

Response to reviewers

First of all, we would like to thank the reviewers for their comments on our manuscript. We considered each comment and now provide a response to each point in this document. Revisions were also made in the manuscript and are highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer 00526025

1- This is an excellent comprehensive review of complex regional pain syndrome. I think it is useful for physicians interested in pain. I have a few comments. Page 10, line 4: I think it might be “sensory” instead of “sensitive.”

Corrected, thank you.

2- I think it might be more comprehensive if the authors describe reports of use of pregabalin and opioids other than morphine for the treatment of CRPS. I think the authors did not describe them because there were scanty reports of use of pregabalin and opioids other than morphine. The description “there are few reports of use of pregabalin or opioids other than morphine for the treatment of CRPS” would make the readers understand the comprehensiveness of the authors.

We thank the reviewer for this comment. We added a few sentences to clarify as mentioned by the reviewer.

3- The authors describe sympathetic blockade for the treatment of CRPS. I think sympathetic blockade is rather invasive. So, I would recommend the authors write sympathetic blockade immediately before Section 6.2 (Other medical treatments).

We agree with the reviewer and we moved the paragraph as suggested.

4- I would like to recommend the authors describe “intravenous regional blockade.

This was added in the revised version of the manuscript as suggested.

Reviewer 02488500

Although well written, the manuscript and the content are not unique. There is nothing new here. The topic, data, and material has been covered, and in fact covered more comprehensively, in most major pain text books (Bonica, Raj, etc). Perhaps a literature review, or meta-analysis to discuss and assess for efficacy of treatments. In addition, the degree to which the treatments are discussed is extremely short and incomplete.

We understand that this reviewer did not appreciate the first version of the manuscript. We agree that the treatments were not discussed in much detail. The objective of the review is to provide an overview of CRPS and its treatments for a wide audience of health care professionals. We covered most aspects of CRPS and it not possible to go into details for every aspect, as in textbooks. However, we improved the treatment section because one of the aims of this review is to provide a summary of useful therapeutic approaches.

Reviewer 02488862

This article is a well designed article. I think it needs minor revision. Comment: language edition

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We confirm that the manuscript was edited by the Elsevier language editing service from the first submission.