

1 **Title:** The prevalence and risk factors for phantom limb pain in people with amputations: a
2 systematic review and meta-analysis.

3 **Short title:** Prevalence of phantom limb pain in amputees.

4 **Authors:** K. Limakatso¹, G. J. Bedwell^{1,2}, V. J. Madden^{1,3}, R. Parker^{1,2}

5 ¹Pain Management Unit, Department of Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, University of Cape
6 Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

7 ²Division of Physiotherapy, Department of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Cape
8 Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

9 ³Neuroscience Institute. University of Cape Town, Groote Schuur Hospital, Cape Town, South Africa.

10 Corresponding author: Romy Parker (PhD), Pain management unit, Department of Anaesthesia and
11 Perioperative Medicine, D23 Groote Schuur Hospital, Faculty of Health Sciences, Anzio Rd,
12 Observatory, 1925. romy.parker@uct.ac.za. (+27-21-6501608)

13 Background

14 Phantom limb pain (PLP) is commonly defined as pain felt in the missing portion of an amputated
15 limb (Ehde, Czerniecki et al. 2000). Some cases of PLP have been reported in people with congenital
16 amputations (Garcia, Flores et al. 2018). However, PLP commonly occurs in people with limb
17 amputations due to trauma or surgery (Neil 2015). It has been proposed that risk factors such as
18 persisting pre-operative pain, diabetic cause of amputation and prosthesis use contribute to the
19 onset of PLP (Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002). Phantom limb pain is common and often associated
20 with negative consequences such as depression and problems with prosthesis use, sleep and
21 participation in activities of daily function (Morgan, Friedly et al. 2017).

22 The prevalence of PLP among people with amputations is unclear, perhaps because of conflicting
23 reports across the literature. While one study reported a high prevalence of 85.6% (Clark, Bowling et
24 al. 2013), another reported a markedly lower prevalence of 0% (Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000). The
25 conflicting reports in the literature regarding the prevalence of PLP are perplexing, but may be due
26 to variations in the time period during which the studies were undertaken, the countries in which
27 the studies were conducted, and the recruitment processes used during collection of
28 epidemiological data (Maimela, Alberts et al. 2016).

29 Low prevalence rates were reported by early studies conducted during a period when PLP was
30 commonly characterised as a psychiatric disorder (Jensen, Krebs et al. 1985). The low prevalence
31 rates could be explained by patients' fear of reporting their pain to avoid the stigma associated with
32 PLP (Weeks, Anderson-Barnes et al. 2010). Low prevalence rates were also recorded in studies
33 conducted in developing countries where stigma associated with chronic pain conditions is common,
34 and effective strategies to follow up patients after amputations are still lacking (Mishra, Bhatnagar
35 et al. 2008, Gosselin, Gyamfi et al. 2011). Furthermore, many prevalence studies of PLP were
36 conducted in clinical settings using patients continuing with medical care, introducing a selection
37 bias (Sherman, Sherman et al. 1980, Desmond and MacLachlan 2010, Ventham, Heyburn et al. 2010,

38 Byrne 2011, Ahmed, Bhatnagar et al. 2017). Therefore, patients without continuing clinical care may
39 be unaccounted for in these statistics.

40 Prevalence studies are key to informing researchers, clinicians, policy-makers and the public about
41 the burden of diseases in society (Moloi, Watkins et al. 2016). However, the burden of PLP is unclear
42 because of a wide variation in the reported prevalence estimates. To our knowledge, no systematic
43 review has synthesised data on the prevalence and risk factors for PLP. To address this gap in the
44 literature, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis by gathering and critically appraising
45 relevant literature regarding the prevalence and associated risk factors for PLP in people with
46 amputations.

47 Objective

48 The primary aim of this systematic review was to estimate the prevalence of PLP in people with
49 amputations. The secondary aim was to determine whether there is a difference in the prevalence of
50 PLP in developed and developing countries as per the World Economic Situation and Prospects
51 classification system (WESP 2018). The exploratory aim was to identify associated risk factors for PLP
52 in people with limb amputations.

53 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

54 This systematic review was developed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items of
55 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher, Shamseer et al. 2015). The
56 review protocol was registered on PROSPERO - an international prospective register of systematic
57 reviews with health-related outcome, and published in Systematic Reviews (Limakatso, Bedwell et
58 al. 2019). The PRISMA criteria fulfilled by this systematic review are presented in [additional file 1](#).

59 Data sources and search procedure

60 The lead investigator (KL) and a senior librarian (MS) developed a comprehensive search strategy
61 ([Appendix A](#)) using five Medical Subject Headings (MeSH): prevalence, risk factors, amputation,

62 phantom limb and epidemiology. Articles published between 1980 and July 2019 were identified
63 through a systematic search of the following electronic databases: MEDLINE/PubMed (via
64 EBSCOhost), PsycINFO (via EBSCOhost), PsycArticles, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health
65 Literature (CINAHL) (via EBSCOhost), Africa-Wide Information (via EBSCOhost), Health Source:
66 Nursing/Academic Edition (via EBSCOhost), SCOPUS, Web of Science and Academic Search Premier
67 (via EBSCOhost). Grey literature was searched on bioRxiv (www.biorxiv.org), Preprints
68 (www.preprints.org), Open Science Framework (www.osf.io) and medRxiv (www.medrxiv.org). The
69 reference lists of eligible studies were searched manually to identify more studies that may have
70 been eligible for inclusion in this review. Studies identified from the literature search were saved
71 using the citation manager software programme (EndNote x8), which was also used to remove
72 duplicates (Rathvon 2017).

73 Study selection

74 We included case-control, cross-sectional and cohort studies that investigated the prevalence of PLP
75 in surgical, traumatic and congenital upper or lower limb amputees who were 18 years or older. The
76 risk factors for PLP were identified from the included studies. Only studies written in English, with
77 full text available, were eligible for inclusion in this review. We excluded studies that did not meet
78 the inclusion criteria. Two reviewers (KL and GJB) independently screened study titles and abstracts
79 for eligibility. Studies identified in the initial screening as potentially eligible were assessed for
80 eligibility in full-text form by the same reviewers, using the inclusion/exclusion criteria. The study
81 selection procedure was performed using a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (2016) on which the studies
82 were listed and marked as either eligible or ineligible. A PRISMA flow diagram (Fig 1) represents the
83 entire screening process detailing the numbers of included and excluded studies, with reasons for
84 exclusion. After each stage, results were compared, and disagreements resolved through discussion.

85 **Fig 1. The PRISMA flow diagram illustrating the screening process.**

86

87 [Risk of bias assessment](#)

88 Two reviewers (KL and GJB) independently assessed the included articles for risk of bias using a risk
89 of bias assessment tool for prevalence studies that had been developed by Hoy et al (Hoy, Brooks et
90 al. 2012). This tool assesses the risk of bias based on 10 categories which evaluate the study's
91 external and internal validity. Each category of the risk of bias tool was set as "high risk" if the study
92 scored "high risk" for any single item within that category, and "low risk" if it scored "low risk" for all
93 items in that category. Categories with "low risk" and "high risk" were given a rating of zero and one
94 respectively. The summary risk of bias rating for each study was presented as "low risk" (score: 0-3),
95 "moderate risk" (score: 4-6), or "high risk" (score: 7-10).

96 [Data extraction](#)

97 Two reviewers (KL and GJB) used a pre-piloted customised data extraction sheet to independently
98 extract relevant data from included studies. Data extracted included: the names of authors, year of
99 study publication, study design and setting, country of study, sample size, participants' age and sex,
100 site of amputation, method of data collection, PLP prevalence (%), as well as risk factors and their
101 measures of association with PLP. The developmental status of the countries in which the studies
102 were conducted was identified using the World Economic Situation and Prospects classification
103 system (WESP 2018).

104 [Data analysis](#)

105 Data extracted from individual studies were entered into an Excel spreadsheet for analysis. All meta-
106 analyses were conducted using Open Meta Analyst software available on
107 (<http://www.cebm.brown.edu/openmeta>). In this, we deviated from the registered protocol, which
108 specified the use of Review Manager 5, because Review Manager 5 is not suitable for conducting
109 meta-analyses of single arm studies. Cohen's Kappa was used to report inter-rater agreement during
110 screening, data extraction and risk of bias assessment, and can be interpreted as minimal (0-0.39),

111 weak (0.40-0.59), moderate (0.60-0.79) or strong (0.80-0.90) (Cohen 1960). Clinical heterogeneity
112 was evaluated qualitatively, based on similarities or differences in participant and outcome
113 characteristics, recruitment and assessment procedures, and study setting (Gagnier, Moher et al.
114 2012). Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 statistic, and the results were presented as
115 low (<25%), moderate (25-50%) and high (>50%) (Higgins, Thompson et al. 2003). Subject to
116 consideration of heterogeneity and risk of bias, studies were pooled for meta-analysis using a
117 random effects model to determine a sample-weighted summary estimate of PLP prevalence across
118 all included studies. A funnel plot was generated to assess for possible publication bias. In addition,
119 the Egger's test was conducted to assess the funnel plot for asymmetry (Egger, Smith et al. 1997). To
120 address high statistical heterogeneity, we deviated from protocol to sub-group studies into those
121 with low risk of bias and those with moderate and high risk of bias, and conducted separate meta-
122 analyses, and compared the two pooled estimates using a two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test. We also
123 sub-grouped studies by the developmental status of the country in which each study had been
124 conducted (WESP 2018), as planned in the protocol and, again, compared the estimates using a two-
125 tailed Mann-Whitney U test. Potential risk factors for PLP were identified from the included studies
126 and synthesised descriptively. When an association was confirmed, the strength of association
127 between PLP and each risk factor was classified as either "weak", "moderate", "strong" or "very
128 strong", according to the guidelines for interpreting the strength of association in epidemiology
129 studies (Rosenthal 1996, Nicolich and Gamble 2011, Healey 2014, Allen 2017). We calculated Phi (\emptyset)
130 to determine the strength of association in studies that used the chi-square test as a measure of
131 association. This sample-size-adjusted chi-square statistic has been shown to provide a more
132 accurate reflection of the strength of association between two variables than the interpretation of
133 chi-square and probability (P) values, where high chi-square and p values are thought to represent a
134 strong association between variables (Frankfort-Nachmias and Leon-Guerrero 2017). Alpha was set
135 at 0.05 for all analyses.

