Table 1. Model parameters from Bayesian modelling averaging of successive ‘nociceptive pain’ models.

| Criteria | 7 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 19 | 27 | 5 | 2 | 14 | 32 | 16 | 36 | 22 | 1 | 28 |
|----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|
| Model 1  |   |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| BMA: PP  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |   |   |   |
| EV       | -1.26 | 4.24 | 2.80 | -1.90 | -1.51 | -1.41 | 1.43 | 0.13 | 8.1 | -0.05 | 7.7 | 5.5 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| SD       | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.74 | 0.39 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.11 |   |

| Model 2  |   |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| BMA: PP  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |   |   |   |
| EV       | -1.26 | 4.23 | 2.79 | -1.90 | -1.50 | -1.42 | 1.40 | 0.14 | 8.6 | -0.06 | 6.2 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 6.2 |   |   |
| SD       | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.75 | 0.41 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.23 |   |   |   |   |   |

| Model 3  |   |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| BMA: PP  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |   |   |   |
| EV       | -1.26 | 4.24 | 2.81 | -1.90 | -1.50 | -1.43 | 1.39 | 0.15 | 9.7 | -0.06 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 9.2 |   |   |   |
| SD       | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.77 | 0.43 | 0.23 | 0.23 |   |   |   |   |   |   |

| Model 4  |   |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| BMA: PP  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |   |   |   |
| EV       | -1.26 | 4.24 | 2.81 | -1.89 | -1.50 | -1.43 | 1.36 | 0.17 | 10.6 | -0.07 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.6 |   |   |   |
| SD       | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.78 | 0.44 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 |   |   |   |

| Model 5  |   |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| BMA: PP  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |   |   |   |
| EV       | -1.28 | 4.24 | 2.82 | -1.90 | -1.50 | -1.43 | 1.33 | 0.18 | 81.8 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.6 |   |   |   |
| SD       | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.80 | 0.46 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

| Model 6  |   |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| BMA: PP  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |   |   |   |
| EV       | -1.28 | 4.25 | 2.91 | -1.89 | -1.51 | -1.41 | 1.45 | 0.74 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| SD       | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.58 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.50 | 0.39 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

| Model 7  |   |   |    |    |    |    |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| BMA: PP  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |   |   |   |
| EV       | -1.26 | 4.12 | 3.24 | -1.88 | -1.40 | -1.49 | 0.45 | 0.36 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| SD       | 0.36 | 0.50 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 0.36 | 0.39 | 0.54 | 0.39 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Abbreviations: BMA-Bayesian model averaging, PP-Posterior probability (%), EV-Expected value (regression coefficient), SD-Standard deviation of the EV. Variables within models listed in descending order of Posterior probability.

Table 2. Indices of classification accuracy from successive regression models.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
<th>LR⁺</th>
<th>LR⁻</th>
<th>DOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>100.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>100.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>100.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>100.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>100.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>100.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 7</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>80.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are presented as ‘%’ (except LR +, LR −, DOR).
Abbreviations: CA- Classification Accuracy, PPV-Positive Predictive Value, NPV-Negative Predictive Value, LR +-Positive Likelihood Ratio, LR −- Negative Likelihood Ratio, DOR-Diagnostic Odds Ratio.

Table 3. Model parameters for criteria in the final ‘nociceptive pain’ model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>95% CI Lower</th>
<th>95% CI Upper</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>OR 95% CI Lower</th>
<th>OR 95% CI Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Intermittent</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Burning</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Localised</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>69.79</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>193.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clear Aggs/Eases</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>57.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dysesthesias</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Night pain</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Antalgic</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: SD-Standard deviation, 95% CI-95% confidence interval, OR-Odds ratio.

Table 4. Cross-tabulation of classification accuracy of the final ‘nociceptive pain’ model.
Table 5. Indices of classification accuracy for the final ‘nociceptive pain’ model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>95% CI Lower</th>
<th>95% CI Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR+</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>15.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR−</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>100.67</td>
<td>52.72</td>
<td>192.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are presented as ‘%’ (except LR +, LR −, DOR).

Abbreviations: CA- Classification Accuracy, PPV-Positive Predictive Value, NPV-Negative Predictive Value, LR + Positive Likelihood Ratio, LR − Negative Likelihood Ratio, DOR-Diagnostic Odds Ratio.