
Pain Treatment Center
Dept. of Anesthesiology & Perioperative Medicine
University of Rochester Medical Center
601 Elmwood Ave, Box 604
Rochester, NY 14642
Tel: 585-276-3252
Fax: 585-276-0144
E-mail: Adam_Carinci@urmc.rochester.edu

Adam J. Carinci, MD, JD, MBA
*Chief, Division of Pain Medicine
Director, Pain Treatment Center
Associate Professor*

Can Minor Trauma Cause CRPS? What the Science Really Says

A science-driven discussion of minor trauma, biologic plausibility, and vulnerability.

Introduction

One of the most contested issues in Complex Regional Pain Syndrome (CRPS) litigation is whether **minor trauma**—such as a soft tissue injury, venipuncture, or minor surgical procedure—can plausibly cause the condition. Plaintiffs often assert that CRPS followed a trivial injury, while defense counsel frequently challenge such claims as biologically implausible or speculative.

The medical literature does not support absolutist positions on either side. Instead, it reflects a nuanced understanding of CRPS as a condition with **variable triggers, incomplete mechanistic clarity, and heterogeneous clinical expression**. This article examines what the science actually supports, how courts evaluate these claims, and how minor-trauma CRPS opinions can be responsibly framed in litigation.

I. What Is Meant by “Minor Trauma” in CRPS Claims?

In litigation, “minor trauma” is rarely a medical term of art. It is typically used to describe injuries that:

- Do not involve fracture or major tissue disruption
- Produce limited acute objective findings
- Would not ordinarily be expected to result in permanent impairment

Examples include sprains, contusions, needle sticks, and low-risk outpatient procedures. The forensic question is not whether such events are “minor” in isolation, but whether they can plausibly initiate the pathophysiological processes associated with CRPS in a given individual.

II. Current Scientific Understanding of CRPS Pathophysiology

CRPS is believed to arise from a **multifactorial interaction** involving peripheral inflammation, autonomic dysregulation, central sensitization, and maladaptive neuroplasticity. No single mechanism explains all cases.

Importantly, the literature does **not require a severe injury** to initiate these processes.

Instead, CRPS appears to involve:

- Abnormal inflammatory responses
- Dysregulated sympathetic signaling
- Altered cortical representation of the affected limb

These mechanisms, in theory, can be triggered by relatively limited peripheral insults, particularly in susceptible individuals.

III. What the Literature Actually Shows About Minor Trauma

Peer-reviewed studies document CRPS following events that would traditionally be considered minor, including:

- Soft tissue injuries without fracture
- Venipuncture and injections
- Minor surgical procedures

However, the literature does **not** support the conclusion that minor trauma *commonly* causes CRPS, nor does it establish inevitability. Instead, it demonstrates **possibility under specific conditions**, often without predictive certainty.

Most studies are observational, retrospective, or case-based, limiting their ability to establish causation in the legal sense. Courts frequently misinterpret this nuance, either overstating or dismissing the significance of these reports.

IV. Susceptibility, Not Trauma Severity, Is Often the Key Variable

The emerging theme in CRPS research is **individual susceptibility** rather than injury magnitude. Proposed susceptibility factors include:

- Genetic predisposition
- Prior pain syndromes
- Autonomic dysfunction
- Psychological stressors (not causative, but modulatory)

From a forensic perspective, failure to analyze susceptibility is a critical weakness. An opinion that relies solely on the minor nature of the trauma—either to assert or deny causation—oversimplifies the science.

V. Why Courts Are Skeptical of Minor-Trauma CRPS Claims

Courts tend to approach minor-trauma CRPS claims with heightened skepticism due to:

- Weak temporal correlation without mechanistic explanation
- Lack of objective corroboration
- Failure to exclude alternative explanations
- Overreliance on post hoc reasoning

Experts who assert causation based solely on chronology are particularly vulnerable to exclusion or impeachment under Daubert-type standards.

VI. How to Responsibly Frame Minor-Trauma CRPS Opinions

Scientifically defensible opinions regarding minor trauma and CRPS share several characteristics:

- Acknowledgment that minor trauma **can** be a trigger, but is not determinative
- Explanation of biological plausibility without overstating certainty
- Analysis of individual susceptibility factors
- Transparent discussion of alternative explanations

This measured approach enhances credibility and aligns medical reasoning with legal expectations.

VII. Implications for Litigation Strategy

For plaintiff counsel, success depends on demonstrating why a particular minor injury plausibly triggered CRPS in that specific individual—not on general assertions that minor trauma is sufficient.

For defense counsel, effective rebuttal focuses on gaps in susceptibility analysis, absence of corroboration, and speculative reasoning—not on categorical denial of medical possibility.

Conclusion

The question of whether minor trauma can cause CRPS does not lend itself to simple answers. The medical literature supports **biological plausibility in select cases**, but not universal causation. Courts are best served by expert testimony that reflects this nuance rather than absolutism. Scientifically grounded restraint is often the most persuasive position in CRPS litigation.

References

1. Harden RN, et al. *Proposed new diagnostic criteria for complex regional pain syndrome*. Pain. 2007.
2. Bruehl S. *Complex regional pain syndrome*. BMJ. 2015.
3. Goebel A, et al. *Complex regional pain syndrome in adults*. Lancet. 2019.
4. Oaklander AL, et al. *Peripheral nerve injury in CRPS*. Pain. 2006.
5. Birklein F, Schlereth T. *Complex regional pain syndrome—significant progress in understanding*. Pain. 2015.

Dr. Adam J. Carinci, MD, JD, MBA is a nationally recognized CRPS thought leader and leading expert witness with over fifteen years of pain medicine experience. With dual training as both a physician and a lawyer, Dr. Carinci is a sought-after expert witness in complex medico-legal matters on a national stage, bringing distinct acumen at the intersection of medicine and law. He is double board-certified in Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine and maintains an active, full-time clinical practice. Dr. Carinci is Chief of Pain Management and Director of the Interventional Spine and Pain Treatment Center at the University of Rochester Medical Center and an Associate Professor at the University of Rochester School of Medicine.