Comparison of subjective motor imagery abilities in CRPS compared to chronic limb pain and health controls: a cross sectional study

Short title: "Motor imagery in CRPS"

Cohen-Aknine, Gabriel[a], Homs, Alexis[a,e], Mottet, Denis[b], Mura, Thibault[c], Jedryka, François[d], Dupeyron, Arnaud[a,e]

[a] *EuroMov Digital Health in Motion, Univ Montpellier, IMT Mines Ales, CHU Nimes ,Nimes, France*

[b] *Euromov Digital Health in Motion, University of Montpellier, IMT Mines Ales, Montpellier, France*

[c] *Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Public Health and Innovation in Methodology (BESPIM), CHU Nimes, Nîmes, Univ Montpellier, France*

[d] *Department of Pain Management, CHU Nimes, Univ Montpellier, Nîmes, France*

[e] *Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, CHU Nimes, Nîmes, France*

Corresponding author :

Gabriel Cohen-Aknine

Address: Euromov Digital Health in Motion (DHM) Laboratory, UFR STAPS, University of Montpellier, 700 Avenue du Pic Saint Loup, 34090 Montpellier, France

Email : gabriel.cohenaknine@chu-nimes.fr

Keywords: *Complex Regional Pain Syndromes; Motor imagery, Psychotherapy; Chronic Pain; Bayes Theorem; MIQ-RS*

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

Cohen-Aknine, Gabriel: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Writing-Original Draft **Homs, Alexis:** Resources, Writing-Review & Editing, Visualization **Mottet, Denis:** Methodology, Validation, Data Curation, Writing-Review & Editing,

Visualization, Supervision, **Mura, Thibault:** Methodology, Writing-Review & Editing **Jedryka, François:** Investigation, Resources, Writing-Review & Editing **Dupeyron, Arnaud:** Validation, Resources, Writing-Review & Editing, Visualization, Project Administration

ABSTRACT

Complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS) is a chronic pain condition with extensive symptoms. Motor imagery (MI) is a common therapy in chronic pain, however it is unknown whether patients with CRPS have a subjective MI deficit. In this single-center observational study, 120 patients were recruited, comprising 40 participants each with CRPS, chronic limb pain (CLP), and healthy individuals.. In this single-center observational study, 120 patients were recruited, comprising 40 participants each with CRPS, chronic limb pain (CLP), and healthy individuals. Participants completed the Motor Imagery Questionnaire - Revised Second (MIQ-RS) once on each side to assess their subjective kinesthetic (KMI) and visual (VMI) MI abilities. The study was performed in the University Hospital of Nîmes (France). The total MIQ-RS score and KMI and VMI subscores were compared between groups and between healthy and painful sides.. There was no difference between or within groups ($p>0.05$; 95% CI) for all scores. Bayesian analysis suggested that CLP patients had the same MI abilities as healthy individuals and between their healthy and painful sides for the KMI score ($BF_{01}>3$). This approach allowed us to conclude that if a difference exists for CRPS patients, it is very small. Motor imagery training appears to be effective in rehabilitation programs for patients with CRPS, but not in improving a deficit in the ability to perform motor imagery. Future studies should aim to assess MI abilities by a subjective or objective method in a longitudinal study and observe changes in these abilities.

INTRODUCTION

Complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS) is a chronic pain condition characterized by multiple categories of symptoms with sensory, motor, vasomotor, and sudomotor disorders [1–3]. The long duration of symptoms represents a high cost to the health care system [4,5]. The mechanism of CRPS is not fully understood, although there is an international consensus to explain the symptoms by both central and peripheral processes[2,6]. Some studies appear to show changes in brain structure and function on both affected and unaffected sides, but the results are not consistent [7–10]. However, abnormal neuroplasticity[11] in the central nervous system has been demonstrated, accounting for reductions in higher-order motor control and dysfunction of intentional movements [12], and altered body perception called "neglect-like syndrome" [13,14]. Furthermore, a reduced activation of cortical areas during the motor imagery (MI) task in the affected side [15] has been observed, and changes in motor areas such as the premotor cortex that is involved in MI abilities [7,16,17].

MI is a dynamic state whereby subjects mentally simulate specific actions [18], and precedes motor execution in the premotor cortex [19]. Subjective MI abilities can be assessed using questionnaires, most often assessing two distinct parts of subjective MI abilities: visual motor imagery (VMI) and kinesthetic motor imagery (KMI) [20,21]. VMI can be considered as external imagery (performing the movement as a viewer) and KMI as internal imagery (performing the movement in the first person with kinesthetic sensations). Movement is impaired early in CPRS and as a part of motor planning. Currently, MI training is a recommended technique and effective therapy in chronic pain and CRPS [22–26]. Therefore, assessment of MI abilities using a simple questionnaire could be an interesting strategy in the clinical management of patients. Furthermore, patients with chronic low back pain pain (CLBP) appear to have impaired subjective motor skills [27], and chronic pain seems to be associated to changes in primary motor cortex [28]. In addition, people with chronic pain as chronic limb pain shows impairments in Laterality judgment performance [29–31]. Thus, it is difficult to determine whether the changes observed, particularly in MI tasks, are specific to CRPS or to chronic pain. [28,32]

