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Reviewer's report:

Major revisions / questions:

- One of the key features of CRPS1 is that the symptoms are present in an area larger than the innervation area of 1 nerve. Can the disease described in this manuscript therefore be called 'CRPS'?
- Line 58: 'Since then, a dozen articles have been devoted to the subject'. What did these authors conclude? And why is the current study still necessary?
- Most CRPS1 patients are female; how do you explain the high prevalence among men in your study population?
- How did you manage to retrieve all the symptoms of the Budapest criteria from medical records, while these criteria also contain new symptoms compared to previous diagnostic criteria, for example alldynia to deep somatic pressure and/or joint movement?
- In the Dutch guidelines for CRPS1 it is concluded, based on a systematic literature review performed in 2006, that there is no evidence in the literature for the use of radiography, TBPS & MRI in the diagnostics of CRPS1. Is the literature published since then convincing enough to study these diagnostic instruments? Adding these recent references to your manuscript would make the methods section more convincing.
- A characteristic of CRPS is that the symptoms can fluctuate over time (for example patients can mainly suffer from CRPS-symptoms during the evening). Could this have influenced the results concerning the treatment effect? Would a second measurement be of any value?
- Please add the reasons for drop-outs / losses to follow-up
- The literature group consists of a heterogenous group of patients, because of the fact that different sets of criteria were used when these patients were diagnosed. Could this have influenced the results of your study?
- The readability of the discussion section is restricted, my recommendation is to shorten and structure this section.
- The weaknesses of the study are explained as follows: (Line 349 & 357): 'retrospective and results cannot be generalised to all cases of CRPS, but same applies to other articles published on crps(..). Is this explanation a valuable addition?
Minor revisions:
- from paragraph 2.1 on CRPS1 is replaced by CRPS
- Line 24: describe > described
- Line 27: into > in
- Line 34: obtain > obtained
- Line 36: return > returned
- Line 37: workable > eligible
- Please revise line 37/38
- Line 42: use > used
- Line 47: key words > keywords
- Line 73: to hospital > to the hospital
Line 81: [18] > [18],
- Line 81: They are calling Budapest criteria > they are called the Budapest criteria
- Please reconsider Lines 114-117.
- Line 132: CRPS type 2 > articles on CRPS type 2
- Line 133: 'what does 'data in this line refer to?
- Line 139: hospital > the hospital
- Line 167: in 2 cases only was there > in only 2 cases there was
- Line 175: the pain VAS > 'the pain (VAS)' or 'the pain on a VAS'
- line 175: on admission > at admission
- line 186: regarding to > with regard to
- line 187: return > returned
- Line 194: cases series > case series
- Line 213: regarding to > regarding OR with regard to
- Line 223: Budapest criteria > The Budapest criteria
- Line 227: 'in the study performed in 2010 > which study are you referring to here?
- Line 233: what do you mean by 'this'?
- Line 236: Budapest criteria > the Budapest criteria
- Line 243: but > and?
- Lines 250 - 251 > please revise and explain what criterion no 4 is
- Line 264 > after wrist fracture > after a wrist fracture
- Lines 274 - 277: please clarify
- line 290: disease > the disease
- line 296: with wrist fracture > with a wrist fracture
- line 299: to discriminating > to discriminate
- line 345: of > for
- line 346: patient > patients
- Line 350: excluded > exclude
- Line 353: when disease course is > when the disease course was
- Line 388: extracted OR exctracts & analyzes
- Line 390: participate to > participated in
- Line 391: approve > approved

Discretionary revisions:
- The main focus of the manuscript is diagnostics; this is not mentioned in the title of the article.
- To improve the readability, more information on the diagnostic instruments could be added (e.g. the radiological data)
- Line 103 (etc); evolution > course?
- Line 138: resumed > resume (or summarizes)
- Line 173: incipient > acute?
- line 197: were finally used > were included
- line 198: The comparative sample consists of these articles
- line 260: but in the literature group > in the literature group, however,
- line 260: patients > the patients
- line 280: two of which have used > of which two used
- line 328: treated > reported
- line 345: and the > and neither the
- line 347: what do you mean by 'in touch with'?
- line 367: of the disease course > after trauma?
- What do you mean by line 368?
- Line 369: is > should be?
- - Line 394: for > for help for the tables > for her help with the tables
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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