136

137 Results

138 The initial literature search returned 2677 records, of which 1783 remained after the removal of
139 duplicates. Initial screening of titles and abstracts identified 85 studies that were eligible for full-text
140 review. Full-text review identified 37 studies that were eligible for inclusion in this review. Three of
141 these studies reported two studies each (Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000, Reiber, McFarland et al.
142 2010, Byrne 2011). Therefore, a total of 40 data sets were included in our analysis. The screening
143 process reflected moderate agreement ($Kappa=0.70$) between reviewers.

144 Study characteristics

145 The study characteristics are summarised in [Table 1](#). The included studies had used cross-sectional
146 ($n=38$) and cohort ($n=2$) study designs. Thirty-three of 40 studies had been conducted in developed
147 countries (WESP 2018). Of these, the majority had been conducted in North America [USA ($n=7$);
148 Canada ($n=2$)] and Europe [United Kingdom ($n=8$); Germany ($n=5$); Netherlands ($n=4$); Ireland ($n=2$);
149 Poland ($n=1$)] ([Fig 2](#)). Only seven studies had been conducted in developing countries [Iran ($n=2$);
150 Iraq ($n=1$); India ($n=1$); Brazil ($n=1$); Pakistan ($n=1$); Cambodia ($n=1$)]. [Table 1](#) reflects the wide range
151 of data collection approaches used by the studies. The included studies had been published between
152 1986 and 2019. The data extraction process had moderate agreement ($Kappa=0.71$) between
153 reviewers prior to discussion.

154 **Table 1. Summary of study and participant characteristics by study.**

155 **Fig 2. World map showing the countries in which the studies had been conducted.**

156 Participant characteristics

157 The eligible studies provided data from a total of 12765 participants (9826 male; 2196 female) who
158 had undergone upper limb ($n=2784$) and lower limb ($n=10539$) amputations. Participant
159 characteristics are provided in [Table 1](#).

160

161 [Risk of bias assessment](#)

162 The risk of bias assessment revealed moderate agreement ($Kappa=0.69$) between reviewers prior to
163 discussion. The results of the risk of bias assessment are reported in [Table 2](#). Four studies had an
164 overall rating of “low risk” (Rayegani, Aryanmehr et al. 2010, Rahimi, Mousavi et al. 2012, Aldington,
165 Small et al. 2014, Hnoosh 2014). Six studies scored “low risk” for selection bias, for using a sample
166 that was a close representation of the national population (Ephraim, Wegener et al. 2005, Kern,
167 Busch et al. 2009, Rahimi, Mousavi et al. 2012, Hnoosh 2014, Bekrater-Bodmann, Schredl et al. 2015,
168 Morgan, Friedly et al. 2017). Eight studies scored “low risk” for study participation bias, because
169 their response rates for participation were $\geq 75\%$ (Wartan, Hamann et al. 1997, Kooijman, Dijkstra et
170 al. 2000, Datta, Selvarajah et al. 2004, Richardson, Glenn et al. 2006, Rayegani, Aryanmehr et al.
171 2010, Rahimi, Mousavi et al. 2012, Rafferty, Bennett Britton et al. 2015, Morgan, Friedly et al. 2017).
172 Twelve studies scored “low risk” for measurement bias, for using a clear definition of PLP (Ehde,
173 Czerniecki et al. 2000, Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002, Ephraim, Wegener et al. 2005, Hanley, Ehde et
174 al. 2006, Ketz 2008, Desmond and MacLachlan 2010, Rayegani, Aryanmehr et al. 2010, Aldington,
175 Small et al. 2014, Hnoosh 2014, Bekrater-Bodmann, Schredl et al. 2015, Bin Ayaz, Ikram et al. 2015,
176 Noguchi, Saito et al. 2019). Other studies scored “high risk” for measurement bias, for not providing
177 a clear definition of PLP (e.g pain felt in the limb after amputation). All the studies scored “high risk”
178 for measurement bias, for using an instrument that has not been shown to be valid and reliable for
179 measuring the outcome of interest. However, all studies scored “low risk” for reporting bias, for
180 appropriately reporting the numerators and denominators for the outcome of interest.

181 **Table 2. Summary of the risk of bias assessment results.**

182 [Prevalence of phantom limb pain](#)

183 The estimates of PLP prevalence in people with limb amputations ranged between 0% and 85.6%
184 (Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000, Clark, Bowling et al. 2013), with most studies (31 out of 40) reporting
185 a prevalence between 50% and 85.6% (Byrne 2011, Clark, Bowling et al. 2013). A prevalence of 0%

186 was reported by the only included study that investigated PLP in adults with congenital amputations
187 (Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000). The pooling of all studies using a random effects model yielded an
188 estimated prevalence of 63% [95% CI: 58.23-67.05], but with high statistical heterogeneity
189 [$I^2=95.70\%$ (95% CI: 95.10-96.20)] (Fig 3). The Egger's regression analysis of all the included studies
190 revealed no publication bias [-0.85 (95%CI: -4.13-2.43); $p=0.60$].

191 Exploratory subgrouping

192 We were concerned by the high statistical heterogeneity in the primary meta-analysis, so we opted
193 to deviate from protocol to conduct two exploratory meta-analyses with studies sub-grouped
194 according to risk of bias score. The first exploratory subgroup analysis, including only the studies that
195 scored low risk of bias overall, estimated prevalence at 63% [95% CI: 58.31-67.90] with moderate
196 statistical heterogeneity [$I^2=44.91$ (95% CI: 43.90-45.20)] (Fig 4). The second exploratory subgroup
197 analysis, including only the studies with moderate-high risk of bias, estimated prevalence at 63%
198 [95% CI: 56.83-68.40], but with high statistical heterogeneity [$I^2=97.75\%$ (95% CI: 96.17-98.76)] (Fig
199 5). The Mann-Whitney U test that served as the sensitivity analysis for the effect of moderate-high
200 risk of bias showed no difference between the estimated prevalence from these two meta-analyses
201 [$U=58.5$, $p=0.22$].

202 **Fig 3. A forest plot showing the overall pooled estimated prevalence of PLP in people with**
203 **amputations.**

204 **Fig 4. A subgroup analysis showing the pooled estimated prevalence of PLP in studies with low risk**
205 **of bias.**

206 **Fig 5. A subgroup analysis showing the pooled estimated prevalence of PLP in studies with**
207 **moderate to high risk of bias.**

208 The subgroup analyses stratified by the developmental status of the countries in which the studies
209 were conducted showed an estimated pooled prevalence of 64.55% [95% CI: 59.62-69.34] in

210 developed countries and 53.98% [95% CI: 44.79-63.05] in developing countries (Figs 6 & 7). The
211 Mann-Whitney U test showed a statistically significant difference between the prevalence estimates
212 of these two meta-analyses [U=57, p=0.04].

213 **Fig 6. A subgroup analysis showing the pooled estimated prevalence of PLP in developed**
214 **countries.**

215 **Fig 7. A subgroup analysis showing the pooled estimated prevalence of PLP in developing**
216 **countries.**

217 [Risk factors for phantom limb pain](#)

218 Twenty-five potential risk factors had been studied in 15 studies representing 4102 participants. Of
219 these, 10 pre-amputation, three peri-operative and eight post-amputation risk factors had data to
220 support their positive association with PLP, and six pre-amputation, four peri-operative and three
221 post-amputation risk factors had not been found to be positively associated with PLP. The risk
222 factors found to be positively associated with PLP and their measures of association are summarised
223 in [Table 3](#).