The aim of this study was to compare MI abilities between patients with CRPS, patients with chronic limb pain (CLP) and healthy subjects. We hypothesized that individuals with CRPS will have lower specific nerve impulse abilities than controls and at least equal to those of individuals with pain in other limbs. Secondarily, we aimed to compare MI abilities of participants' affected side to their unaffected side in both chronic pain groups. We hypothesized that the painful side would be more affected than the healthy side [2,14,33].

MATERIALS AND METHOD

Design

This was a prospective, single-center, cross-sectional study conducted at the University Hospital of Nîmes (France). The study was approved by the local ethics committees (2020-A02281-38) and registered on clinicaltrials.org (NCT04703348). All patients received an information letter and provided written consent.

Participants and setting

Patients with CRPS were recruited from January 2021 to October 2022 in the pain medicine department (CHU Nîmes, France). Healthy participants were recruited from hospital employees using a poster campaign. Patients with CLP were recruited in the physical medicine and rehabilitation department and were included if they experienced limb pain lasting more than 3 months including musculoskeletal disorders, chronic post-traumatic pain, or post-surgical pain regardless of etiology.

Inclusion criteria were: age above 18, less than 150 minutes of moderate-to-intense physical activity per week, and education until A level of baccalaureate / high school diploma or equivalent. CRPS patients had to have a CRPS diagnosis by validated Budapest criteria [22,34,35], and CLP patients' CLP must have arisen secondary to trauma, surgery, or musculoskeletal disorders. Additionally, patients were excluded if CRPS was secondary to stroke, stellate block injection performed 3 weeks before the questionnaire, presence of central neurological disease, patients with chronic fibromyalgia or low back pain, patient

pregnancy/parturition/breastfeeding, visual blindness, amputation, or previous experience with MI practice.

Intervention

Questionnaires were originally planned to be performed during consultation. However, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, some participants (60%) completed the questionnaire over a video conference with an investigator. The questionnaires were audio recorded on REDCap© (online questionnaire) [36]. Patients completed the MIQ-RS (Movement Imagery Questionnaire - Revised Second Edition) twice, starting with the right side and followed by the left side (non-randomized running order based on the difference in laterality between the upper and lower limb) with a pause if necessary.

Age, sex, body mass index (BMI), upper and lower dominant limb, education level, and physical activity level were recorded.

Outcome measures

The MIQ-RS is a validated questionnaire for assessing subjective MI [37,38], with a validated French translation [39], but it has not yet been used in patients with CRPS. It is a practitioner-administered questionnaire (done by 2 administrators), comprising 14 tasks in which patients first perform a movement such as a knee raise, then imagine it visually and kinesthetically. Patients evaluate their abilities on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "very easy to see/feel" (1 point) to "very hard to see/feel" (7 points). A total score and two sub scores (KMI and VMI) are calculated on a scale of 7. There is no official cutoff available. The primary outcome was the difference in MIQ-RS total score and sub scores between the groups; the secondary outcome was the difference in scores between the healthy and painful side in the CRPS and CLP groups.

Data analysis

No published results were available in this population to perform a sample size calculation. Based on the assumption that CRPS patients experience abnormal plasticity of the central

nervous system, we used a population of stroke patients [40] to estimate the expected deficit (score of 29 for the VMI, and 25 for the KMI with standard deviations around 10 for both measures). The expected scores in the control group were based on the study by Loison et al. [39] (40 for the VMI and 33 for the KMI with standard deviations around 10). Thus, the inclusion of 40 patients seemed reasonable to highlight the smaller of the two expected differences (25 vs 33 for the KMI score with a SD=10) with a power of 90% and an alpha risk at 5%.

MI abilities were compared between the three groups to explore the effect of pain on subjective abilities to determine whether MI was different in CRPS or whether pain could account for this difference. The mean scores of the total MIQ-RS and both sub scores were recorded. Then, an intragroup comparison of MI abilities was performed between the painful side and the healthy side for CRPS and CLP patients to address whether pain affected the subjective ability to perform MI.

We performed a second analysis with a Bayesian statistical approach to test for an effect of CRPS on MI subjective abilities [41–43]. This approach determines the degree of evidence to reject the hypothesis. A Bayes factor between 5 and 10 is considered moderate evidence [42,44].

