of non-English narratives. Future research studies should also focus on validating existing (or developing new) models on non-English languages. One potential solution could be training LLMs on diverse cultural and demographic data to create domain-specific corpora that address gaps in socioeconomic, geographic, and linguistic diversity.

4.4.4. LLM in future studies : Future research could enhance LLMs by refining multimodal integration (e.g., text and audio), improving literature synthesis with domain-specific training, and ensuring generalizability across chronic pain conditions using larger, diverse datasets. Moreover, dynamic real-time personalization and ethical applications, including bias detection, remain critical areas for advancing LLM use in chronic pain research, bridging current gaps and expanding their clinical impact.

5. Conclusions

This systematic review highlights the evidence related to NLP systems for chronic pain. The review demonstrates NLP's utility across various applications such as chronic pain data classification, patient discourse analysis, and treatment outcome prediction. While significant progress has been achieved, several challenges remain, including the need for diverse datasets, standard evaluation metrics, and reproducible research practices. Future efforts should focus on addressing these gaps through interdisciplinary collaboration, methodological rigor, and inclusivity to ensure impactful, equitable, and replicable solutions. By leveraging advancements in NLP, the field can continue to drive innovation in chronic pain management and research.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Prof. Clifford for sharing his insights on writing a decent scientific article that inspired this report. Many thanks to Prof. Reyna for the in-class discussions. Finally, thanks, Tim & Masoud, for suggesting improvements on this paper.

Conflict of Interest

The author (SR) has no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Funding

None.

References

- [1] S. Michaela Rikard. Chronic Pain Among Adults — United States, 2019–2021. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 72, 2023. ISSN 0149-21951545-861X. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7215a1. URL <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/72/wr/mm7215a1.htm>.
- [2] Jennifer S. De La Rosa, Benjamin R. Brady, Mohab M. Ibrahim, Katherine E. Herder, Jessica S. Wallace, Alyssa R. Padilla, and Todd W. Vanderah. Co-occurrence of chronic pain and anxiety/depression symptoms in U.S. adults: prevalence, functional impacts, and opportunities. *PAIN*, 165(3):666, March 2024. ISSN 0304-3959. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000003056. URL https://journals.lww.com/pain/fulltext/2024/03000/co_occurrence_of_chronic_pain_and.18.aspx.
- [3] Luca Bacco, Fabrizio Russo, Luca Ambrosio, Federico D’Antoni, Luca Vollero, Gianluca Vadalà, Felice Dell’Orletta, Mario Merone, Rocco Papalia, and Vincenzo Denaro. Natural language processing in low back pain and spine diseases: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Surgery*, 9, July 2022. ISSN 2296-875X. doi: 10.3389/fsurg.2022.957085. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/surgery/articles/10.3389/fsurg.2022.957085/full>. Publisher: Frontiers.
- [4] Paulo Branco, Sara Berger, Taha Abdullah, Etienne Vachon-Preseu, Guillermo Cecchi, and A. Vania Apkarian. Predicting placebo analgesia in patients with chronic pain using natural language processing: a preliminary validation study. *PAIN*, 164(5):1078, May 2023. ISSN 0304-3959. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002808. URL https://journals.lww.com/pain/abstract/2023/05000/predicting_placebo_analgesia_in_patients_with.15.aspx.
- [5] Matthew J. Page, Joanne E. McKenzie, Patrick M. Bossuyt, Isabelle Boutron, Tammy C. Hoffmann, Cynthia D. Mulrow, Larissa Shamseer, Jennifer M. Tetzlaff, Elie A. Akl, Sue E. Brennan, Roger Chou, Julie Glanville, Jeremy M. Grimshaw, Asbjørn Hróbjartsson, Manoj M. Lalu, Tianjing Li, Elizabeth W. Loder, Evan Mayo-Wilson, Steve McDonald, Luke A. McGuinness, Lesley A. Stewart, James Thomas, Andrea C. Tricco, Vivian A. Welch, Penny Whiting, and David Moher. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372:n71, March 2021. ISSN 1756-1833. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. URL <https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n71>.
- [6] Citationchaser: A tool for transparent and efficient forward and backward citation chasing in systematic searching - Haddaway - 2022 - Research Synthesis Methods - Wiley Online Library, . URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jrsm.1563>.
- [7] JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis - JBI Global Wiki, . URL <https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL>.
- [8] Jonathan AC Sterne, Miguel A. Hernán, Barnaby C. Reeves, Jelena Savović, Nancy D. Berkman, Meera Viswanathan, David Henry, Douglas G. Altman, Mohammed T. Ansari, Isabelle Boutron, James R. Carpenter, An-Wen Chan, Rachel Churchill, Jonathan J. Deeks, Asbjørn Hróbjartsson, Jamie Kirkham, Peter Jüni,

