Supported by: EXPERT WITNESS GATEWAY
MEDICO LEGAL MAGAZINE

UNDERSTANDING COMPLEX REGIONAL PAIN SYNDROME IN A MEDICO-LEGAL CONTEXT

By Altaf Patel, Director, Cromptons Solicitors – altaf.patel@cromptonssolicitors.co.uk

Altaf Patel is an APIL accredited senior litigator specialising in Serious, catastrophic injury and medical negligence. He has a special interest in Complex Regional Pain Syndrome and is also a founding trustee of the charity Burning Nights CRPS support.

What is Complex Regional Pain Syndrome

Complex Regional Pain Syndrome, commonly known by the acronym, 'CRPS', is a rare and chronic condition that affects the nervous system, causing intense and often debilitating pain. It is a poorly understood disorder that can develop after an injury or surgery but can also occur without any obvious trigger.

CRPS remains one of the most problematic diagnoses encountered in medicolegal work. Although recognised within mainstream pain medicine, it continues to generate significant controversy in litigation due to its protean presentation, uncertain mechanisms and reliance on clinical assessment rather than confirmatory testing. These features place CRPS at the centre of disputes concerning diagnosis, causation, credibility and long-term loss.

CRPS is mostly seen in adults, with research showing a higher prevalence in females than males by a ratio of 3-4:1. It has however also been found to affect children and teenagers.

CRPS is thought to be the most painful pain condition known to modern medicine falling at no. 42 on the McGill Pain Index.

The nature and categorisation of CRPS

CRPS is conventionally subdivided into the following categories:

- Type I, where no specific nerve injury is demonstrated.
- Type II, where a definable nerve injury is present.
- CRPS with some remitting features, and
- CRPS – NOS – Not otherwise Specified, where patients may not fully meet diagnostic criteria

Supported by: EXPERT WITNESS GATEWAY
MEDICO LEGAL MAGAZINE

The clinical picture often includes severe and persistent pain disproportionate to the precipitating event, sensory disturbance, temperature or colour asymmetry, sweating abnormalities, movement restriction, weakness, and trophic changes. Importantly, these features are neither static nor universally present, and prominence may fluctuate over time.

Despite ongoing research, CRPS lacks a definitive biomarker. Diagnosis therefore rests on clinical evaluation, guided by the Budapest Criteria, which requires a combination of reported symptoms and observed signs across multiple categories.

The Budapest Criteria and the Diagnosis of CRPS

The Budapest Criteria, first proposed in 2004, provides the accepted clinical framework for diagnosing CRPS. The criteria emphasise a combination of disproportionate pain, reported symptoms and objectively observed signs, whilst excluding alternative explanations.

First, the individual must experience continuing pain that is disproportionate in duration and/or severity to the original injury or precipitating event. This assessment is necessarily contextual and depends on the expected recovery trajectory for the relevant trauma or injury. A deviation from the usual course of healing should prompt consideration of CRPS, rather than being regarded as diagnostic in isolation.

Second, the patient must report symptoms from at least three or more recognised categories:

- **Sensory**, which includes features such as hyperaesthesia or hypersensitivity in the affected limb;
- **Vasomotor**, which encompasses temperature asymmetry and/or changes in skin colour compared with the contralateral limb;
- **Sudomotor/oedema**, such as swelling, altered sweating, or sweating asymmetry;
- **Motor/trophic**, which includes reduced range of movement, motor dysfunction (for example weakness, tremor, or dystonia), and/or trophic changes affecting skin, hair, or nails.

Thirdly clinicians must identify at least one objectively demonstrable sign in two or more of these categories at the time of examination. These may include evidence of hyperalgesia or allodynia on sensory testing, measurable temperature or colour asymmetry, oedema or sweating asymmetry or disturbance in observable limbs, or demonstrable motor limitation, dysfunction, or trophic change.

Finally, diagnosis requires that no other condition more adequately accounts for clinical findings.