JASP version 0.16.4© software was used to perform statistical analyses. Because of a skewed distribution, a non-parametric approach was performed. Quantitative variables were expressed as median and IQR (Inter Quartile Range), and compared between groups (CRPS vs CLP vs healthy) using a Kruskal-Wallis test. We performed a chi-square test to compare homogeneity for categorical data. A nonparametric signed rank test was used for the within-group comparison. Statistical analyses were performed at the conventional two-tailed α level of 0.05.

RESULTS

A total of 129 participants were screened for inclusion, and 120 patients were retained after exclusion. Each group consisted of 40 patients; the CRPS group comprised 31 women (78%),

and the CLP group 23 women (58%) compared to 28 women (70%) for the Healthy group (Table 1). Details are provided in Appendix 1.

Descriptive Statistics		**CLP Group** *(n=40)*	**CRPS Group** *(n=40)*	**Healthy Group** *(n=40)*	**F Test** *(Kruskal-Wallis Test)*	**P value**
Age, years median [IQR] (1st – 3rd Quartile)		48 [18.75] (39.75-58.5)	53 [18.5] (42-60.5)	47.5 [15.75] (37.75-53.5)	1.59	0.23
BMI, kg/m², median [IQR] (1st – 3rd Quartile)		25 [8](22-30]	25.5 [6] (23-29)	23 [6] (21-27)	2.81	0.10
Pain Duration, month [IQR] (1st – 3rd Quartile)		12 [34] (5.75-39.75)	9.5 [9] (6-15)	NA	4.22	0.35
		Chronic Pain Limb Group	**CRPS Group**	**Healthy Group**	**X² Test**	**P value**
Sex	**Men**	17 *(42.5%)*	9 *(22.5%)*	12 *(30%)*	3.77	0.15
	Women	23 *(57.5%)*	31 *(77.5%)*	28 *(70%)*		
Upper dominant	**Right**	39 *(99.5%)*	35 *(87.5%)*	37 *(92.5%)*	2.88	0.24
	Left	1 *(0.5%)*	5 *(12.5%)*	3 *(7.5%)*		
Lower dominant	**Right**	26 *(65%)*	31 *(77.5%)*	27 *(67.5%)*	1.67	0.44

	Left	14 *(35%)*	9 *(22.5%)*	13 *(32.5%)*		
Level of moderate-intense physical activity per week	**< 1h**	17 *(42.5%)*	32 *(80%)*	17 *(42.5%)*	24.15	< 0.01
	>1h - <1h30	7 *(17.5%)*	4 *(10%)*	16 *(40%)*		
	>1h30 - <2h30	16 *(40%)*	4 *(10%)*	7 *(17.5%)*		
Level of education	**A level**	13 *(32.5%)*	24 *(60%)*	2 *(5%)*	44.28	< 0.01
	1 years of study after A level	5 *(12.5%)*	11 *(27.5%)*	5 *(12.5%)*		
	2 years of study after A level	5 *(12.5%)*	3 *(7.5%)*	9 *(22.5%)*		
	Bachelor degree	7 *(17.5%)*	2 *(5%)*	8 *(20%)*		
	Master's Degree	7 *(17.5%)*	0 *(0%)*	10 *(25%)*		
	Ph.D and higher	3 *(7.5%)*	0 *(0%)*	6 *(15%)*		

Table 1: Participant characteristics. Data are presented as medians for continuous variables and numbers and percentage for categorical variables in each group

Primary objective results

There were no statistical differences between the three groups for the MIQ-RS total score (Figure 1) (95%CI p>0.05), the KMI score (95%CI p>0.05), or the VMI score (95%CI p>0.05) (Table 2). Details are provided in Appendix 2.

	CLP	**CRPS**	**Healthy**	**P value**
MIQ-RS	5.29 [1.45]	5.07 [1.51]	5.43 [1.36]	0.23

Total Mean	(2.71-7)	(2.5-3.96)	(1-7)	
MIQ-RS **KMI Mean**	5.14 [1.43] (2.57-7)	5.14 [1.36] (2.29-6.86)	5.29 [1.71] (1-7)	0.34
MIQ-RS **VMI Mean**	5.5 [1.46] (2.86-7)	5.07 [1.57] (2.57-7)	5.5 [1.36] (1-7)	0.16

[IQR] (1st Quartile-3rd Quartile)

Table 2: MIQ-RS scores of the different groups. Data are presented as medians and Inter Quartile Range (IQR)



Figure 1: Boxplot of the MIQ-RS Total Score between CRPS, CLP and healthy patients.

Secondary objective

CRPS Group

There was no statistical difference between the painful side and the healthy side for the MIQ-RS total (Figure 2) (95%CI p>0.05), KMI score (95%CI p>0.05) and VMI score (95%CI p>0.05). Results are summarized in Table 3 (Details in Appendix 2).



Figure 2: Boxplot of the MIQ-RS Total Score between the Healthy and Painful Side for CRPS Group.

