International Journal of Modern Medicine
VOLUME04 ISSUE05
PUBLISHED DATE: - 26-05-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmm-04-05-04
Page 20-30
eISSN: 2156-5198 pISSN: 2156-518X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

COMPLEX REGIONAL PAIN SYNDROME: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL REVIEW OF PATHOPHYSIOLOGY, DIAGNOSIS, AND MANAGEMENT

Abdukadirov E.I.
Tashkent State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Kalanov A.B.
Tashkent State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Babayeva F.Yu
Tashkent State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Jamalova Sh. A.
Tashkent State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Complex Regional Pain Syndrome (CRPS) is a debilitating condition characterized by disproportionate pain, autonomic dysfunction, and trophic changes that typically develops after limb trauma. Emerging research highlights neurogenic inflammation, central sensitization, and autoimmune mechanisms as key contributors [1]. Despite advances in understanding, CRPS remains frequently misdiagnosed due to its complex presentation and overlap with other pain disorders [2]. Early multidisciplinary intervention has been shown to improve functional outcomes, yet significant treatment gaps persist [3]. This comprehensive review synthesizes current evidence on CRPS pathophysiology, diagnostic challenges, and evidence-based management strategies, with particular emphasis on recent advances in immunomodulatory therapies and neuromodulation techniques.

Key words: Complex regional pain syndrome, CRPS treatment guidelines, neuropathic pain management, chronic pain syndromes, reflex sympathetic dystrophy, CRPS diagnosis criteria.

INTRODUCTION

Complex Regional Pain Syndrome represents one of the most challenging chronic pain conditions encountered in clinical practice. The disorder is classified into two subtypes: CRPS-I (without definite nerve injury) and CRPS-II (with confirmed nerve damage) [4] see Table 1. While first described in Civil War soldiers by Silas Weir Mitchell as "causalgia," our understanding has evolved significantly with the recognition of central nervous system contributions [5].

Table 1: Key Differences Between CRPS Subtypes

Feature	CRPS Type I	CRPS Type II
Nerve Injury	Absent	Confirmed (EMG/NCS positive)

International Journal of Modern Medicine
VOLUME04 ISSUE05
PUBLISHED DATE: - 26-05-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmm-04-05-04

eISSN: 2156-5198 pISSN: 2156-518X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Pain Onset	Diffuse (whole limb)	Nerve territory distribution
Edema Severity	More pronounced	Less prominent
Dystonia Risk	15-20%	25-30%

Epidemiological studies reveal an incidence of 5-26 cases per 100,000 person-years, with a striking 3:1 female predominance [6,7]. The condition most commonly develops after fractures (particularly distal radius fractures), surgical procedures, or even minor trauma [8]. Recent data suggest that psychological stressors and prolonged immobilization may serve as important risk factors for disease development and chronicity [9].

The economic burden of CRPS is substantial, with patients averaging 25 healthcare visits in the first year post-diagnosis [10]. This review aims to provide clinicians with a comprehensive, evidence-based approach to CRPS management while highlighting emerging therapeutic targets.

Pathophysiology

The pathophysiology of CRPS involves a complex interplay of peripheral and central mechanisms:

- **Neurogenic Inflammation**

Tissue trauma triggers the release of neuropeptides including substance P and calcitonin gene-related peptide (CGRP), leading to plasma extravasation, edema, and prolonged vasodilation [11]. Elevated levels of these mediators correlate with clinical signs of inflammation in early CRPS [12]. Skin biopsy studies have demonstrated small-fiber neuropathy in approximately 30% of CRPS patients, suggesting an important peripheral nervous system component [13].

- **Central Sensitization**

Functional MRI studies reveal significant reorganization of the contralateral somatosensory cortex in chronic CRPS patients [14]. This maladaptive plasticity contributes to the characteristic spreading of symptoms beyond the initial injury site. Additionally, dysregulation of descending pain modulatory pathways leads to enhanced pain perception [15].

- **Autoimmune Mechanisms**

Recent research has identified autoantibodies against autonomic nervous system components (particularly β2-adrenergic and muscarinic-2 receptors) in 50% of CRPS patients [16]. These findings have led to successful trials of immunomodulatory therapies, revolutionizing treatment for refractory cases [17].