Diagnosis and Evidential Fragility

In medicolegal contexts, CRPS is often challenged because diagnosis depends substantially on subjective experience and examiner interpretation. Absence of a diagnostic test means that opinions must be justified by reference to methodology rather than conclusion.

Common evidential weaknesses can include:

- failure to document contemporaneous objective signs,
- retrospective labelling of symptoms as CRPS,
- inadequate consideration of differential diagnoses such as peripheral neuropathy, infection, inflammatory arthropathy, or functional neurological disorder.

A defensible medicolegal opinion should demonstrate not merely that CRPS is possible, but that diagnostic criteria were met at the relevant time and applied correctly.

Causation: Medical Probability -v- Legal Proof

Causation represents a frequent point of contention. CRPS is unusual in that it may follow relatively trivial trauma or injury and yet not all such trauma or injury results in CRPS. This disconnect complicates legal analysis somewhat.

From a medicolegal standpoint, the expert must address the nature and timing of the alleged trauma or injury, the chronology of symptom development and progression, absence or presence of competing explanations and whether the proposed causal mechanism is medically coherent.

It is insufficient to rely on temporal association alone. Courts require a reasoned explanation linking the index incident to the onset of the symptoms based on the "balance of probabilities".

Credibility and the Problem of Subjectivity

CRPS cases frequently invite scrutiny of symptom validity due to the subjective nature of pain and what sometimes presents as a dramatic level of reported disability. However, medicolegal experts must take care not to equate diagnostic uncertainty with fabrication.

Inconsistencies, surveillance material, or functional variation should be analysed within a biopsychosocial framework. Fluctuating ability is not uncommon in chronic pain cases and does not, of itself, negate diagnosis.

A balanced report must acknowledge both supportive and unsupportive features, allowing the Court to weigh the evidence rather than being directed toward a predetermined conclusion.

Prognosis and Quantification of Loss

Outcomes in CRPS can vary widely with some patients showing substantial improvement, particularly with early diagnosis and active rehabilitation, while others develop persistent pain and functional limitation. Unfortunately, CRPS often remains undiagnosed and/or misdiagnosed leading to chronicity of the condition.

When advising the Court, prognosis should be evidence-based and avoid deterministic assumptions. Relevant considerations should include symptom duration, consistency of clinical findings, treatment response, psychological comorbidity, and observed function in daily life. Where psychological comorbidity is concerned, it is essential to distinguish between psychosomatic illness, functional mechanism and biopsychosocial disease models particularly when future care, employment capacity, or dependency are in issue.

Symptoms of CRPS are underpinned by identifiable physiological processes affecting the peripheral and central nervous system. Although many of these processes are not readily demonstrable on routine imaging or laboratory testing, their presence is inferred from reproducible clinical signs observed on examination and from established neurobiological models. While psychological factors may influence pain perception, coping strategies, and functional outcomes, as they do in many chronic medical conditions, they cannot provide an adequate or complete explanation for the objective autonomic, sensory, and motor abnormalities observed in CRPS and therefore to characterise the condition as psychologically generated risks conflating modulation of symptoms with causation.

In a medicolegal assessment context, failure to maintain this distinction may lead to erroneous conclusions regarding diagnosis, causation, and credibility.

Medicolegal reporting therefore requires not only explicit reference to recognised diagnostic criteria but also careful consideration and documentation of observed behaviour and signs, transparent discussion of potentially alternative diagnosis with acknowledgment of uncertainty where it exists. Such discipline is key in cases where polarised views between experts are common and where expert credibility is frequently tested in Court.

Conclusion

CRPS presents not only significant biopsychosocial and psychosomatic challenges but also a convergence of medical complexity and legal difficulty. Its significance in litigation arises less from its rarity than from the challenges it poses to presentation of symptoms and traditional evidential frameworks. For courts to assess CRPS claims fairly, expert evidence must be methodical, analytical, and firmly anchored in established clinical principles.

BURNING NIGHTS
Cromptons Solicitors