	Painful Side	Healthy Side	P value
MIQ-RS Total Mean	5.29 [1.39] (4.34-5.73)	5.07 [1.52] (2.5-3.96)	0.32
MIQ-RS KMI Mean	4.93 [1.5] (4.25-5.75)	5.21 [1.61] (4.4-6)	0.52
MIQ-RS VMI Mean	5.29 [1.89] (4.11-6)	5.29 [1.36] (4.64-6)	0.28

[IQR] (1st Quartile-3rd Quartile)

Table 3: MIQ-RS scores of the painful and healthy side for patients with CRPS. Data are presented as medians and Inter Quartile Range (IQR).

Chronic Limb Pain Group

There was also no statistical difference between the painful side and the healthy side for the MIQ-RS total, KMI and VMI score (Table 4) in the CLP group. (Details in Appendix 3).

	Painful Side	Healthy Side	P value
MIQ-RS Total Mean	5.32 [1.25] (4.75-6)	5.39 [1.61] (4.55-6.16)	0.32
MIQ-RS KMI Mean	5.14 [1.43] (4.57-6)	5.29 [1.5] (4.54-6)	0.6
MIQ-RS VMI Mean	5.5 [1.29] (5-6.29)	5.57 [1.61] (4.82-6.43)	0.27

[IQR] (1st Quartile-3rd Quartile)

Table 4: MIQ-RS scores between the painful and healthy side for patients with Chronic Limb Pain (CLP). Data are presented as medians and Inter Quartile Range (IQR).

Complementary analysis

To allow us to better interpret the results, we performed a second analysis with a Bayesian statistical approach to test for the presence or absence of an effect of CRPS on MI subjective abilities. [41–43]. This approach gives us the ability to determine the degree of evidence to reject the hypothesis. A Bayes factor between 5 and 10 is considered moderate evidence [42,44]. Based on this observation, we can state that the CLP group and the healthy group have the same subjective MI abilities (BF_{01}=4.259 for the MIQ-RS KMI score ; BF_{01}=4.159 for the MIQ-RS KMI score ; BF_{01}=4.304 for the MIQ-RS VMI score), and the CLP patients have the same subjective KMI abilities in their healthy and painful side (BF_{01}=3.381 for the MIQ-RS KMI score) (Appendix 3).

For the other objectives, we cannot interpret the results, probably due to a lack of power.

DISCUSSION

There was no statistical difference in subjective MI abilities between the CRPS, CLP, and healthy groups, and between the healthy and painful sides for the CRPS and CLP groups. Furthermore, CLP patients did not appear to be impaired in their subjective MI abilities compared with healthy individuals and in their affected limb compared with their healthy limb. The secondary analysis with the Bayesian method allows us not to consider a significant degree of evidence to reject the null hypothesis in the presence of a Bayesian factor lower than 3. The finding of no difference with an inferential model and the absence of similarities leads us to take precautions in conclusion. This result seems to be due to a lack of power.

Our results could be explained by some limitations of our study, such as the non-random order in which the questionnaire was completed and the lack of matching between the groups, due to the low prevalence of the CRPS and our strict selection criteria. Indeed, education and level of physical activity were statistically different between the groups and are known to modify motor imagery abilities [39]. Although the MIQ-RS is a commonly used questionnaire [45], and seems to be a reliable and valid tool [37–39], it is not well balanced between upper and lower extremity questions, with 10 of the 14 questions focused on upper extremity MI abilities. Another limitation of this questionnaire is the assessment of the lower limbs. Indeed, the assessment was done by lifting the leg, whereas pain could occur when the patient put weight on it. A third limitation of the questionnaire was that some questions were asked while sitting, others while standing, and some questions did not specify the position. Finally, a systematic review proposed a threshold of 3 levels of capacity according to brain lesions, and despite abnormal central plasticity in CRSD patients, we could not use this classification [46].

The selection criteria were very strict to avoid selection or interview bias. The STROBE checklist [47,48] shows a very low level of bias. The strict selection criteria may have made the population non-representative of that commonly encountered in rehabilitation, particularly for education and physical activity level [49–51].

Our study only looked at subjective and not objective abilities in MI, however, the KMI subscore seems to correlate well with motor cortex activation in stroke patients [52]. Motor cortex excitability during MI in patients with CRPS does not appear to differ from that of healthy persons [53], and our results seem to confirm these observations. Furthermore, neuroimaging techniques studying central nervous system dysfunction in CRPS patients are inconclusive or show bilateral disinhibition of the primary motor cortex [54]. This change may be more consistent with altered body perception [13,14] than with MI disorders in CRPS patients. In futures studies, it could be interesting to correlate subjective MI abilities with medical imaging, such as electroencephalograms, to measure motor cortex activity and connectivity during the MI task, as has been done previously with healthy individuals. [55].