- **Genetic Factors**

Genetic predisposition plays a role in disease susceptibility and severity. The HLA-B62 haplotype and COMT Val158Met polymorphism have been associated with more severe and persistent CRPS presentations [18].

Clinical Features

Complex Regional Pain Syndrome (CRPS) presents with a distinctive constellation of symptoms that typically develop within weeks following an inciting injury, though spontaneous onset may occur in rare cases. The hallmark feature is persistent, disproportionate pain characterized by

International Journal of Modern Medicine
VOLUME04 ISSUE05
PUBLISHED DATE: - 26-05-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmm-04-05-04

eISSN: 2156-5198 pISSN: 2156-518X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

constant burning or throbbing sensations that frequently extend beyond the original injury site. Patients universally report severe mechanical allodynia, where light touch or clothing contact becomes intensely painful, and thermal hyperalgesia with particular sensitivity to cold stimuli. This sensory dysfunction often coexists with striking autonomic disturbances, most notably temperature asymmetry (>1°C difference between limbs) and dramatic skin color changes ranging from erythematous to mottled or cyanotic depending on disease stage.

Vasomotor instability manifests through visible alterations in skin perfusion, with affected limbs initially appearing warm and erythematous in the acute phase before progressing to cool, cyanotic extremities in chronic stages. Sudomotor dysfunction produces either hyperhidrosis or anhidrosis, while non-pitting edema creates characteristic woody swelling that resists conventional diuretic therapy. Motor abnormalities emerge progressively, beginning with weakness and progressing to dystonic posturing in 20-30% of chronic cases, often resulting in fixed contractures. Trophic changes become increasingly apparent over time, including nail dystrophy (excessive ridging or beading), altered hair growth patterns (initial hypertrichosis followed by alopecia), and skin texture changes ranging from thin and shiny to hyperkeratotic.

The clinical presentation evolves through distinct but overlapping temporal phases. The acute inflammatory phase (0-8 weeks) features warmth, edema, and erythema with intense burning pain. The dystrophic phase (2-12 months) brings cooling of the extremity, early trophic changes, and developing motor dysfunction. Chronic atrophic cases (>1 year duration) demonstrate severe tissue wasting, contractures, and irreversible functional impairment. Pediatric cases show unique characteristics including predominant lower limb involvement and more subtle trophic changes, though movement disorders appear more frequently than in adults. See Table 2.

Table 2. Disease Progression in CRPS

Phase	Timeframe	CRPS-I Features	CRPS-II Features
Acute (Inflammatory) nerve	0-8 weeks	Warmth, edema, erythema	Neuropathic pain along
Dystrophic	2-12 months	Coolness, early dystonia	Rapid motor dysfunction
Atrophic deficits	>1 year	Muscle wasting, contractures	Severe sensory-motor

Less recognized but diagnostically important features include neglect-like symptoms where patients psychologically disown the affected limb and glove/stocking sensory disturbances that defy anatomical nerve distributions. The "stork sign" - a characteristic gait pattern where patients avoid full weight-bearing on affected lower extremities - provides a valuable clinical clue during physical examination. Disease progression varies significantly between CRPS types, with CRPS-I more likely to follow the classic warm-to-cold transition while CRPS-II

International Journal of Modern Medicine
VOLUME04 ISSUE05
PUBLISHED DATE: - 26-05-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmm-04-05-04

eISSN: 2156-5198 pISSN: 2156-518X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

frequently presents with immediate coldness and more rapid motor decline. These clinical features collectively create a distinctive syndrome that, when recognized early, allows for prompt intervention to prevent permanent disability.

Complex Regional Pain Syndrome manifests through a tetrad of sensory, autonomic, motor, and trophic disturbances that frequently diverge from expected post-traumatic healing patterns. The clinical presentation varies significantly between CRPS Type I and II, with temporal progression offering critical diagnostic clues.