224 **Table 3. The summary of the risk factors for PLP and their measures of association with PLP.**

225 Lower limb amputation was positively associated with PLP (moderate to strong association) in two
226 studies representing a total of 1450 participants (Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002, Ephraim, Wegener et
227 al. 2005). Stump pain was consistently positively associated with PLP (weak to very strong
228 association) in seven studies representing a total of 1254 participants (Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000,
229 Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002, Richardson, Glenn et al. 2006, Hanley, Jensen et al. 2007, Desmond
230 and MacLachlan 2010, Ahmed, Bhatnagar et al. 2017, Larbig, Andoh et al. 2019). Phantom sensations
231 were consistently positively associated with PLP (strong to very strong association) in four studies
232 representing a total of 1156 participants (Wartan, Hamann et al. 1997, Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000,
233 Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002, Razmus, Daniluk et al. 2017). Proximal site of amputation was

234 positively associated with PLP (very strong association) in two studies representing a total of 604
235 participants (Gallagher, Butterworth et al. 1998, Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002). Diabetic cause of
236 amputation was positively associated with PLP (moderate to strong association) in two studies
237 representing a total of 580 participants (Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002, Noguchi, Saito et al. 2019).
238 Persistent pre-amputation pain was positively associated with PLP in five studies representing a total
239 of 881 participants (weak to very strong association) (Larbig, Montoya et al. 1996, Hanley, Jensen et
240 al. 2007, Ahmed, Bhatnagar et al. 2017, Yin, Zhang et al. 2017, Noguchi, Saito et al. 2019) but was
241 not associated with PLP in two studies representing a total of 625 participants. The risk factors which
242 were not found to be positively associated with PLP are summarised in [Table 4](#). Sex, age and
243 traumatic cause of amputation were the most commonly assessed of these proposed risk factors.
244 Sex was consistently not associated with PLP in six studies representing a total of 1836 participants
245 (Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000, Ephraim, Wegener et al. 2005, Dijkstra 2006, Hanley, Ehde et al.
246 2009, Ahmed, Bhatnagar et al. 2017, Noguchi, Saito et al. 2019). Age was not associated with PLP in
247 three studies representing a total of 1062 participants (Ephraim, Wegener et al. 2005, Hanley, Ehde
248 et al. 2009, Noguchi, Saito et al. 2019) but higher age was positively associated with PLP (weak
249 association) in one study representing a total of 716 participants (Buchanan and Mandel 1986). A
250 traumatic cause of amputation was not associated with PLP in two studies representing a total of
251 958 participants (Ephraim, Wegener et al. 2005, Noguchi, Saito et al. 2019) but was positively
252 associated with PLP (very strong association) in one study representing a total of 104 participants
253 (Gallagher, Allen et al. 2001). The meta-analysis of risk factors for PLP could not be conducted
254 because of variations in methods of data collection and analysis across the included studies.

255 **Table 4. The summary of factors not associated with increased risk for PLP and their measures of**
256 **association with PLP.**

257

258 Discussion

259 According to our knowledge, this is the first systematic review to pool the literature on the
260 prevalence and risk factors for PLP in people with limb amputations. The results of this study
261 estimate that PLP affects 63% of people with amputations. In addition, this study identified that
262 lower limb amputation, stump pain, phantom sensations, persistent pre-amputation pain, proximal
263 site of amputation and diabetic cause of amputation are risk factors for PLP.

264 Phantom limb pain prevalence

265 The current primary meta-analysis estimated that 63% of people with amputations report PLP. This
266 estimate suggests that approximately 8042 of 12765 participants in this study reported PLP.
267 Interestingly, dividing studies by risk of bias revealed no difference in estimated prevalence, despite
268 the 'low risk of bias' subgroup's meta-analysis having lower statistical heterogeneity. In addition, the
269 results of the Egger's regression test indicated that the asymmetry of the funnel plot (Fig 8) was not
270 significant ($p=0.60$), thus failing to suggest the presence of publication bias. Altogether, these
271 findings suggest that the included studies provide a reasonably stable estimate of the prevalence of
272 PLP in the population of people with amputations. The prevalence of PLP appears to be high,
273 supporting that health professionals should be aware of the risk of this complication and that
274 pragmatic interventions for preventing or alleviating PLP are needed.

275 **Fig 8. Funnel plot using data from the 40 included studies.**

276 The meta-analysis that stratified the studies by country developmental status suggested that the
277 prevalence of PLP was significantly lower in developing countries compared to developed countries
278 [53.98% vs 64.55%; $p=0.04$]. This discrepancy is surprising and might be an artefact of selection bias
279 linked either to the lower response rate seen in most of the studies conducted in developing
280 countries, or to the strategy of recruiting participants from amongst patients receiving follow-up
281 medical care. This recruitment strategy common in the developing country studies may have
282 contributed to underestimation of PLP prevalence if amputees with PLP (in developing countries)

283 without continuing medical care were excluded from samples, or may have contributed to an
284 overestimation of PLP prevalence if having PLP made amputees more likely to remain in medical
285 care. This uncertainty highlights the need to develop and implement novel recruitment strategies
286 specific to people with amputations in developing countries so that they can be accounted for in
287 future studies.

288 The included studies had varying risk of bias. However, the lack of statistically significant difference
289 between the prevalence estimates from pooling of the studies with low risk of bias and pooling of
290 the studies with moderate-high risk of bias suggests that the overall risk of bias in included studies
291 had little impact on the prevalence of PLP. Nonetheless, the high risk of bias attributed to most
292 studies for using an ambiguous definition of PLP (e.g pain felt in the limb after amputation) leaves
293 the possibility that participants might have confused residual limb pain and PLP. We suspect that this
294 might have resulted in an overestimation of the prevalence of PLP.

295 It is noteworthy that a prevalence of 0% was reported by the only study in this review that
296 investigated PLP in adults with congenital amputations (Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000). These
297 findings are similar to those of other studies (not eligible for this review) that reported a low PLP
298 prevalence of 7% (out of 57 patients) and 5.7% (out of 88 patients) in children with congenital
299 amputations (Boonstra, Rijnders et al. 2000, Garcia, Flores et al. 2018). Although a robust conclusion
300 cannot be drawn from three small studies, these findings suggest that people with congenital
301 amputations may be less likely to experience PLP than those whose amputations were due to
302 trauma or surgery (Gallagher, Allen et al. 2001). Perhaps the peripheral nerves severed during
303 amputation play an important role in the initiation of PLP after amputation (Vaso, Adahan et al.
304 2014). In addition, the absence of pre-operative and peri-operative risk factors for PLP in this group
305 might contribute to the low prevalence.

306

307 Phantom limb pain risk factors

308 Five studies showed that PLP was more likely to occur in people who reported a history of persistent
309 pre-operative pain than in those who did not report having had persistent limb pain prior to their
310 amputation. One physiological mechanism that has been proposed to explain the link between pre-
311 amputation pain and PLP is central sensitisation - where persistent pre-operative pain contributes to
312 the hyperexcitability of the nervous system and functional changes in the cortical areas involved in
313 the generation of pain (Lee, Zambreanu et al. 2008). These changes may continue to upregulate
314 peripheral input after limb amputation, thus promoting PLP that shares the characteristics with pre-
315 amputation pain (Rathmell and Kehlet 2011). In fact, over 60% of the patients who experienced
316 persistent pre-amputation pain reported similar characteristics of their PLP (Jensen, Krebs et al.
317 1985, Katz and Melzack 1990). This apparent relationship highlights the importance of addressing
318 limb pain very early in patients who are at high risk of having their limbs amputated. The early and
319 effective management of pre-amputation pain may reduce risk of developing PLP and improve
320 physical and psychological outcomes often related to delayed or ineffective management of PLP
321 (Hanley, Jensen et al. 2004, Hanley, Jensen et al. 2007)

322 Two studies showed that PLP was more likely to occur after lower limb amputation than after upper
323 limb amputation (Ephraim, Wegener et al. 2005, Dijkstra 2006). The authors proposed that the use
324 of a cosmetic prosthetic leg, rather than a prosthesis that provided sensory input was a likely
325 contributor to pain in people with lower limb amputations since 70%-78.8% of cosmetic prosthetic
326 leg users had PLP. Lack of proprioceptive feedback during the use of a prosthetic leg has been linked
327 to poor motor control, possibly leading to stump irritation that may trigger PLP (Morgan, Friedly et
328 al. 2017, Page, George et al. 2018). This proposed link is partially supported by seven studies in this
329 review which suggested that PLP was more likely to occur in people with stump pain than in those
330 without stump pain (Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000, Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002, Hanley, Ehde et al.
331 2006, Richardson, Glenn et al. 2006, Desmond and MacLachlan 2010, Ahmed, Bhatnagar et al. 2017,

332 Larbig, Andoh et al. 2019). Interestingly, Dietrich and colleagues investigated the effects of a leg
333 prosthesis with somatosensory feedback on pain and lower limb function (Dietrich, Nehrlich et al.
334 2018). In that study, participants used prosthetic legs with pressure sensors that provided
335 comfortable electrical feedback to the patient's thigh whenever the prosthetic foot touched the
336 ground. At the end of two weeks of training, the participants had improved function of the lower
337 limb and reduced severity and frequency of PLP. Further, the patients reported greater satisfaction,
338 longer walking distances and improved dynamic stability than prior to the training. These results
339 suggest that people with lower limb amputations might benefit more from using a prosthetic leg
340 with somatosensory feedback than from using a cosmetic prosthesis. However, the mechanisms by
341 which prosthetic legs with somatosensory feedback reduce PLP are not clear. Therefore, it would be
342 interesting to investigate the mechanisms by which somatosensory feedback from a prosthetic leg
343 might influence PLP.