Chronic pain alters the central nervous system in different ways depending on the condition [28,56]. A previous study using the Revised Movement Imagery Questionnaire (MIQ-R) showed impaired KMI and VMI abilities for CLBP patients [27]. Patients with CLBP showed high levels of kinesiophobia, pain catastrophizing and low levels of coping compared with healthy participants. Psychological factors were not assessed in our study and could explain this difference. Pain catastrophizing impacts motor activity cortex [57,58]. However, in CRPS patients, the action observation seems to increase symptoms [59] and epidemiological studies show presence of psychological symptoms [60]. Thus, evidence suggest that the patients included in our study are not different in terms of psychological factors.

MI training appears to be an effective treatment for improving neuronal excitability or synapse conductance in healthy and pathological individuals [61] and KMI has the same cortical correlate in relation to movement execution [62]. Recommended rehabilitation programs support the use of MI training alone or in combination with other modalities such as GMI (Graded Motor Imagery) [23,25,63–66]. MI training appears to activate areas of the brain involved in movement preparation [15,20,61,67]. It is plausible that MI helps CRPS patients by activating other gray matter pathways [12,68,69], by improving body schema deficits [14,70–73], or because CRPS or chronic pain

patients may not be so different from healthy patients in their MI abilities. MI training appears to be an effective treatment, but not to correct MI deficit [26].

Finally, the use of the MIQ-RS could not be a relevant questionnaire to assess the subjective abilities of MI.

Future studies should use other MI assessment questionnaires or more objective assessment (medical imagery), and should focus on a simple and quick way to help clinicians develop tailored rehabilitation programs. Our results show that patients with CLP have the same MI abilities as healthy subjects and between their healthy and painful sides for kinesthetic motor abilities. Thus, whilst MI training may be effective in rehabilitation programs for CRPS patients, it does not appear to improve a specific MI deficit, however using the movement approach to restore function and decrease pain appears to be effective [66].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the following people for their support and assistance: Marine Ourmet, Brigitte Laffont for regulatory documents, Willy Fagart, Dr Anaïs Pages, Julie Bourdier, Romain Dolin, Shuan Banh, Kevin Jezequel and Sarah Kabani for editing the manuscript. The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The study data are available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

References

1. Marinus J, Moseley GL, Birklein F, et al. Clinical features and pathophysiology of complex regional pain syndrome. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2011;10(7):637-648. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(11)70106-5

2. Birklein F, Ajit SK, Goebel A, Perez RSGM, Sommer C. Complex regional pain syndrome — phenotypic characteristics and potential biomarkers. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2018;14(5):272-284. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2018.20

3. Maihöfner C, Seifert F, Markovic K. Complex regional pain syndromes: new pathophysiological concepts and therapies. *European Journal of Neurology*. 2010;17(5):649-660. doi:10.1111/j.1468-1331.2010.02947.x

4. Elsamadicy AA, Yang S, Sergesketter AR, et al. Prevalence and Cost Analysis of Complex Regional Pain Syndrome (CRPS): A Role for Neuromodulation: PREVALENCE AND COST OF CRPS. *Neuromodulation: Technology at the Neural Interface*. 2018;21(5):423-430. doi:10.1111/ner.12691

5. Groupe de Travail "Douleurs chroniques rebelles," Serrie A, Trèves R, Bontoux D, Queneau P. *Rapport de l'Académie Nationale de Médecine pour une meilleure prise en charge des malades. Les douleurs chroniques en France.* Académie Nationale de Médecine Française; 2018:18. https://www.academie-medecine.fr/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/apr%C3%A8s-vote-Rapport-Douleurs-chroniques-12-10-2018-2.pdf

6. Birklein F, Dimova V. Complex regional pain syndrome–up-to-date. *PR9*. 2017;2(6):e624. doi:10.1097/PR9.0000000000000624

7. Di Pietro F, McAuley JH, Parkitny L, et al. Primary motor cortex function in complex regional pain syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Pain*. 2013;14(11):1270-1288. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2013.07.004

8. Lenz M, Höffken O, Stude P, et al. Bilateral somatosensory cortex disinhibition in complex regional pain syndrome type I. *Neurology*. 2011;77(11):1096-1101. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e31822e1436

9. Nardone R, Brigo F, Höller Y, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation studies in complex regional pain syndrome type I: A review. *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica*. 2018;137(2):158-164. doi:10.1111/ane.12852

10. Eisenberg E, Chistyakov AV, Yudashkin M, Kaplan B, Hafner H, Feinsod M. Evidence for cortical hyperexcitability of the affected limb representation area in CRPS: a psychophysical and transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *Pain*. 2005;113(1-2):99-105. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2004.09.030

11. Cramer SC, Sur M, Dobkin BH, et al. Harnessing neuroplasticity for clinical applications. *Brain*. 2011;134(6):1591-1609. doi:10.1093/brain/awr039