- Yoon K. Loke, Theresa D. Pigott, Craig R. Ramsay, Deborah Regidor, Hannah R. Rothstein, Lakhbir Sandhu, Pasqualina L. Santaguida, Holger J. Schünemann, Beverly Shea, Ian Shrier, Peter Tugwell, Lucy Turner, Jeffrey C. Valentine, Hugh Waddington, Elizabeth Waters, George A. Wells, Penny F. Whiting, and Julian PT Higgins. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*, 355:i4919, October 2016. ISSN 1756-1833. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i4919. URL <https://www.bmj.com/content/355/bmj.i4919>. Publisher: British Medical Journal Publishing Group Section: Research Methods & Reporting.
- [9] A. Necaie and M.J. Amon. Peer Support for Chronic Pain in Online Health Communities: Quantitative Study on the Dynamics of Social Interactions in a Chronic Pain Forum. *J. Med. Internet Res.*, 26, 2024. doi: 10.2196/45858. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85203252437&doi=10.2196%2f45858&partnerID=40&md5=a5e0f717f4510054571243e6e4bc3082>. Publisher: JMIR Publications Inc.
- [10] J.C. Lotz, G. Ropella, P. Anderson, Q. Yang, M.A. Hedderich, J. Bailey, and C.A. Hunt. An exploration of knowledge-organizing technologies to advance trans-disciplinary back pain research. *JOR Spine*, 6(4), 2023. doi: 10.1002/jsp2.1300. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85177452510&doi=10.1002%2fjsp2.1300&partnerID=40&md5=219c719cd9bca8a03d4d3beadb4f7cf7>. Publisher: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- [11] D.A.P. Nunes, J. Ferreira-Gomes, F. Neto, and D. Martins de Matos. Modeling Chronic Pain Experiences from Online Reports Using the Reddit Reports of Chronic Pain Dataset. *Information*, 14(4), 2023. doi: 10.3390/info14040237. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85153684201&doi=10.3390%2finfo14040237&partnerID=40&md5=4be34de12ec45b6d46595d9f42a3de81>. Publisher: MDPI.
- [12] J Chaturvedi, R Stewart, M Ashworth, and A Roberts. Distributions of recorded pain in mental health records: a natural language processing based study. *BMJ OPEN*, 14(4), 2024. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-079923.
- [13] V. Venerito and F. Iannone. Large language model-driven sentiment analysis for facilitating fibromyalgia diagnosis. *RMD Open*, 10(2), 2024. doi: 10.1136/rmdopen-2024-004367. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85197149326&doi=10.1136%2frmdopen-2024-004367&partnerID=40&md5=c5028d4991ef6392b0ec5df59c24555f>. Publisher: BMJ Publishing Group.
- [14] J. M. Reinen, C. Agurto, G. Cecchi, and J. L. Rogers. Remotely-captured, free-text responses track with patient health states in chronic pain. pages 169–171, 2024. doi: 10.1109/ICDH62654.2024.00037.
- [15] Abeed Sarker, Sahithi Lakamana, Yuting Guo, Yao Ge, Abimbola Leslie, Omolola Okunromade, Elena Gonzalez-Polledo, Jeanmarie Perrone, and Anne Marie McKenzie-Brown. #ChronicPain: Automated Building of a Chronic Pain Cohort from Twitter Using Machine Learning. *Health Data Science*, 3:0078, January 2023. ISSN 2765-8783. doi: 10.34133/hds.0078. URL <https://spj.science.org/doi/10.34133/hds.0078>.