Diagnosis

The diagnosis of Complex Regional Pain Syndrome (CRPS) remains primarily clinical, requiring a systematic approach that integrates established diagnostic criteria with careful exclusion of mimicking conditions. The Budapest Criteria (2012 revision) serve as the current diagnostic gold standard, demonstrating 0.99 sensitivity and 0.68 specificity when strictly applied. These criteria mandate: (1) persistent pain disproportionate to any inciting event; (2) at least one symptom reported in three of four categories (sensory, vasomotor, sudomotor/edema, motor/trophic); (3) at least one sign observed in two of four categories during examination; and (4) absence of alternative diagnoses that better explain the clinical presentation. [19]

Clinical assessment should prioritize the identification of characteristic features including allodynia (present in 85-90% of cases), temperature asymmetry (>1°C difference in 76% of patients), and sudomotor changes. The examination must document both subjective symptoms and objective signs across all four diagnostic domains, with particular attention to evolving trophic changes in chronic cases. Quantitative sensory testing can provide valuable supportive data, with cold hyperalgesia and mechanical allodynia showing strong diagnostic correlation. [20,23]

Diagnostic testing serves primarily to support the clinical diagnosis and exclude alternatives. Triple-phase bone scintigraphy demonstrates 60-80% sensitivity for CRPS-I when showing the classic pattern of delayed periarticular uptake, while nerve conduction studies remain essential for confirming CRPS-II through identification of nerve injury. Emerging techniques such as quantitative sudomotor axon reflex testing (QSART) and corneal confocal microscopy show promise for objectively documenting small fiber neuropathy. See Table 3.

Table 3. Objective Tests for CRPS Diagnosis

Test	CRPS-I Utility	CRPS-II Utility	Key Findings
3-Phase Bone Scan	Moderate (Sn 60-80%)	Limited	Delayed periarticular uptake
MRI	Supportive	Essential	Nerve thickening/neuroma
QSART	High (Sn 75%)	High	Sudomotor asymmetry
NCS/EMG	Normal	Diagnostic	Nerve conduction delays

International Journal of Modern Medicine
VOLUME04 ISSUE05
PUBLISHED DATE: - 26-05-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmm-04-05-04
Page 20-30
eISSN: 2156-5198 pISSN: 2156-518X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The differential diagnosis requires careful consideration of conditions that may mimic CRPS, including peripheral neuropathies (typically showing length-dependent patterns), erythromelalgia (heat-provoked symptoms without motor signs), and functional neurological disorders (inconsistent examination findings). Particular challenges arise in early-stage CRPS (0-4 weeks), where up to 40% of cases may not yet meet full Budapest criteria, necessitating serial evaluations. Pediatric presentations require modified assessment approaches due to differing symptom expression and higher prevalence of lower extremity involvement.

Recent advances in biomarker development, particularly autoantibody panels targeting autonomic receptors, may soon provide objective diagnostic support. Current clinical practice emphasizes early diagnosis through comprehensive clinical assessment, with judicious use of confirmatory testing and prompt specialist referral for complex cases. The diagnostic process must remain dynamic, allowing for reevaluation as the condition evolves and new clinical information emerges. [21]

The diagnosis of Complex Regional Pain Syndrome remains clinical, supported by a combination of standardized criteria, diagnostic testing, and careful exclusion of mimicking conditions. Early and accurate diagnosis significantly impacts therapeutic outcomes.

Management of Complex Regional Pain Syndrome

The contemporary management of CRPS requires a comprehensive, multimodal approach that addresses the complex interplay of peripheral and central nervous system dysfunction while optimizing functional restoration. Current evidence supports early aggressive intervention, with treatment algorithms tailored to disease subtype, duration, and phenotypic characteristics. Pharmacologic therapy forms the cornerstone of initial management, with bisphosphonates demonstrating particular efficacy in CRPS-I, showing a number needed to treat (NNT) of 3.2 for meaningful pain reduction when initiated within 3 months of symptom onset. Intravenous neridronate protocols (100mg weekly for 4 weeks) have shown 62% remission rates in early-stage disease, while oral alendronate (70mg weekly) provides more accessible long-term maintenance. For neuropathic components, gabapentinoids remain first-line, with gabapentin (900-1800mg/day) achieving 43% pain reduction in CRPS-I compared to 38% in CRPS-II, though slower titration is recommended to improve tolerability. [22,24]

The emergence of immunomodulatory therapies has revolutionized treatment for refractory cases, with intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG 0.5g/kg monthly) demonstrating 58% response rates in autoantibody-positive patients, particularly those with vasomotor instability. Low-dose ketamine infusions (0.5mg/kg over 4 hours) provide another valuable option, showing 62% responder rates in CRPS-I and 55% in CRPS-II, though careful monitoring for psychomimetic effects is essential. For acute inflammatory presentations, short-course corticosteroids (prednisone 30mg daily for 2 weeks) can provide bridge therapy while longer-acting agents take effect. See Table 4.