12. Shokouhi M, Clarke C, Morley-Forster P, Moulin DE, Davis KD, St Lawrence K. Structural and Functional Brain Changes at Early and Late Stages of Complex Regional Pain Syndrome. *J Pain*. 2018;19(2):146-157. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2017.09.007

13. Punt DT, Cooper L, Hey M, Johnson MI. Neglect-like symptoms in complex regional pain syndrome: learned nonuse by another name? *Pain*. 2013;154(2):200-203. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2012.11.006

14. Halicka M, Vittersø AD, Proulx MJ, Bultitude JH. Neuropsychological Changes in Complex Regional Pain Syndrome (CRPS). *Behavioural Neurology*. 2020;2020:e4561831. doi:10.1155/2020/4561831

15. Gieteling EW, van Rijn MA, de Jong BM, et al. Cerebral activation during motor imagery in complex regional pain syndrome type 1 with dystonia. *PAIN*. 2008;134(3):302-309. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2007.04.029

16. Schwenkreis P, Maier C, Tegenthoff M. Functional imaging of central nervous system involvement in complex regional pain syndrome. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2009;30(7):1279-1284. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A1630

17. Im JJ, Kim J, Jeong H, et al. Prefrontal White Matter Abnormalities Associated With Pain Catastrophizing in Patients With Complex Regional Pain Syndrome. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2021;102(2):216-224. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2020.07.006

18. Decety J. Do imagined and executed actions share the same neural substrate? *Cognitive Brain Research*. 1996;3(2):87-93. doi:10.1016/0926-6410(95)00033-X

19. D'Ostilio K, Garraux G. Brain mechanisms underlying automatic and unconscious control of motor action. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2012;6. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2012.00265

20. Guillot A, Collet C. Contribution from neurophysiological and psychological methods to the study of motor imagery. *Brain Res Brain Res Rev*. 2005;50(2):387-397. doi:10.1016/j.brainresrev.2005.09.004

21. Pearson J. The human imagination: the cognitive neuroscience of visual mental imagery. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2019;20(10):624-634. doi:10.1038/s41583-019-0202-9

22. Harden RN, McCabe CS, Goebel A, et al. Complex Regional Pain Syndrome: Practical Diagnostic and Treatment Guidelines, 5th Edition. *Pain Medicine*. 2022;23(Supplement_1):S1-S53. doi:10.1093/pm/pnac046

23. Duong S, Bravo D, Todd KJ, Finlayson RJ, Tran DQ. Treatment of complex regional pain syndrome: an updated systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Can J Anaesth*. 2018;65(6):658-684. doi:10.1007/s12630-018-1091-5

24. Méndez-Rebolledo G, Gatica-Rojas V, Torres-Cueco R, Albornoz-Verdugo M, Guzmán-Muñoz E. Update on the effects of graded motor imagery and mirror therapy on complex regional pain syndrome type 1: A systematic review. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil*. 2017;30(3):441-449. doi:10.3233/BMR-150500

25. Bowering KJ, O'Connell NE, Tabor A, et al. The Effects of Graded Motor Imagery and Its Components on Chronic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *The Journal of Pain*. 2013;14(1):3-13. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2012.09.007

26. Cuenca-Martínez F, Reina-Varona Á, Castillo-García J, La Touche R, Angulo-Díaz-Parreño S, Suso-Martí L. Pain relief by movement representation strategies: An umbrella and mapping review with meta-meta-analysis of motor imagery, action observation and mirror therapy. *Eur J Pain*. 2022;26(2):284-309. doi:10.1002/ejp.1870

27. La Touche R, Grande-Alonso M, Cuenca-Martínez F, Gónzález-Ferrero L, Suso-Martí L, Paris-Alemany A. Diminished Kinesthetic and Visual Motor Imagery Ability in Adults With Chronic Low Back Pain. *PM&R*. 2019;11(3):227-235. doi:10.1016/j.pmrj.2018.05.025

28. Chang WJ, O'Connell NE, Beckenkamp PR, Alhassani G, Liston MB, Schabrun SM. Altered Primary Motor Cortex Structure, Organization, and Function in Chronic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *The Journal of Pain*. 2018;19(4):341-359. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2017.10.007

29. Coslett HB, Medina J, Kliot D, Burkey A. Mental motor imagery and chronic pain: the foot laterality task. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*. 2010;16(4):603-612. doi:10.1017/S1355617710000299

30. Breckenridge JD, McAuley JH, Ginn KA. Motor Imagery Performance and Tactile Spatial Acuity: Are They Altered in People with Frozen Shoulder? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(20):7464. doi:10.3390/ijerph17207464

31. Ravat S, Olivier B, Gillion N, Lewis F. Laterality judgment performance between people with chronic pain and pain-free individuals. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Physiother Theory Pract*. 2020;36(12):1279-1299. doi:10.1080/09593985.2019.1570575