- [16] G. Himmelstein, D. Bates, and L. Zhou. Examination of Stigmatizing Language in the Electronic Health Record. *JAMA Netw. Open*, 5(1), 2022. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.44967. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85123815131&doi=10.1001%2fjamanetworkopen.2021.44967&partnerID=40&md5=e94b47935bc2a8100dea0ffc8c3b2bf9>. Publisher: American Medical Association.
- [17] C. Agurto, M. Merler, J. Reinen, P. Parida, G. Cecchi, and J. L. Rogers. Exploring Chronic Pain Experiences: Leveraging Text and Audio Analysis to Infer Well-Being Metrics. pages 196–201, 2024. doi: 10.1109/ICDH62654.2024.00041.
- [18] Diogo A. P. Nunes, Joana Ferreira-Gomes, Daniela Oliveira, Carlos Vaz, Sofia Pimenta, Fani Neto, and David Martins de Matos. Chronic Pain Patient Narratives Allow for the Estimation of Current Pain Intensity. *2023 IEEE 36th International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems (CBMS)*, 12(NA):716–719, 2023. doi: 10.1109/cbms58004.2023.00306.
- [19] A. Aggarwal, S. Rai, S. Giorgi, S. Havaladar, G. Sherman, J. Mittal, and S.C. Guntuku. A Cross-Modal Study of Pain Across Communities in the United States. pages 1050–1058. Association for Computing Machinery, Inc, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3543873.3587642. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85159593399&doi=10.1145%2f3543873.3587642&partnerID=40&md5=4c5ec4c50905a1f59b9419f126d4aa07>.
- [20] K.S. Gordon, E. Buta, M.L. Pratt-Chapman, C.A. Brandt, R. Gueorguieva, A.R. Warren, T.E. Workman, Q. Zeng-Treitler, and J.L. Goulet. Relationship Between Pain and LGBT Status Among Veterans in Care in a Retrospective Cross-Sectional Cohort. *J. Pain Res.*, 16:4037–4047, 2023. doi: 10.2147/JPR.S432967. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85178493774&doi=10.2147%2fJPR.S432967&partnerID=40&md5=fa323bde00e260a615e138da60640b75>. Publisher: Dove Medical Press Ltd.
- [21] Ashar YK, Lumley MA, Perlis RH, Liston C, Gunning FM, and Wager TD. Reattribution to Mind-Brain Processes and Recovery From Chronic Back Pain: A Secondary Analysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*, 6(9): e2333846, 2023. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.33846. Place: United States.
- [22] S.K. Dobscha, S.L. Luther, R.D. Kerns, D.K. Finch, J.L. Goulet, C.A. Brandt, M. Skanderson, H. Bathulapalli, S.J. Fodeh, B. Hahm, L. Bouayad, A. Lee, and L. Han. Mental Health Diagnoses are Not Associated With Indicators of Lower Quality Pain Care in Electronic Health Records of a National Sample of Veterans Treated in Veterans Health Administration Primary Care Settings. *J. Pain*, 24(2):273–281, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2022.08.009. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85147049122&doi=10.1016%2fjpain.2022.08.009&partnerID=40&md5=9a7f7bc7e1625e908181b68fb1f65cc6>. Publisher: Elsevier B.V.
- [23] E.V. Goldstein, S.J. Mooney, J. Takagi-Stewart, B.F. Agnew, E.R. Morgan, M.J. Haviland, W. Zhou, and L.C. Prater. Characterizing Female Firearm Suicide Circumstances: A Natural Language Processing and Machine Learning Approach. *Am.*