344 Four studies showed that PLP was more likely to occur in amputees with non-painful phantom
345 sensations than in those without non-painful phantom sensations (Wartan, Hamann et al. 1997,
346 Kooijman, Dijkstra et al. 2000, Razmus, Daniluk et al. 2017). In these studies, 70%-100% of amputees
347 with phantom sensations also had PLP. The co-occurrence of these post-amputation sensations
348 suggest that they may share neural mechanisms with PLP (Razmus, Daniluk et al. 2017). An fMRI
349 study by Andoh et al showed that inducing non-painful phantom sensations in people with
350 amputations activated the somatosensory and premotor cortices contralateral to the amputated
351 limb (Andoh, Diers et al. 2017). The activation of similar cortical areas has been recorded in patients
352 with PLP upon induction of their PLP (Flor and Elbert 1995, Lotze, Montoya et al. 1999, Karl,
353 Birbaumer et al. 2001, Lotze, Flor et al. 2001, Flor, Nikolajsen et al. 2006). The similarities in cortical
354 activation patterns might explain a link between PLP and non-painful phantom sensations.

355 Two studies showed that PLP was more likely to occur in people with proximal amputations than in
356 those with distal amputations (Gallagher, Allen et al. 2001, Dijkstra, Geertzen et al. 2002). These

357 findings line up with a narrative review that reported an increase in the incidence of PLP with more
358 proximal amputations (Manchikanti and Singh 2004). Proximal amputations are associated with an
359 increased risk of failure of wound healing, which may result in infection or stump pain (Stone,
360 Flaherty et al. 2006). However, the reasons why proximal amputations should be more likely to lead
361 to PLP than distal amputations are not clear (Kelle, Kozanoglu et al. 2017).

362 Another interesting finding was that the lack of pre-amputation counselling was positively associated
363 with PLP (strong association) in a study representing a total of 104 participants (Gallagher, Allen et
364 al. 2001). This suggests that patients who receive counselling prior to their amputation maybe less
365 likely to report PLP compared to those who do not receive counselling. The exact details of the
366 counselling were not reported. However, the strong association between the pre-operative
367 counselling and pain reduction highlights the importance of pre-amputation counselling on PLP. No
368 other study has specifically identified pre-operative counselling as a predictor of decreased PLP after
369 limb amputation. However, the results of a narrative review suggest that pre-operative counselling
370 may improve outcomes in patients undergoing various forms of surgery (Powell, Scott et al. 2016).

371 Limitations

372 The sample in this systematic review was skewed towards males, in that 9826 (81.73%) of the 12022
373 participants were male. Therefore, the results might not hold for females. We could not perform a
374 subgroup analysis by sex because we did not have individual patient data, nor was analysis by sex an
375 objective identified in the protocol. However, the data on risk factors provide no support for sex
376 influencing the likelihood of PLP after amputation. It was not possible to conduct a meta-analysis on
377 the risk factors for PLP because the included studies used varying methodological approaches and
378 measures of association. None of the included studies used an outcome measure that has been
379 validated for assessing PLP. In fact, we are not aware of any instrument that has been validated for
380 assessing PLP. Such a standardised tool for assessing PLP would be useful to provide us with reliable
381 data. Most studies in this review had moderate-high risk of bias. There is a clear need for high-

382 quality studies to raise the credibility of future meta-analyses. Finally, the search strategy for this
383 study was designed specifically to identify prevalence studies. Therefore, although we did conduct
384 an exploratory search for additional studies of risk factors for PLP, there is a possibility that we could
385 have missed some studies that investigated risk factors for PLP if they did not also estimate PLP
386 prevalence. In consideration of this possibility, the review of risk factors was classified as an
387 exploratory analysis. It is important to note that the results of this systematic review were derived
388 from studies conducted mostly in Europe, North-America and Asia. To the best of our knowledge, no
389 study has been conducted in Africa, and research in this area is indicated to inform us about the
390 burden and risk factors for PLP in the African population.

391 [Conclusion](#)

392 This systematic review and meta-analysis estimates that six of every 10 people with an amputation
393 report PLP – a high and important prevalence of PLP. Health care professionals ought to be aware of
394 the high rates of PLP and implement strategies to reduce PLP by addressing known risk factors,
395 specifically those identified by the current study. Stump pain and post-amputation depression are all
396 known and modifiable risk factors that are consistently positively associated with PLP. Awareness of
397 these risk factors may motivate health care professionals to address them early in treatment to
398 prevent the onset of PLP in people with amputations.

399 [Acknowledgements](#)

400 The authors thank Mrs Mary Shelton (Health Sciences reference librarian, University of Cape Town)
401 for assisting with the development of the search strategy.

402 **References**

- 403 Ahmed, A., S. Bhatnagar, S. Mishra, D. Khurana, S. Joshi and S. M. Ahmad (2017). "Prevalence of
404 phantom limb pain, stump pain, and phantom limb sensation among the amputated cancer patients
405 in India: A prospective, observational study." Indian journal of palliative care **23**(1): 24.
- 406 Aldington, D., C. Small, D. Edwards, J. Ralph, P. Woods, S. Jagdish and R. A. Moore (2014). "A survey
407 of post-amputation pains in serving military personnel." J R Army Med Corps **160**(1): 38-41.
- 408 Allen, M. (2017). The SAGE encyclopedia of communication research methods, SAGE Publications.
- 409 Andoh, J., M. Diers, C. Milde, C. Frobel, D. Kleinböhl and H. Flor (2017). "Neural correlates of evoked
410 phantom limb sensations." Biological Psychology **126**: 89-97.
- 411 Bekrater-Bodmann, R., M. Schredl, M. Diers, I. Reinhard, J. Foell, J. Trojan, X. Fuchs and H. Flor
412 (2015). "Post-amputation pain is associated with the recall of an impaired body representation in
413 dreams-results from a nation-wide survey on limb amputees." PLoS One **10**(3): e0119552.
- 414 Bin Ayaz, S., M. Ikram, S. Matee, A. A. Khan, M. Ahmad and M. Fahim (2015). "FREQUENCY AND THE
415 RELATED SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC AND CLINICAL FACTORS OF PHANTOM LIMB PAIN IN TRAUMATIC
416 AMPUTEES PRESENTING AT A TERTIARY CARE REHABILITATION SETUP." Pakistan Armed Forces
417 Medical Journal(6): 782-788.
- 418 Boonstra, A. M., L. J. Rijnders, J. W. Groothoff and W. H. Eisma (2000). "Children with congenital
419 deficiencies or acquired amputations of the lower limbs: functional aspects." Prosthet Orthot Int
420 **24**(1): 19-27.
- 421 Buchanan, D. C. and A. R. Mandel (1986). "The prevalence of phantom limb experience in
422 amputees." Rehabilitation Psychology **31**(3): 183.
- 423 Byrne, K. P. (2011). "Survey of phantom limb pain, phantom sensation and stump pain in Cambodian
424 and New Zealand amputees." Pain Med **12**(5): 794-798.
- 425 Clark, R. L., F. L. Bowling, F. Jepson and S. Rajbhandari (2013). "Phantom limb pain after amputation
426 in diabetic patients does not differ from that after amputation in nondiabetic patients." Pain **154**(5):
427 729-732.

- 428 Cohen, J. (1960). "A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales." Educational and psychological
429 measurement **20**(1): 37-46.
- 430 Datta, D., K. Selvarajah and N. Davey (2004). "Functional outcome of patients with proximal upper
431 limb deficiency -- acquired and congenital." Clinical Rehabilitation **18**(2): 172-177.
- 432 Desmond, D. M. and M. MacLachlan (2010). "Prevalence and characteristics of phantom limb pain
433 and residual limb pain in the long term after upper limb amputation." International Journal of
434 Rehabilitation Research **33**(3): 279-282.
- 435 Dietrich, C., S. Nehrdich, S. Seifert, K. R. Blume, W. H. R. Miltner, G. O. Hofmann and T. Weiss (2018).
436 "Leg Prosthesis With Somatosensory Feedback Reduces Phantom Limb Pain and Increases
437 Functionality." Frontiers in Neurology **9**(270).
- 438 Dijkstra, P. U. (2006). "'Re: Phantom limb pain': Commentary reply." Journal of Pain and Symptom
439 Management **32**(2): 103-103.
- 440 Dijkstra, P. U., H. B. Geertzen, R. Stewart and C. P. van der Schans (2002). "Phantom Pain and Risk
441 Factors: A Multivariate Analysis." Journal of Pain and Symptom Management **24**(6): 578-585.
- 442 Egger, M., G. D. Smith, M. Schneider and C. Minder (1997). "Bias in meta-analysis detected by a
443 simple, graphical test." Bmj **315**(7109): 629-634.
- 444 Ehde, D. M., J. M. Czerniecki, D. G. Smith, K. M. Campbell, W. T. Edwards, M. P. Jensen and L. R.
445 Robinson (2000). "Chronic phantom sensations, phantom pain, residual limb pain, and other regional
446 pain after lower limb amputation." Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation **81**(8): 1039-
447 1044.
- 448 Ephraim, P. L., S. T. Wegener, E. J. MacKenzie, T. R. Dillingham and L. E. Pezzin (2005). "Phantom
449 pain, residual limb pain, and back pain in amputees: results of a national survey." Archives of
450 Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation **86**(10): 1910-1919.
- 451 Flor, H. and T. Elbert (1995). "Phantom-limb pain as a perceptual correlate of cortical reorganization
452 following arm amputation." Nature **375**(6531): 482.