32. Ravat S, Olivier B, Gillion N, Lewis F. Laterality judgment performance between people with chronic pain and pain-free individuals. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*. 2020;36(12):1279-1299. doi:10.1080/09593985.2019.1570575

33. Upadhyay J, Geber C, Hargreaves R, Birklein F, Borsook D. A critical evaluation of validity and utility of translational imaging in pain and analgesia: Utilizing functional imaging to enhance the process. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2018;84:407-423. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.08.004

34. Mesaroli G, Hundert A, Birnie KA, Campbell F, Stinson J. Screening and diagnostic tools for complex regional pain syndrome: a systematic review. *PAIN*. 2021;162(5):1295-1304. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002146

35. Harden RN, Bruehl S, Perez RSGM, et al. Validation of proposed diagnostic criteria (the "Budapest Criteria") for Complex Regional Pain Syndrome. *Pain*. 2010;150(2):268-274. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2010.04.030

36. Floridou GA, Peerdeman KJ, Schaefer RS. Individual differences in mental imagery in different modalities and levels of intentionality. *Mem Cognit*. 2022;50(1):29-44. doi:10.3758/s13421-021-01209-7

37. Gregg M, Hall C, Butler A. The MIQ-RS: A Suitable Option for Examining Movement Imagery Ability. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*. 2010;7(2):249-257. doi:10.1093/ecam/nem170

38. Butler AJ, Cazeaux J, Fidler A, et al. The Movement Imagery Questionnaire-Revised, Second Edition (MIQ-RS) Is a Reliable and Valid Tool for Evaluating Motor Imagery in Stroke Populations. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*. 2012;2012:1-11. doi:10.1155/2012/497289

39. Loison B, Moussaddaq AS, Cormier J, et al. Translation and validation of the French Movement Imagery Questionnaire – Revised Second version (MIQ-RS). *Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*. 2013;56(3):157-173. doi:10.1016/j.rehab.2013.01.001

40. Santos-Couto-Paz CC, Teixeira-Salmela LF, Tierra-Criollo CJ. The addition of functional task-oriented mental practice to conventional physical therapy improves motor skills in daily functions after stroke. *Braz J Phys Ther*. 2013;17(6):564-571. doi:10.1590/S1413-35552012005000123

41. van Doorn J, van den Bergh D, Böhm U, et al. The JASP guidelines for conducting and reporting a Bayesian analysis. *Psychon Bull Rev*. 2021;28(3):813-826. doi:10.3758/s13423-020-01798-5

42. Kruschke JK. Bayesian Analysis Reporting Guidelines. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2021;5(10):1282-1291. doi:10.1038/s41562-021-01177-7

43. Quintana DS, Williams DR. Bayesian alternatives for common null-hypothesis significance tests in psychiatry: a non-technical guide using JASP. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2018;18(1):178. doi:10.1186/s12888-018-1761-4

44. Jeffreys H. *Theory of Probability.* 3d ed. Clarendon Press; 1961.

45. Suica Z, Behrendt F, Gäumann S, et al. Imagery ability assessments: a cross-disciplinary systematic review and quality evaluation of psychometric properties. *BMC Medicine*. 2022;20(1):166. doi:10.1186/s12916-022-02295-3

46. McInnes K, Friesen C, Boe S. Specific Brain Lesions Impair Explicit Motor Imagery Ability: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2016;97(3):478-489.e1. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2015.07.012

47. Cuschieri S. The STROBE guidelines. *Saudi J Anaesth*. 2019;13(Suppl 1):S31-S34. doi:10.4103/sja.SJA_543_18

48. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *BMJ*. 2007;335(7624):806-808. doi:10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.AD

49. Beerthuizen A, Stronks DL, Van't Spijker A, et al. Demographic and medical parameters in the development of complex regional pain syndrome type 1 (CRPS1): prospective study on 596 patients with a fracture. *Pain*. 2012;153(6):1187-1192. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2012.01.026

50. Mailis-Gagnon A, Lakha SF, Allen MD, Deshpande A, Harden RN. Characteristics of Complex Regional Pain Syndrome in Patients Referred to a Tertiary Pain Clinic by Community Physicians, Assessed by the Budapest Clinical Diagnostic Criteria. *Pain Medicine*. 2014;15(11):1965-1974. doi:10.1111/pme.12584

51. Kim H, Lee CH, Kim SH, Kim YD. Epidemiology of complex regional pain syndrome in Korea: An electronic population health data study. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(6):e0198147. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0198147

52. Confalonieri L, Pagnoni G, Barsalou LW, Rajendra J, Eickhoff SB, Butler AJ. Brain Activation in Primary Motor and Somatosensory Cortices during Motor Imagery Correlates with Motor Imagery Ability in Stroke Patients. *ISRN Neurol*. 2012;2012:613595. doi:10.5402/2012/613595