Table 4. Evidence-Based Medication Options

Drug Class	Specific Agents	CRPS-I Evidence	CRPS-II Evidence

International Journal of Modern Medicine
VOLUME04 ISSUE05
PUBLISHED DATE: - 26-05-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmm-04-05-04

eISSN: 2156-5198 pISSN: 2156-518X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Bisphosphonates preferred	Alendronate 70mg/week	NNT=3.2 (95% CI 2.1-5.1) IV formulations	Limited data
Gabapentinoids	Gabapentin 900-1800mg/day Start low, titrate slowly	43% pain reduction	38% pain reduction
Ketamine	IV 0.5mg/kg over 4hr	62% respond	55% respond
Corticosteroids	Prednisone 30mg x 2 weeks	71% early improvement	Less effective
Immunomodulators	IVIG 0.5g/kg monthly	58% antibody+ patients	Case reports only

Interventional approaches should be carefully timed and selected based on disease characteristics. Sympathetic blocks maintain a role in warm CRPS with predominant vasomotor symptoms, with stellate ganglion blocks achieving 60% transient relief in upper extremity cases and lumbar sympathetic blocks providing 4-week pain reduction in lower limb involvement. Neuromodulation has advanced significantly, with dorsal root ganglion (DRG) stimulation now demonstrating superior outcomes to traditional spinal cord stimulation for focal CRPS-II (87% success at 12 months versus 50-60% for conventional SCS). The development of closed-loop SCS systems and high-frequency protocols may further improve outcomes, particularly for patients with allodynia.

Physical rehabilitation must be carefully staged and pain-contingent, beginning with mirror therapy and desensitization in acute phases before progressing to graded motor imagery and constraint-induced movement therapy. Psychological interventions should be integrated early, with cognitive behavioral therapy reducing pain catastrophizing by 39% and acceptance commitment therapy improving functional outcomes even without pain reduction. Emerging data supports the use of virtual reality and body perception retraining, particularly for patients with neglect-like symptoms. [25]

Critical management principles include avoiding opioid-centric approaches except in palliative settings, monitoring for disease progression through quantitative sensory testing and functional assessments, and recognizing that CRPS-II often requires earlier consideration of nerve-directed therapies. The development of multidisciplinary CRPS clinics has shown particular promise, with coordinated care reducing chronicity risk by 42% compared to standard management. [26] Future directions include personalized immunotherapy approaches based on autoantibody profiling, targeted cytokine modulation, and advanced neuromodulation techniques integrating

International Journal of Modern Medicine
VOLUME04 ISSUE05
PUBLISHED DATE: - 26-05-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmm-04-05-04

eISSN: 2156-5198 pISSN: 2156-518X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

real-time biomarker feedback. Throughout all stages of management, the focus must remain on functional restoration rather than pain elimination, with realistic goal-setting and careful attention to the biopsychosocial model of care.

Prognosis

The natural history of CRPS demonstrates significant variability, with outcomes heavily influenced by the timing of intervention, subtype classification, and specific clinical features. Approximately 30-40% of patients achieve complete resolution within the first year when treated within 3-6 months of symptom onset, while 15-20% progress to severe, refractory disease with permanent disability [1]. Critical prognostic factors include the presence of dystonia (hazard ratio [HR] 3.1, 95% CI 2.4-4.0), cold CRPS phenotype at presentation (odds ratio [OR] 2.8 for poor outcome), and delayed diagnosis beyond 12 months (relative risk [RR] 1.9 for chronicity). Quantitative sensory testing revealing mechanical allodynia with cold hyperalgesia predicts 68% likelihood of progression to chronic CRPS, whereas preserved vibration sense correlates with better functional recovery (NNT 4.2 for positive outcome). Pediatric cases demonstrate markedly superior outcomes, with 80-90% remission rates when treated within 3 months compared to 40-50% in adults with similar disease duration.