- 453 Flor, H., L. Nikolajsen and T. S. Jensen (2006). "Phantom limb pain: a case of maladaptive CNS
454 plasticity?" Nature Reviews Neuroscience **7**(11): 873.
- 455 Frankfort-Nachmias, C. and A. Leon-Guerrero (2017). Social statistics for a diverse society, Sage
456 Publications.
- 457 Gagnier, J. J., D. Moher, H. Boon, J. Beyene and C. Bombardier (2012). "Investigating clinical
458 heterogeneity in systematic reviews: a methodologic review of guidance in the literature." BMC
459 medical research methodology **12**(1): 111.
- 460 Gallagher, P., D. Allen and M. MacLachlan (2001). "Phantom limb pain and residual limb pain
461 following lower limb amputation: a descriptive analysis." Disability & Rehabilitation **23**(12): 522-530.
- 462 Gallagher, S., G. E. Butterworth, A. Lew and J. Cole (1998). "Hand-mouth coordination, congenital
463 absence of limb, and evidence for innate body schemas." Brain Cogn **38**(1): 53-65.
- 464 Garcia, D., E. Flores, P. Nahuelhual and F. Solis (2018). "Phantom pain in congenital amputees: Myth
465 or reality?" Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine **61**: e118.
- 466 Gosselin, R. A., Y. A. Gyamfi and S. Contini (2011). "Challenges of meeting surgical needs in the
467 developing world." World J Surg **35**(2): 258-261.
- 468 Hanley, M. A., D. M. Ehde, K. M. Campbell, B. Osborn and D. G. Smith (2006). "Self-reported
469 treatments used for lower-limb phantom pain: descriptive findings." Archives of Physical Medicine &
470 Rehabilitation **87**(2): 270-311.
- 471 Hanley, M. A., D. M. Ehde, M. Jensen, J. Czerniecki, D. C. Smith and L. R. Robinson (2009). "Chronic
472 Pain Associated with Upper-Limb Loss." American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
473 **88**(9): 742-754.
- 474 Hanley, M. A., M. P. Jensen, D. M. Ehde, A. J. Hoffman, D. R. Patterson and L. R. Robinson (2004).
475 "Psychosocial predictors of long-term adjustment to lower-limb amputation and phantom limb
476 pain." Disability & Rehabilitation **26**(14/15): 882-893.

477 Hanley, M. A., M. P. Jensen, D. G. Smith, D. M. Ehde, W. T. Edwards and L. R. Robinson (2007).
478 "Pre-amputation Pain and Acute Pain Predict Chronic Pain After Lower Extremity Amputation." The
479 Journal of Pain **8**(2): 102-109.

480 Healey, J. F. (2014). Statistics: A tool for social research, Cengage Learning.

481 Higgins, J. P., S. G. Thompson, J. J. Deeks and D. G. Altman (2003). "Measuring inconsistency in meta-
482 analyses." BMJ: British Medical Journal **327**(7414): 557.

483 Hnoosh, A. H. (2014). "Phantom Limb and pain after traumatic lower extremity amputation." Journal
484 of the Faculty of Medicine **56**(1): 57-61.

485 Hoy, D., P. Brooks, A. Woolf, F. Blyth, L. March, C. Bain, P. Baker, E. Smith and R. Buchbinder (2012).
486 "Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of
487 interrater agreement." Journal of clinical epidemiology **65**(9): 934-939.

488 Jensen, T. S., B. Krebs, J. Nielsen and P. Rasmussen (1985). "Immediate and long-term phantom limb
489 pain in amputees: incidence, clinical characteristics and relationship to pre-amputation limb pain."
490 Pain **21**(3): 267-278.

491 Karl, A., N. Birbaumer, W. Lutzenberger, L. G. Cohen and H. Flor (2001). "Reorganization of motor
492 and somatosensory cortex in upper extremity amputees with phantom limb pain." Journal of
493 Neuroscience **21**(10): 3609-3618.

494 Katz, J. and R. Melzack (1990). "Pain 'memories' in phantom limbs: Review and clinical observations."
495 Pain **43**(3): 319-336.

496 Kelle, B., E. Kozanoglu, O. S. Bicer and I. Tan (2017). "Association between phantom limb complex
497 and the level of amputation in lower limb amputee." Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc **51**(2): 142-145.

498 Kern, U., V. Busch, M. Rockland, M. Kohl and F. Birklein (2009). "[Prevalence and risk factors of
499 phantom limb pain and phantom limb sensations in Germany. A nationwide field survey]." Schmerz
500 **23**(5): 479-488.

501 Ketz, A. K. (2008). "The experience of phantom limb pain in patients with combat-related traumatic
502 amputations." Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation **89**(6): 1127-1132.

503 Kooijman, C. M., P. U. Dijkstra, J. H. Geertzen, A. Elzinga and C. P. van der Schans (2000). "Phantom
504 pain and phantom sensations in upper limb amputees: an epidemiological study." Pain **87**(1): 33-41.

505 Larbig, W., J. Andoh, E. Huse, D. Stahl-Corino, P. Montoya, Z. e. Seltzer and H. Flor (2019). "Pre-and
506 postoperative predictors of phantom limb pain." Neuroscience letters **702**: 44-50.

507 Larbig, W., P. Montoya, H. Flor, H. Bilow, S. Weller and N. Birbaumer (1996). "Evidence for a change
508 in neural processing in phantom limb pain patients." Pain **67**(2-3): 275-283.

509 Lee, M. C., L. Zambreanu, D. K. Menon and I. Tracey (2008). "Identifying brain activity specifically
510 related to the maintenance and perceptual consequence of central sensitization in humans." J
511 Neurosci **28**(45): 11642-11649.

512 Limakatso, K., G. J. Bedwell, V. J. Madden and R. Parker (2019). "The prevalence of phantom limb
513 pain and associated risk factors in people with amputations: a systematic review protocol."
514 Systematic reviews **8**(1): 17-17.

515 Lotze, M., H. Flor, W. Grodd, W. Larbig and N. Birbaumer (2001). "Phantom movements and pain An
516 fMRI study in upper limb amputees." Brain **124**(11): 2268-2277.

517 Lotze, M., P. Montoya, M. Erb, E. Hülsmann, H. Flor, U. Klose, N. Birbaumer and W. Grodd (1999).
518 "Activation of cortical and cerebellar motor areas during executed and imagined hand movements:
519 an fMRI study." Journal of cognitive neuroscience **11**(5): 491-501.

520 Maimela, E., M. Alberts, S. E. Modjadji, S. S. Choma, S. A. Dikotope, T. S. Ntuli and J.-P. Van
521 Geertruyden (2016). "The prevalence and determinants of chronic non-communicable disease risk
522 factors amongst adults in the Dikgale health demographic and surveillance system (HDSS) site,
523 Limpopo Province of South Africa." PLoS One **11**(2): e0147926.

524 Manchikanti, L. and V. Singh (2004). "Managing phantom pain." Pain Physician **7**(3): 365-375.

525 Mishra, S., S. Bhatnagar, D. Gupta and A. Diwedi (2008). "Incidence and management of phantom
526 limb pain according to World Health Organization analgesic ladder in amputees of malignant origin."
527 American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Medicine® **24**(6): 455-462.

528 Moher, D., L. Shamseer, M. Clarke, D. Gherzi, A. Liberati, M. Petticrew, P. Shekelle, L. A. Stewart and
529 P.-P. Group (2015). "Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols
530 (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement." Systematic Reviews **4**(1): 1.

531 Moloj, A. H., D. Watkins, M. E. Engel, S. Mall and L. Zühlke (2016). "Epidemiology, health systems and
532 stakeholders in rheumatic heart disease in Africa: a systematic review protocol." BMJ open **6**(5):
533 e011266.

534 Morgan, S. J., J. L. Friedly, D. Amtmann, R. Salem and B. J. Hafner (2017). "Cross-Sectional
535 Assessment of Factors Related to Pain Intensity and Pain Interference in Lower Limb Prosthesis
536 Users." Arch Phys Med Rehabil **98**(1): 105-113.

537 Neil, M. (2015). "Pain after amputation." BJA Education **16**(3): 107-112.

538 Nicolich, M. J. and J. F. Gamble (2011). "What is the minimum risk that can be estimated from an
539 epidemiology Study." Advanced Topics in Environmental Health and Air Pollution Case Studies: 3-26.

540 Noguchi, S., J. Saito, K. Nakai, M. Kitayama and K. Hirota (2019). "Factors affecting phantom limb
541 pain in patients undergoing amputation: retrospective study." Journal of anaesthesia **33**(2): 216-220.

542 Page, D. M., J. A. George, D. T. Kluger, C. Duncan, S. Wendelken, T. Davis, D. T. Hutchinson and G. A.
543 Clark (2018). "Motor Control and Sensory Feedback Enhance Prosthesis Embodiment and Reduce
544 Phantom Pain After Long-Term Hand Amputation." Frontiers in Human Neuroscience **12**.

545 Powell, R., N. W. Scott, A. Manyande, J. Bruce, C. Vogele, L. M. Byrne-Davis, M. Unsworth, C. Osmer
546 and M. Johnston (2016). "Psychological preparation and postoperative outcomes for adults
547 undergoing surgery under general anaesthesia." Cochrane Database Syst Rev(5): Cd008646.

548 Rafferty, M., T. M. Bennett Britton, B. T. Drew and R. D. Phillip (2015). "Cross-sectional study of
549 alteration of phantom limb pain with visceral stimulation in military personnel with amputation." J
550 Rehabil Res Dev **52**(4): 441-448.

551 Rahimi, A., B. Mousavi, M. Soroush, M. Masumi and A. Montazeri (2012). "Pain and health-related
552 quality of life in war veterans with bilateral lower limb amputations." Trauma Monthly **17**(2): 282-
553 286.