53. van Velzen GAJ, Marinus J, van Dijk JG, van Zwet EW, Schipper IB, van Hilten JJ. Motor Cortical Activity During Motor Tasks Is Normal in Patients With Complex Regional Pain Syndrome. *The Journal of Pain*. 2015;16(1):87-94. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2014.10.010

54. Di Pietro F, McAuley JH, Parkitny L, et al. Primary motor cortex function in complex regional pain syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Pain*. 2013;14(11):1270-1288. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2013.07.004

55. Toriyama H, Ushiba J, Ushiyama J. Subjective Vividness of Kinesthetic Motor Imagery Is Associated With the Similarity in Magnitude of Sensorimotor Event-Related Desynchronization Between Motor Execution and Motor Imagery. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. 2018;12. Accessed April 22, 2022. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00295

56. Kregel J, Coppieters I, DePauw R, et al. Does Conservative Treatment Change the Brain in Patients with Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain? A Systematic Review. *Pain Physician*. 2017;20(3):139-154.

57. Henderson LA, Akhter R, Youssef AM, et al. The effects of catastrophizing on central motor activity. *Eur J Pain*. 2016;20(4):639-651. doi:10.1002/ejp.781

58. Seminowicz DA, Davis KD. Cortical responses to pain in healthy individuals depends on pain catastrophizing. *Pain*. 2006;120(3):297-306. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2005.11.008

59. Moseley GL, Zalucki N, Birklein F, Marinus J, van Hilten JJ, Luomajoki H. Thinking about movement hurts: The effect of motor imagery on pain and swelling in people with chronic arm pain. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2008;59(5):623-631. doi:10.1002/art.23580

60. Marinus J, Perez RS, van Eijs F, et al. The role of pain coping and kinesiophobia in patients with complex regional pain syndrome type 1 of the legs. *Clin J Pain*. 2013;29(7):563-569. doi:10.1097/AJP.0b013e31826f9a8a

61. Ruffino C, Papaxanthis C, Lebon F. Neural plasticity during motor learning with motor imagery practice: Review and perspectives. *Neuroscience*. 2017;341:61-78. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2016.11.023

62. Yang YJ, Jeon EJ, Kim JS, Chung CK. Characterization of kinesthetic motor imagery compared with visual motor imageries. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):3751. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-82241-0

63. Moseley LG. Graded motor imagery is effective for long-standing complex regional pain syndrome: a randomised controlled trial: *Pain*. 2004;108(1):192-198. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2004.01.006

64. De Souza NS, Martins ACG, Bastos VHDV, et al. Motor imagery and its effect on complex regional pain syndrome: an integrative review. *Neurol Int*. 2015;7(3). doi:10.4081/ni.2015.5962

65. Smart KM, Wand BM, O'Connell NE. Physiotherapy for pain and disability in adults with complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS) types I and II. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;2:CD010853. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD010853.pub2

66. Harden RN, McCabe CS, Goebel A, et al. Complex Regional Pain Syndrome: Practical Diagnostic and Treatment Guidelines, 5th Edition. *Pain Medicine*. 2022;23(Supplement_1):S1-S53. doi:10.1093/pm/pnac046

67. McFarland D, Miner L, Vaughan T, et al. Mu and beta rhythm topographies during motor imagery and actual movements. *Brain topography*. 2000;12:177-186. doi:10.1023/A:1023437823106

68. Domin M, Strauss S, McAuley JH, Lotze M. Complex Regional Pain Syndrome: Thalamic GMV Atrophy and Associations of Lower GMV With Clinical and Sensorimotor Performance Data. *Frontiers in Neurology*. 2021;12. Accessed December 16, 2022. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fneur.2021.722334

69. Azqueta-Gavaldon M, Schulte-Göcking H, Storz C, et al. Basal ganglia dysfunction in complex regional pain syndrome - A valid hypothesis? *Eur J Pain*. 2017;21(3):415-424. doi:10.1002/ejp.975

70. Punt DT, Cooper L, Hey M, Johnson MI. Neglect-like symptoms in complex regional pain syndrome: Learned nonuse by another name? *PAIN*. 2013;154(2):200. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2012.11.006

71. Brun C, Giorgi N, Pinard AM, Gagné M, McCabe CS, Mercier C. Exploring the Relationships Between Altered Body Perception, Limb Position Sense, and Limb Movement Sense in Complex Regional Pain Syndrome. *The Journal of Pain*. 2019;20(1):17-27. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2018.07.008

72. Kuttikat A, Noreika V, Shenker N, Chennu S, Bekinschtein T, Brown CA. Neurocognitive and Neuroplastic Mechanisms of Novel Clinical Signs in CRPS. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2016;10:16. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2016.00016

73. Swart CMAK, Stins JF, Beek PJ. Cortical changes in complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS). *Eur J Pain*. 2009;13(9):902-907. doi:10.1016/j.ejpain.2008.11.010