- J. Prev. Med.*, 65(2):278–285, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2023.01.030. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85150287481&doi=10.1016%2fj.amepre.2023.01.030&partnerID=40&md5=792c9864eddd5834ba59cd85d09d2f48>. Publisher: Elsevier Inc.
- [24] L. Schirle, A. Jeffery, A. Yaqoob, S. Sanchez-Roige, and D.C. Samuels. Two data-driven approaches to identifying the spectrum of problematic opioid use: A pilot study within a chronic pain cohort. *Int. J. Med. Informatics*, 156, 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2021.104621. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85117163172&doi=10.1016%2fj.ijmedinf.2021.104621&partnerID=40&md5=183b72aa006d50da3b4629bfa6c00ed6>. Publisher: Elsevier Ireland Ltd.
- [25] J. Chaturvedi, N. Chance, L. Mirza, V. Vernugopan, S. Velupillai, R. Stewart, and A. Roberts. Development of a Corpus Annotated With Mentions of Pain in Mental Health Records: Natural Language Processing Approach. *JMIR Form. Res.*, 7, 2023. doi: 10.2196/45849. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85163790531&doi=10.2196%2f45849&partnerID=40&md5=7b7300945704147fc169485409542670>. Publisher: JMIR Publications Inc.
- [26] A.T. Chen, A. Swaminathan, W.R. Kearns, N.M. Alberts, E.F. Law, and T.M. Palermo. Understanding user experience: Exploring participants’ messages with a web-based behavioral health intervention for adolescents with chronic pain. *J. Med. Internet Res.*, 21(4), 2019. doi: 10.2196/11756. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85064853250&doi=10.2196%2f11756&partnerID=40&md5=c4dc5710177ee7c832751de59f8e4927>. Publisher: JMIR Publications Inc.
- [27] T.R. Hylan, M. Von Korff, K. Saunders, E. Masters, R.E. Palmer, D. Carrell, D. Cronkite, J. Mardekian, and D. Gross. Automated prediction of risk for problem opioid use in a primary care setting. *J. Pain*, 16(4):380–387, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2015.01.011. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84926370891&doi=10.1016%2fj.jpain.2015.01.011&partnerID=40&md5=7130a9f08f19f16c03207f204dce0dfd>. Publisher: Churchill Livingstone Inc.
- [28] S.E. Berger, P. Branco, E. Vachon-Preseau, T.B. Abdullah, G. Cecchi, and A. Vania Apkarian. Quantitative language features identify placebo responders in chronic back pain. *Pain*, 162(6):1692–1704, 2021. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002175. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85106541141&doi=10.1097%2fj.pain.0000000000002175&partnerID=40&md5=af557b70ab033341c3133e3c9a110873>. Publisher: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.
- [29] S.L. Taylor, P.M. Herman, N.J. Marshall, Q. Zeng, A. Yuan, K. Chu, Y. Shao, C. Morioka, and K.A. Lorenz. Use of Complementary and Integrated Health: A Retrospective Analysis of U.S. Veterans with Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain Nationally. *J. Altern. Complement. Med.*, 25(1):32–39, 2019. doi: 10.1089/acm.2018.0276. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85056148697&doi=10>.

- 1089%2facm.2018.0276&partnerID=40&md5=ab3f028474589feec32bf9d99b911570.
Publisher: Mary Ann Liebert Inc.
- [30] J. Chaturvedi, A. Mascio, S.U. Velupillai, and A. Roberts. Development of a Lexicon for Pain. *Front. Digit. Health*, 3, 2021. doi: 10.3389/fdgth.2021.778305. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85131262204&doi=10.3389%2ffdgth.2021.778305&partnerID=40&md5=0ccdd618d8a8bc7617a7d84c54346455>. Publisher: Frontiers Media SA.
- [31] J.E. Davidson, G. Ye, M.C. Parra, A. Chofflet, K. Lee, A. Barnes, J. Harkavy-Friedman, and S. Zisook. Job-Related Problems Prior to Nurse Suicide, 2003-2017: A Mixed Methods Analysis Using Natural Language Processing and Thematic Analysis. *J. Nurs. Regul.*, 12(1):28–39, 2021. doi: 10.1016/S2155-8256(21)00017-X. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85103945116&doi=10.1016%2fS2155-8256%2821%2900017-X&partnerID=40&md5=eb62306985e75484d72ee030e43c2aae>. Publisher: Elsevier Inc.
- [32] Paulo Branco, Sara Berger, Taha Abdullah, Etienne Vachon-Preseu, Guillermo Cecchi, and A. Vania Apkarian. Predicting placebo analgesia in patients with chronic pain using natural language processing: a preliminary validation study. *Pain*, 164(5):1078–1086, 2022. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002808.
- [33] L. Goudman, A. De Smedt, and M. Moens. Social Media and Chronic Pain: What Do Patients Discuss? *J. Pers. Med.*, 12(5), 2022. doi: 10.3390/jpm12050797. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85130728867&doi=10.3390%2fjpm12050797&partnerID=40&md5=44fd08728e78c91895bce8167d0d7f4b>. Publisher: MDPI.
- [34] Z. Yang, M. Dehmer, O. Yli-Harja, and F. Emmert-Streib. Combining deep learning with token selection for patient phenotyping from electronic health records. *Sci. Rep.*, 10(1), 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-58178-1. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85078690955&doi=10.1038%2fs41598-020-58178-1&partnerID=40&md5=1aef4227950a28b924207d952d9d44d4>. Publisher: Nature Research.
- [35] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding, May 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>. arXiv:1810.04805 [cs].
- [36] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach, July 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692>. arXiv:1907.11692 [cs].
- [37] MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database | Scientific Data, . URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/sdata201635>.
- [38] Jean Adams, Frances C. Hillier-Brown, Helen J. Moore, Amelia A. Lake, Vera Araujo-Soares, Martin White, and Carolyn Summerbell. Searching and synthesising ‘grey literature’ and ‘grey information’ in public health: critical reflections on three

case studies. *Systematic Reviews*, 5(1):164, September 2016. ISSN 2046-4053. doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0337-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0337-y>.