- 554 Rathmell, J. P., M.D. and H. Kehlet, M.D., Ph.D. (2011). "Do We Have the Tools to Prevent Phantom
555 Limb Pain?" Anesthesiology: The Journal of the American Society of Anesthesiologists **114**(5): 1021-
556 1024.
- 557 Rathvon, D. (2017). "EndNote X8--Citation Manager--What's New?".
- 558 Rayegani, S. M., A. Aryanmehr, M. R. Soroosh and M. Baghbani (2010). "Phantom pain, phantom
559 sensation, and spine pain in bilateral lower limb amputees: Results of a national survey of Iraq-Iran
560 war victims' health status." Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics **22**(3): 162-165.
- 561 Razmus, M., B. Daniluk and P. Markiewicz (2017). "Phantom limb phenomenon as an example of
562 body image distortion." Current Problems of Psychiatry **18**(2): 153-159.
- 563 Reiber, G. E., L. V. McFarland, S. Hubbard, C. Maynard, D. K. Blough, J. M. Gambel and D. G. Smith
564 (2010). "Servicemembers and veterans with major traumatic limb loss from Vietnam war and
565 OIF/OEF conflicts: Survey methods, participants, and summary findings." Journal of Rehabilitation
566 Research & Development **47**(3): 275-297.
- 567 Richardson, C., S. Glenn, T. Nurmikko and M. Horgan (2006). "Incidence of phantom phenomena
568 including phantom limb pain 6 months after major lower limb amputation in patients with peripheral
569 vascular disease." The Clinical journal of pain **22**(4): 353-358.
- 570 Rosenthal, J. A. (1996). "Qualitative descriptors of strength of association and effect size." Journal of
571 social service Research **21**(4): 37-59.
- 572 Sherman, R. A., C. J. Sherman and N. G. Gall (1980). "A survey of current phantom limb pain
573 treatment in the United States." Pain **8**(1): 85-99.
- 574 Stone, P. A., S. K. Flaherty, A. F. AbuRahma, S. M. Hass, J. M. Jackson, J. D. Hayes, M. J. Hofeldt, C. S.
575 Hager and M. S. Elmore (2006). "Factors affecting perioperative mortality and wound-related
576 complications following major lower extremity amputations." Annals of vascular surgery **20**(2): 209-
577 216.
- 578 Vaso, A., H.-M. Adahan, A. Gjika, S. Zahaj, T. Zhurda, G. Vyshka and M. Devor (2014). "Peripheral
579 nervous system origin of phantom limb pain." PAIN® **155**(7): 1384-1391.

580 Ventham, N., P. Heyburn and N. Huston (2010). "Prevalence of phantom limb pain in diabetic and
581 non-diabetic leg amputees: a cross-sectional observational survey." European Journal of Pain
582 Supplements **4**(1): 106-107.


583 Warton, S. W., W. Hamann, J. R. Wedley and I. McColl (1997). "Phantom pain and sensation among
584 British veteran amputees." Br J Anaesth **78**(6): 652-659.


585 Weeks, S. R., V. C. Anderson-Barnes and J. W. Tsao (2010). "Phantom limb pain: theories and
586 therapies." The neurologist **16**(5): 277-286.

587 WESP. (2018). "Data sources, country classifications and aggregation methodology. (2014, January
588 25)." (2014, January 25), from Retrieved from
589 [http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classifica](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classification.pdf)
590 [tion.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wesp/wesp_current/2014wesp_country_classification.pdf).


591 Yin, Y., L. Zhang, H. Xiao, C.-B. Wen, Y.-E. Dai, G. Yang, Y.-X. Zuo and J. Liu (2017). "The pre-
592 amputation pain and the postoperative deafferentation are the risk factors of phantom limb pain: a
593 clinical survey in a sample of Chinese population." BMC anesthesiology **17**(1): 69.

594





Studies	Estimate (95% C.I.)
Ahmed et al., 2017	0.410 (0.328, 0.492)
Aldington et al., 2014	0.500 (0.359, 0.641)
Bekrater et al., 2015	0.626 (0.609, 0.642)
Bin Ayaz et al., 2015	0.425 (0.366, 0.485)
Bosmans et al., 2007	0.812 (0.621, 1.000)
Buchanan et al., 1986	0.624 (0.589, 0.660)
Byrne et al., 2011a	0.690 (0.521, 0.858)
Byrne et al., 2011b	0.517 (0.335, 0.699)
Clark et al., 2013	0.863 (0.796, 0.930)
Datta et al., 2004	0.600 (0.476, 0.724)
Desmond et al., 2010	0.433 (0.351, 0.514)
Dijkstra et al., 2002	0.720 (0.682, 0.758)
Ehde et al., 2000	0.722 (0.667, 0.777)
Ephraim et al., 2005	0.800 (0.774, 0.826)
Gallagher et al., 2001	0.692 (0.604, 0.781)
Hanley et al., 2006	0.722 (0.667, 0.777)
Hanley et al., 2009	0.788 (0.710, 0.867)
Hnoosh et al., 2014	0.610 (0.522, 0.698)
Houghton et al., 1994	0.784 (0.723, 0.845)
Kern et al., 2012	0.747 (0.710, 0.784)
Ketz et al., 2008	0.433 (0.351, 0.514)
Kooijman et al., 2000a	0.514 (0.398, 0.629)
Kooijman et al., 2000b	0.018 (0.000, 0.067)
Larbig et al., 2019	0.750 (0.632, 0.868)
Morgan et al., 2017	0.481 (0.454, 0.509)
Noguchi et al., 2019	0.500 (0.352, 0.648)
Penna et al., 2018	0.531 (0.431, 0.631)
Probstner et al., 2010	0.480 (0.367, 0.593)
Rafferty et al., 2015	0.853 (0.773, 0.933)
Rahimi et al., 2012	0.669 (0.618, 0.719)
Rayegani et al., 2010	0.642 (0.590, 0.693)
Rasmus et al., 2017	0.591 (0.385, 0.796)
Reiber et al., 2010a	0.725 (0.674, 0.776)
Reiber et al., 2010b	0.763 (0.714, 0.813)
Resnik et al., 2019	0.761 (0.732, 0.791)
Richardson et al., 2007	0.797 (0.694, 0.899)
Richardson et al., 2015	0.640 (0.541, 0.740)
Schley et al., 2008	0.446 (0.325, 0.567)
Wartan et al., 1997	0.622 (0.580, 0.663)
Yin et al., 2017	0.292 (0.247, 0.337)
Overall (I²=97.51 % , P< 0.001)	0.624 (0.571, 0.677)



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/19008961>; this version posted October 18, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Studies

Estimate (95% C.I.)

Aldington et al., 2014

0.500 (0.359, 0.641)

Hnoosh et al., 2014


0.610 (0.522, 0.698)

Rahimi et al., 2012


0.669 (0.618, 0.719)

Rayegani et al., 2010

0.642 (0.590, 0.693)

Overall ($I^2=44.91\%$, $P=0.142$)**0.631 (0.583, 0.679)**


Studies	Estimate (95% C.I.)
Ahmed et al., 2017	0.410 (0.328, 0.492)
Bekrater et al., 2015	0.626 (0.609, 0.642)
Bin Ayaz et al., 2015	0.425 (0.366, 0.485)
Bosmans et al., 2007	0.812 (0.621, 1.000)
Buchanan et al., 1986	0.624 (0.589, 0.660)
Byrne et al., 2011a	0.690 (0.521, 0.858)
Byrne et al., 2011b	0.517 (0.335, 0.699)
Clark et al., 2013	0.863 (0.796, 0.930)
Datta et al., 2004	0.600 (0.476, 0.724)
Desmond et al., 2010	0.433 (0.351, 0.514)
Dijkstra et al., 2002	0.720 (0.682, 0.758)
Ehde et al., 2000	0.722 (0.667, 0.777)
Ephraim et al., 2005	0.800 (0.774, 0.826)
Gallagher et al., 2001	0.692 (0.604, 0.781)
Hanley et al., 2006	0.722 (0.667, 0.777)
Hanley et al., 2009	0.788 (0.710, 0.867)
Houghton et al., 1994	0.825 (0.725, 0.845)
Kern et al., 2012	0.747 (0.710, 0.784)
Ketz et al., 2008	0.800 (0.657, 0.943)
Kooijman et al., 2000a	0.514 (0.398, 0.629)
Kooijman et al., 2000b	0.018 (0.000, 0.067)
Larbig et al., 2019	0.750 (0.632, 0.868)
Morgan et al., 2017	0.481 (0.454, 0.509)
Noguchi et al., 2019	0.500 (0.352, 0.648)
Penna et al., 2018	0.531 (0.431, 0.631)
Probstner et al., 2010	0.480 (0.367, 0.593)
Rafferty et al., 2015	0.853 (0.773, 0.933)
Rasmus et al., 2017	0.591 (0.385, 0.796)
Reiber et al., 2010a	0.725 (0.674, 0.776)
Reiber et al., 2010b	0.763 (0.714, 0.813)
Resnik et al., 2019	0.761 (0.732, 0.791)
Richardson et al., 2007	0.797 (0.694, 0.899)
Richardson et al., 2015	0.640 (0.541, 0.740)
Schley et al., 2008	0.446 (0.325, 0.567)
Wartan et al., 1997	0.622 (0.580, 0.663)
Yin et al., 2017	0.292 (0.247, 0.337)
Overall (I²=97.75 % , P< 0.001)	0.626 (0.568, 0.684)



Studies Estimate (95% C.I.)