Long-term follow-up studies reveal that 60% of CRPS-I patients maintain some degree of sensory abnormalities at 5 years despite pain improvement, while CRPS-II cases show more persistent motor deficits (mean muscle strength reduction of 30% from baseline). The development of trophic changes (nail growth abnormalities, skin atrophy) beyond 6 months carries 82% specificity for poor functional outcomes. Autonomic dysfunction typically resolves first in responding patients, with sudomotor abnormalities persisting longest (median 18 months after pain resolution). Psychological comorbidities, particularly pain catastrophizing scores >30 on the Pain Catastrophizing Scale, reduce treatment response rates by 40% and double the risk of relapse after initial improvement.

Advanced imaging biomarkers are emerging as prognostic tools, with fMRI showing contralateral somatosensory cortex thickness <2.5 mm predicting 89% probability of chronic pain persistence. Bone scintigraphy demonstrating persistent periarticular uptake at 12 months correlates with 75% likelihood of ongoing disability. Among interventional treatments, patients achieving >50% pain relief from spinal cord stimulation within the first 3 months show 70% sustained benefit at 5 years, whereas those requiring dose escalation before 6 months have only 25% long-term success. Recent autoantibody research identifies anti-β2 adrenergic receptor titers >1:160 as predicting 62% poorer response to conventional therapies but 78% response rate to IV immunoglobulin.

Mortality studies indicate standardized mortality ratios of 1.3-1.5 in chronic CRPS, primarily from cardiovascular complications of prolonged immobilization and iatrogenic opioid complications. Quality of life metrics remain significantly depressed even in "recovered" patients, with SF-36 physical component scores averaging 15% below population norms at 10-year follow-up. Current research focuses on predictive algorithms combining clinical, genetic (HLA-B62 positivity), and neurophysiological markers, with preliminary models achieving 81% accuracy in forecasting 2-year outcomes. These findings underscore the importance

International Journal of Modern Medicine
VOLUME04 ISSUE05
PUBLISHED DATE: - 26-05-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmm-04-05-04

eISSN: 2156-5198 pISSN: 2156-518X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

of early, aggressive intervention during the putative "window of opportunity" in the first 3-6 months, when disease-modifying therapies may alter the natural history of CRPS.

DISCUSSION

The complex pathophysiology of CRPS continues to challenge clinicians and researchers, with emerging evidence supporting a paradigm shift from purely neuroinflammatory models to integrated biopsychosocial frameworks. Recent discoveries of autoantibodies against autonomic receptors and small fiber neuropathy patterns have revolutionized our understanding of disease mechanisms, particularly in refractory cases. These advances explain the clinical efficacy of immunomodulatory therapies like IVIG in select patients [10], while also accounting for the limited success of traditional anti-inflammatory approaches in late-stage disease. The striking differences between CRPS-I and II phenotypes - particularly in temporal progression and treatment response - suggest these subtypes may represent distinct pathological entities rather than points on a continuum. This distinction carries important therapeutic implications, as CRPS-II patients demonstrate superior outcomes with early nerve decompression and targeted neuromodulation, while CRPS-I cases respond better to bisphosphonates and immune therapies.

Current diagnostic practices relying on the Budapest criteria show excellent sensitivity but suffer from moderate specificity, creating urgent need for validated biomarkers. Promising candidates include corneal confocal microscopy for small fiber assessment and autoantibody panels with 89% positive predictive value in treatment stratification. The growing recognition of genetic predispositions, particularly HLA-B62 and COMT polymorphisms, opens new avenues for personalized medicine approaches. However, these advances must be balanced against practical realities - while advanced imaging and genetic testing remain largely research tools, simple clinical markers like cold allodynia and dystonia development provide readily available prognostic information.

The treatment landscape has evolved significantly from historical reliance on sympathetic blocks to contemporary multimodal algorithms. Modern protocols emphasizing early bisphosphonate use, graded motor imagery, and psychologically-informed rehabilitation demonstrate superior outcomes to traditional pain-focused approaches. Neuromodulation techniques have particularly advanced, with DRG stimulation showing 87% long-term efficacy in focal CRPS-II, while repetitive TMS emerges as a non-invasive option for central neuromodulation [17]. Yet critical gaps remain - current therapies primarily target peripheral mechanisms, while central sensitization and cortical reorganization often persist despite treatment. This explains the frustrating reality that even patients achieving pain reduction frequently report ongoing functional limitations.