Appendix A. List of Acronyms

Table A1 lists the acronyms and abbreviations used in this paper.

Table A1: List of Acronyms

Acronym	Definition	Acronym	Definition	Acronym	Definition
CRIS	Clinical Record Interactive Search	EHR	Electronic Health Records	MIMIC	Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care
GeMAPS	Geneva Minimalistic Acoustic Parameter Set	LDA	Latent Dirichlet Allocation	CBT	Cognitive behavioral therapy
CIH	Complementary and Integrative Health	VHA	Veterans Health Administration	NVDRS	National Violent Death Reporting System
CNN	Convolutional Neural Network	VADER	Valence Aware Dictionary and Sentiment Reasoner	CDW	Corporate Data Warehouse
TF-IDF	Term frequency-inverse document frequency	LBP	Lower Back Pain	GPT	Generative Pre-trained Transformer

Appendix B. Search Query Results

Table B1: Search Strategy Results

S.No.	Database Name	Search Date	Number of Records
1	PubMed	09/15/2024	08
2	Web of Science	09/15/2024	36
3	IEEE Xplore	09/15/2024	06
4	SCOPUS	09/15/2024	45
5	ACL Anthology	09/15/2024	32
Total			127

Appendix C. Search Strategy

Appendix C.1. PubMed

(chronic pain) AND ((natural language processing) OR (large language model)) Filters: Adaptive Clinical Trial, Books and Documents, Case Reports, Classical Article, Clinical Conference, Clinical Study, Clinical Trial, Dataset, Meta-Analysis, Observational Study, Observational Study, Veterinary, Randomized Controlled Trial, English

Appendix C.2. Web of Science

“chronic pain” (All Fields) and “natural language processing” OR “large language model” (All Fields) and English (Languages)




Figure C1: PubMed Search Results




Figure C2: Web of Science Search Results

Appendix C.3. IEEE Xplore

(“All Metadata”:“chronic pain”) AND (“All Metadata”:“natural language processing” OR “All Metadata”:“large language model”) Filters Applied: 2014 - 2025

Appendix C.4. Scopus

Search Query: TITLE-ABS-KEY ((“chronic pain”) AND ((“natural language processing”) OR (“large language model”))) AND (LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE , “ar”) OR LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE , “cp”)) AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE , “English”)) AND (LIMIT-TO (PUBSTAGE , “final”))

Appendix C.5. ACL Anthology

In ACL Anthology database, there is no way to batch export records. One has to go to ACL Anthology and enter the following search query string in the search box: (“chronic pain”) AND (“natural language processing” OR “large language model”) and export the




Figure C3: IEEE Xplore Search Results




Figure C4: Scopus Search Results

results. I used the zotero extension to export results.




Figure C5: ACL Anthology Search Results

Appendix D. PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Please see Table [D1](#) and [D2](#) respectively.

Table D1: PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item	Checklist Item	Item Location
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts Checklist.	Abstract
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Section 1.1
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Section 1.2
METHODS			
Eligibility Criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Section 2.1
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Section 2.2
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Section 2.3
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria, including how many reviewers screened each record, whether they worked independently, and details of automation tools used.	Section 2.4
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data, whether they worked independently, and any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators.	Section 2.5
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought, and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Section 2.6
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about missing or unclear information.	
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including the tools used, how many reviewers assessed each study, and whether they worked independently.	Section 2.7
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	N/A
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis.	Section 2.1
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing statistics or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Section 2.6
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify heterogeneity, and software used.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (e.g. arising from reporting biases).	Section 2.8
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A

Table D2: PRISMA 2020 Checklist, Cont'd.

Section and Topic	Item	Checklist Item	Item Location
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Section 3.1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	
Study Characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Section 3.2
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Section 3.3
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Section 3.4
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarize the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Section 3.2
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Section 3.5
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Section 4.1
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Section 4.2
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Section 4.3
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Section 4.4
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to the information provided at registration or in the protocol.	
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Section 5
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Section 5
Availability of data, code, and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	N/A