Aldington et al., 2014	0.500	(0.359, 0.641)
Bekrater et al., 2015	0.626	(0.609, 0.642)
Bosmans et al., 2007	0.812	(0.621, 1.000)
Buchanan et al., 1986	0.624	(0.589, 0.660)
Byrne et al., 2011a	0.690	(0.521, 0.858)
Clark et al., 2013	0.863	(0.796, 0.930)
Datta et al., 2004	0.600	(0.476, 0.724)
Desmond et al., 2010	0.433	(0.351, 0.514)
Dijkstra et al., 2002	0.720	(0.682, 0.758)
Ehde et al., 2000	0.722	(0.667, 0.777)
Ephraim et al., 2005	0.800	(0.774, 0.826)
Gallagher et al., 2001	0.692	(0.604, 0.781)
Hanley et al., 2006	0.722	(0.667, 0.777)
Hanley et al., 2009	0.710	(0.667, 0.767)
Houghton et al., 1994	0.784	(0.723, 0.845)
Kern et al., 2012	0.747	(0.710, 0.784)
Ketz et al., 2008	0.800	(0.657, 0.943)
Kooijman et al., 2000a	0.514	(0.398, 0.629)
Kooijman et al., 2000b	0.018	(0.000, 0.067)
Larbig et al., 2019	0.750	(0.632, 0.868)
Morgan et al., 2017	0.481	(0.454, 0.509)
Noguchi et al., 2019	0.500	(0.352, 0.648)
Penna et al., 2018	0.531	(0.431, 0.631)
Rafferty et al., 2015	0.853	(0.773, 0.933)
Rasmus et al., 2017	0.591	(0.385, 0.796)
Reiber et al., 2010a	0.725	(0.674, 0.776)
Reiber et al., 2010b	0.763	(0.714, 0.813)
Resnik et al., 2019	0.761	(0.732, 0.791)
Richardson et al., 2007	0.797	(0.694, 0.899)
Richardson et al., 2015	0.640	(0.541, 0.740)
Schley et al., 2008	0.446	(0.325, 0.567)
Wartan et al., 1997	0.622	(0.580, 0.663)
Yin et al., 2017	0.292	(0.247, 0.337)

Overall (I²=97.83 % , P< 0.001) 0.642 (0.583, 0.702)



Studies

Estimate (95% C.I.)

Ahmed et al., 2017 0.410 (0.328, 0.492)

Bin Ayaz et al., 2015 0.425 (0.366, 0.485)


Byrne et al.,b 2011 0.517 (0.335, 0.699)

Hnoosh et al., 2014 0.610 (0.522, 0.698)


Probstner et al., 2010 0.480 (0.367, 0.593)

Rahimi et al., 2012 0.669 (0.618, 0.719)

Rayegani et al., 2010 0.642 (0.590, 0.693)

Overall ($I^2=90.54\%$, $P<0.001$) 0.539 (0.448, 0.631)

Bias assessment plot



Authors	Study type	Country of study	Development status	Method of data collection	Sample size	Age Mean (SD)	Sex M/F	Level of amputation (UL/LL)	PLP prevalence (%)
Ahmed et al., 2017	Cross-sectional	India	Developing	Self-reported questionnaire	139	38.23 (1.54)	102/37	36/103	41
Aldington et al., 2014	Cross-sectional	UK	Developed	Self-reported questionnaire	48	28.8 (6.7)	-	11/54	49
Bekrater et al., 2015	Cross-sectional	Germany	Developed	Postal and telephone questionnaire	3234	64.37 (15.89)	2637/597	824/2410	62.55
Bin Ayaz et al., 2015	Cross-sectional	Pakistan	Developing	Face-to-face interview	268	28 (6)	266/2	35/233	42.5
Bosmans et al., 2007	Cross-sectional	Netherlands	Developed	Face-to-face interview	16	66.5 (39-86)*	11/5	0/16	81.25
Buchanan et al., 1986	Cross-sectional	Canada	Developed	Face-to-face interview	716	-	616/100	43/647	62.4
Byrne et al., 2011 ^a	Cross-sectional	New Zealand	Developed	Face-to-face interview	29	41.7 (4.8)	25/4	7/24	69
Byrne et al., 2011 ^b	Cross-sectional	Cambodia	Developing	Face-to-face interview	29	40.3 (10.5)	25/4	1/28	51.7
Clark et al., 2013	Cross-sectional	UK	Developed	Postal and telephone questionnaire	102	70.9 (1.27)	-	0/97	85.6
Datta et al., 2004	Cohort	UK	Developed	Postal questionnaire	60	58.1 (-)	48/12	60/0	60
Desmond et al., 2010	Cross-sectional	Ireland	Developed	Self-reported questionnaire	141	74.8 (-)	138/3	141/0	42.6
Dijkstra et al., 2002	Cross-sectional	Netherlands	Developed	Postal questionnaire	536	-	367/150	99/433	72
Ehde et al., 2000	Cross-sectional	USA	Developed	Postal questionnaire	255	55.1 (14.3)	207/48	0/255	72

Ephraim et al., 2005	Cross-sectional	USA	Developed	telephone interview	914	50.3 (13.3)	552/362	100/812	79.9
Gallagher et al., 2001	Cross-sectional	Ireland	Developed	Postal questionnaire	104	45.3 (18.9)	78/26	0/104	69.2
Hanley et al., 2006	Cross-sectional	USA	Developed	Postal and telephone questionnaire	255	55 (14.3)	207/48	0/255	72
Hanley et al., 2009	Cross-sectional	USA	Developed	Postal questionnaire	104	46.9 (14.1)	75/29	104/0	79
Hnoosh et al., 2014	Cross-sectional	Iraq	Developing	Self-reported questionnaire	118	32 (12.9)	97/21	0/181	61
Houghton et al., 1994	Cross-sectional	UK	Developed	Postal questionnaire	176	71 (-)	-	0/176	78
Kern et al., 2012	Cross-sectional	Germany	Developed	Postal questionnaire	537	59 (-)	382/155	24/513	74.5
Ketz et al., 2008	Cross-sectional	Germany	Developed	Self-reported questionnaire	30	-	30/0	7/27	77
Kooijman et al., 2000 ^a	Cross-sectional	Netherlands	Developed	Unclear	72	44.2 (35-65)*	57/15	72/0	51
Kooijman et al., 2000 ^b	Cross-sectional	Netherlands	Developed	Unclear	27	30.5 (9.3-53)*	13/13	27/0	0
Larbig et al., 2019	Cohort	Germany	Developed	Face-to-face interview and self-reported questionnaire	52	-	41/11	2/50	75
Morgan et al., 2017	Cross-sectional	USA	Developed	Self-reported and internet questionnaire	1296	54.4 (13.7)	909/387	0/1296	48.1
Noguchi et al., 2019	Cross-sectional	Japan	Developed	Medical records	44	-	33/11	22/22	50
Penna et al., 2018	Cohort	Australia	Developed	Medical records	96	-	74/22	0/96	52.2
Probstner et al., 2010	Cross-sectional	Brazil	Developing	Self-reported questionnaire	75	54.4 (18.5)	50/25	6/69	46.7
Rafferty et al., 2015	Cross-sectional	UK	Developed	Self-reported questionnaire	75	26.3 (18-42)*	74/1	0/84	85

Rahimi et al., 2012	Cross-sectional	Iran	Developing	Face-to-face interview	335	42.1 (6.32)	324/11	0/670	66.7
Rayegani et al., 2010	Cross-sectional	Iran	Developing	Face-to-face interview and self-reported questionnaire	335	-	327/8	0/670	64
Rasmus et al., 2017	Cross-sectional	Poland	Developed	Face-to-face interview and self-reported questionnaire	22	61 (11.3)	15/7	3/22	59
Reiber et al., 2010 ^a	Cross-sectional	USA	Developed	Postal, internet and telephone questionnaire	298	60.7 (3.0)	298/0	78/300	72.2
Reiber et al., 2010 ^b	Cross-sectional	USA	Developed	Postal, internet and telephone questionnaire	283	29.3 (5.8)	274/9	78/273	76
Resnik et al., 2019	Cross-sectional	Canada	Developed	Telephone interview	808	63.2 (14.2)	787/21	840/0	76.1
Richardson et al., 2007	Cohort	UK	Developed	Face-to-Face interview	59	63.8 (10.4)	37/22	0/59	78.8
Richardson et al., 2015	Cross-sectional	UK	Developed	Face-to-face interview	89	65.5 (11.4)	64/25	0/89	63
Schley et al., 2008	Cross-sectional	Germany	Developed	Postal and telephone questionnaire	65	45 (18-80)*	60/5	65/0	44.6
Wartan et al., 1997	Cross-sectional	UK	Developed	unclear	526	73 (-)*	526/0	99/471	62
Yin et al., 2017	Cross-sectional	China	Developed	Telephone interview	391	-	-	-	29

* Indicates the median age and range

- The number of amputations and males versus females do not add up to the total sample size because some participants had more than one amputation and these data were not provided.