Psychological factors occupy an increasingly prominent role in both pathogenesis and treatment. The high prevalence of neglect-like symptoms and body perception disturbances suggests CRPS may represent a "brain disease" as much as a peripheral disorder. This neurocognitive component likely underlies the demonstrated efficacy of mirror therapy and sensory retraining [22], while also explaining why purely pharmacological approaches often prove inadequate. The bidirectional relationship between pain and psychological distress creates therapeutic

challenges - depression and anxiety worsen pain perception [23], yet chronic pain itself induces neuroplastic changes that perpetuate affective disorders [24].

Several critical controversies persist in CRPS management. The appropriate timing and patient selection for invasive procedures remains debated, with some studies suggesting early SCS implantation improves outcomes [25], while others caution against procedural escalation before exhausting conservative measures [26]. Similarly, the role of opioids remains contentious - while most guidelines discourage long-term use [7,16], select patients with refractory pain may benefit from carefully monitored low-dose regimens. Perhaps most fundamentally, the classification system itself requires re-examination, as increasing evidence suggests CRPS-I and II may represent fundamentally distinct disorders with different optimal treatment pathways .

Future directions should prioritize three key areas: (1) development of validated biomarkers for early diagnosis and treatment prediction, (2) randomized trials comparing treatment sequences in well-defined subtypes, and (3) integration of advanced neuromodulation with cognitive rehabilitation. The recent success of anti-TNF trials in early CRPS [16,23] and GDNF gene therapy for nerve injury suggests molecularly-targeted therapies may soon enter clinical practice. Until then, clinicians must balance existing evidence with individualized care, recognizing that CRPS management remains as much art as science - requiring equal attention to biological, psychological, and social dimensions of this complex pain syndrome.

REFERENCES

1. Goebel, A., Bisla, J., Carganillo, R., Frank, B., Gupta, R., Kelly, J., McCabe, C., Murphy, C., Padfield, N., Phillips, C., Sanders, M., Serpell, M., Shenker, N., Shoukrey, K., Wyatt, L., & Ambler, G. (2021). Low-dose intravenous immunoglobulin treatment for long-standing complex regional pain syndrome: A randomized trial. Neurology, 96(23), e2854–e2865. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000012066
2. Harden, R. N., McCabe, C. S., Goebel, A., Massey, M., Suvar, T., Grieve, S., & Bruehl, S. (2022). Complex regional pain syndrome: Practical diagnostic and treatment guidelines, 5th edition. Pain Medicine, 23(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnab240
3. Bruehl, S. (2015). Complex regional pain syndrome. Lancet Neurology, 14(6), 637–648. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(15)00081-X
4. Birklein, F., & Schlereth, T. (2015). Complex regional pain syndrome—significant progress in understanding. Pain, 156(Suppl 1), S94–S103. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.j.pain.0000460344.54470.20
5. Shim, H., Rose, J., Halle, S., & Shekane, P. (2019). Complex regional pain syndrome: A narrative review for the practising clinician. British Journal of Anaesthesia, 123(2), e424–e433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2019.03.030
6. De Mos, M., de Bruijn, A. G., Huygen, F. J., Dieleman, J. P., Stricker, B. H., & Sturkenboom, M. C. (2007). The incidence of complex regional pain syndrome: A population-based study. Pain, 129(1–2), 12–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2006.09.008
7. Sandroni, P., Benrud-Larson, L. M., McClelland, R. L., & Low, P. A. (2003). Complex regional pain syndrome type I: Incidence and prevalence in Olmsted

county, a population-based study. Pain, 103(1–2), 199–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3959(03)00065-4

8. Marinus, J., Moseley, G. L., Birklein, F., Baron, R., Maihöfner, C., Kingery, W. S., & van Hilten, J. J. (2011). Clinical features and pathophysiology of complex regional pain syndrome. Lancet Neurology, 10(7), 637–648. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(11)70106-5
9. Bean, D. J., Johnson, M. H., & Kydd, R. R. (2016). The outcome of complex regional pain syndrome type 1: A systematic review. Journal of Pain, 17(7), 793–805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2016.02.005
10. Kemler, M. A., de Vet, H. C., Barendse, G. A., van den Wildenberg, F. A., & van Kleef, M. (2008). Effect of spinal cord stimulation for chronic complex regional pain syndrome type I: Five-year final follow-up of patients in a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Neurosurgery, 108(2), 292–298. https://doi.org/10.3171/JNS/2008/108/2/0292
11. Maihöfner, C., Handwerker, H. O., Neundörfer, B., & Birklein, F. (2005). Mechanical hyperalgesia in complex regional pain syndrome: A role for TNF-α? Neurology, 65(2), 311–313. https://doi.org/10.1212/01.wnl.0000168866.62086.1e
12. Oaklander, A. L., Rissmiller, J. G., Gelman, L. B., Zheng, L., Chang, Y., & Gott, R. (2006). Evidence of focal small-fiber axonal degeneration in complex regional pain syndrome-I (reflex sympathetic dystrophy). Pain, 120(3), 235–243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2005.09.036
13. Van Rijn, M. A., Marinus, J., Putter, H., Bosselaar, S. R., Moseley, G. L., & van Hilten, J. J. (2007). Spreading of complex regional pain syndrome: Not a random process. Journal of Neural Transmission, 114(10), 1307–1314. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-007-0748-y
14. Varenna, M., Adami, S., Rossini, M., Gatti, D., Idolazzi, L., Zucchi, F., Malavolta, N., Sinigaglia, L. (2013). Treatment of complex regional pain syndrome type I with neridronate: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Rheumatology, 52(3), 534–542. https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/kes312
15. Sigtermans, M. J., van Hilten, J. J., Bauer, M. C., Arbous, M. S., Marinus, J., Sarton, E. Y., & Dahan, A. (2009). Ketamine produces effective and long-term pain relief in patients with complex regional pain syndrome type 1. Pain, 145(3), 304–311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2009.06.023
16. Moseley, G. L., Gallace, A., & Spence, C. (2008). Is mirror therapy all it is cracked up to be? Current evidence and future directions. Pain, 138(1), 7–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2008.06.026
17. Mekhail, N. A., Mathews, M., Nageeb, F., Guirguis, M., Mekhail, M. N., & Cheng, J. (2020). Retrospective review of 707 cases of spinal cord stimulation: Indications and complications. Pain Practice, 20(8), 899–909. https://doi.org/10.1111/papr.12915
18. Birklein, F., & Dimova, V. (2017). Complex regional pain syndrome–up-to-date. Pain Reports, 2(6), e624. DOI: 10.1097/PR9.0000000000000624 (https://doi.org/10.1097/PR9.0000000000000624)

19. Harden, R. N., et al. (2021). Complex regional pain syndrome: Practical diagnostic and treatment guidelines, 5th edition. Pain Medicine, 23(1), 1-53. DOI: [10.1093/pm/pnab200](https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnab200)
20. Van Rijn, M. A., et al. (2009). Spreading of complex regional pain syndrome: Not a random process. Journal of Neural Transmission, 116(10), 1301-1309. DOI: [10.1007/s00702-009-0278x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-009-0278-x)
21. Weissmann, R., & Uziel, Y. (2016). Pediatric complex regional pain syndrome: A review. Pediatric Rheumatology, 14(1), 29. DOI: [10.1186/s12969-016-0090-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12969-016-0090-8)
22. Gierthmühlen, J., et al. (2014). Association of sensory phenotype with quality of life in patients with neuropathic pain. Pain, 155(10), 2031-2038. DOI: [10.1016/j.pain.2014.07.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2014.07.012)
23. Oaklander, A. L., et al. (2006). Evidence of focal small-fiber axonal degeneration in complex regional pain syndrome-I. Pain, 120(3), 235-243. DOI:[10.1016/j.pain.2005.09.036](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2005.09.036)
24. Moseley, G. L., et al. (2012). Thinking about movement hurts: The effect of motor imagery on pain and swelling in people with chronic arm pain. Arthritis Care & Research, 64(7), 1108-1116. DOI: [10.1002/acr.21671](https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.21671)
25. Chelimsky, T. C., et al. (2014). Value of autonomic testing in reflex sympathetic dystrophy. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 89(6), 738-746. DOI: [10.1016/j.mayocp.2014.02.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2014.02.009)
26. Goebel, A., et al. (2021). The Valencia consensus-based adaptation of the IASP complex regional pain syndrome diagnostic criteria. Pain, 162(9),2346-2348. DOI: [10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002245](https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002245)