Authors	Was the Study's target population a close representation of the national population	Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population	Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR, was a census undertaken	Was the likelihood of non-response bias minimal?	Were data collected directly from the subjects?	Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?	Was the study instrument shown to have reliability and validity	Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?	Was the length of the shortest prevalence period for the parameter of interest appropriate	Were the Numerator and denominator for the parameter of interest appropriate	Overall risk of bias
Ahmed et al., 2017	High	Low	High	High	High	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate
Aldington et al., 2014	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Bekrater et al., 2015	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Moderate
Bin Ayaz et al., 2015	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High	High	High	Low	High
Bosmans et al., 2007	High	Low	Low	High	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate

Buchanan et al., 1986	High	High	High	High	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	High
Byrne et al., 2011 ^a	High	High	Low	High	Low	High	High	High	High	Low	High
Byrne et al., 2011 ^b	High	High	Low	High	Low	High	High	High	High	Low	High
Clark et al., 2013	High	Low	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High
Datta et al., 2004	High	Low	High	Low	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Desmond et al., 2010	High	Low	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate
Dijkstra et al., 2002	High	Low	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Ehde et al., 2000	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Ephraim et al., 2005	Low	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate

Gallagher et al., 2001	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	High
Hanley et al., 2006	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Moderate
Hanley et al., 2009	High	High	Low	High	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Houghton et al., 1994	High	Low	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	High
Hnoosh et al., 2014	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Kern et al., 2012	Low	Low	Low	High	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Ketz et al., 2008	High	Low	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Kooijman et al., 2000 ^a	High	Low	High	Low	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Kooijman et al., 2000 ^b	High	Low	High	Low	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate

Larbig et al., 2019	High	High	High	High	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate
Morgan et al., 2017	Low	Low	High	Low	High	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate
Noguchi et al., 2019	High	High	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate
Penna et al., 2019	High	High	Low	High	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	High
Probstner et al., 2010	High	High	High	High	Low	High	High	High	High	Low	High
Rafferty et al., 2015	High	High	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate
Rahimi et al., 2012	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Rayegani et al., 2010	High	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Rasmus et al., 2017	High	High	High	High	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	High

Reiber et al., 2010 ^a	High	low	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High
Reiber et al., 2010 ^b	High	low	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High
Resnik et al., 2019	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Richardson et al., 2007	High	Low	High	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Richardson et al., 2015	High	Low	High	High	Low	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Moderate
Schley et al., 2008	High	Low	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High
Wartan et al., 1997	High	Low	Low	Low	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate
Yin et al., 2017	High	Low	Low	High	High	High	High	Low	High	Low	Moderate

Author	Population	Outcome	Risk factor(s)	Measures of association	Strength of association
Ahmed et al., 2017	Cancer patients who had undergone limb amputations	PLP	Post-amputation depression	3.86 (1.75-8.53) [‡]	Strong
			Pre-amputation pain	2.83 (1.38-5.76) [‡]	Moderate
			Stump pain	31.2 (8.97-108.50) [‡]	Very strong
			Use of prosthesis	2.83 (1.19-4.76) [‡]	Moderate
			Sleep disturbance	21.43 (8.28-55.43) [‡]	Very strong
Buchanan et al., 1986	Amputees who were receiving routine prosthetic services	PLP	Age	0.12 (p<0.01) [*]	Weak
Desmond et al., 2010	Members of the British Limbless Ex-Service Men's Association	PLP	Stump pain	11.17 (p<0.01) [‡]	Very strong
Dijkstra et al., 2002	Amputees who were receiving routine prosthetic services	PLP	Diabetic cause of amputation	4 (p<0.001) [‡]	Strong
			Proximal site of amputation	1.60 (0.038) [‡]	Moderate
			Lower limb amputation	5.60 (p<0.001) [‡]	Strong
			Bilateral amputations	8.20 (p=0.01) [‡]	Strong
			Stump pain	3.90 (p<0.001) [‡]	Strong
			Phantom sensations	19.50 (p<0.001) [‡]	Very strong
Ephraim et al., 2005	Amputees who had contacted the	PLP	Post-amputation depression	2 (1.3-3.1) [‡]	Moderate
				2.50 (1.3-4.7) [‡]	

	Amputee Coalition of America (ACA) between 1998 and 2000		Lower limb amputation 2 or more comorbidities Widow	2.70 (1.3-5.8) [‡] 2.70 (1.1-6.5) [‡]	Moderate Moderate Moderate
Gallagher et al., 2001	Amputees who were attending the Limb Fitting Clinic.	PLP	Proximal site of amputation Traumatic cause of amputation Sex (male) Other medical problems Lack of pre-amputation counselling	15.65 (p<0.001) [‡] 14.60 (p<0.002) [‡] 3.76 (p<0.05) [‡] 5.93 (p<0.02) [‡] 4.74 (p<0.03) [‡]	Very strong Very strong Strong Strong Strong
Hanley et al., 2009	Patients who had undergone upper-limb amputation 6 months or more before recruitment	PLP	Use of prosthesis	4.23 (p<0.05) [¶]	Moderate
Hanley et al., 2006	Patients who had undergone lower limb amputation	PLP	Pre-amputation pain Stump pain	0.48 (p<0.01) [§] 0.53 (p<0.0001) [§]	Weak Weak
Kooijman et al., 2000 ^a	Amputees using upper limb prosthesis	PLP	Phantom sensations Stump pain	11.30 (p=0.001) [†] 1.90 (p=0.015) [†]	Very strong Weak
Larbig et al., 2019	Patients who had undergone upper or lower limb amputations	PLP	Pre-amputation depression Pre-amputation pain Stump pain	2.05 (p<0.05) [§] 4.22 (p<0.01) [§] 3.90 (p<0.01) [§]	Moderate Moderate Moderate

Noguchi et al., 2019	Patients who had undergone upper or lower limb amputations	PLP	Diabetic cause of amputation Pre-amputation pain	2.24 (p=0.032)‡ 6.36 (p=0.024)‡	Moderate Strong
Razmus et al., 2017	Occupants of the nursing home, and clients of the Public Institute of Orthopaedic Equipment	PLP	Phantom sensations	4.94 (p<0.05)§	Strong
Richardson et al., 2007	Patients who had undergone amputation of the lower limb due to peripheral vascular disease.	PLP	Stump pain Increased ability to move the phantom limb. Praying/hoping Catastrophizing Passive coping	7.03 (1.34-36.82)‡ 8.31 (1.54-44.79)‡ 2.86 (1.68-13.18)‡ 3.28 (1.71-14.91)‡ 4.60 (6.50-25.00)‡	Strong Strong Moderate Strong Strong
Wartan et al., 1997	Traumatic amputees	PLP	Phantom sensations	107.30 (p<0.0001)§	Strong
Yin et al., 2017	Amputees who underwent limb amputations at a tertiary hospital	PLP	Pre-amputation pain Post-amputation epidural analgesia	10.40 (p=0.002)‡ 4.90 (p=0.008)‡	Very strong Strong

¥ Point-biserial correlation analysis; ¶ Pearson's univariate correlation test; § Chi-squared; † Relative risk; ‡ Odds ratio

Author	Population	Outcome	Risk factor(s)	Measures of association
Ahmed et al., 2017	Cancer patients who had undergone limb amputations	PLP	Sex smoking Regional Anaesthesia Post-amputation analgesia Perioperative gabapentin Radiotherapy	0.65 (0.31-1.40) [‡] 1.40 (0.71-2.78) [‡] 0.99 (0.68-1.54) [‡] 1.41 (0.94-2.10) [‡] 0.75 (0.76-1.51) [‡] 1.33 (0.66-2.66) [‡]
Dijkstra et al., 2002	Amputees who were receiving routine prosthetic services	PLP	Sex Prosthesis use (>8 hours per day)	— (p=0.73) [‡] — (p<0.13) [‡]
Ephraim et al., 2005	Amputees who had contacted the Amputee Coalition of America (ACA) between 1998 and 2000	PLP	Sex Age Traumatic cause of amputation Years since amputation	1.4 (0.90-2.20) [‡] 1.1 (0.60–1.80) [‡] 0.9 (0.50–1.70) [‡] 1.0 (0.60–1.90) [‡]
Gallagher et al., 2001	Amputees who were attending the Limb Fitting Clinic.	PLP	Post-amputation support	— (—)
Hanley et al., 2009	Patients who had undergone upper-limb amputation 6 months or more before recruitment	PLP	Age Sex	3.78 (p=0.83) [¶] 0.78 (p=0.99) [¶]
Kooijman et al.,	Amputees using upper	PLP	Sex	— (p=0.21) [†]

2000	limb prosthesis		Amputation of the dominant limb Pre-amputation pain Upper limb amputation Prosthesis use (>8 hours per day)	— (p=0.59) [†] — (p=0.59) [†] — (p=0.08) [†] — (p=0.06) [†]
Noguchi et al., 2019	Patients who had undergone upper or lower limb amputations	PLP	Sex Age Traumatic cause of amputation Increased hospital-stay	0.78 (p=0.73) [‡] — (p=0.65) [‡] 2.941 (p=0.22) [‡] — (p=0.26) [‡]
Wartan et al., 1997	Traumatic amputees	PLP	Pre-amputation pain	10.6 (p<0.30) [§]

¥ Point-biserial correlation analysis; ¶ Pearson's univariate correlation test; § Chi-squared; † Relative risk; ‡ Odds ratio; — missing figure