

Supplementary Digital Content 2

Table. Systematic review: phenotyping methods reported in the article text^a

	Reference																				
	[2]	[4]	[6]	[8]	[11] ^b	[12]	[14] ^c	[15]	[20]	[21]	[22]	[23]	[27]	[35]	[36]	[37]	[41]	[43]	[46]	[47]	[49]
Clinical examination^d																					
• Brief description			●		○		○	●							●		●				●
• Detailed description				●		●			●	●	●	●	●								●
Pain rating scale				●	○		○	●	●	●	●	●	●		●			●		●	●
History^d																					
• Brief	●				○		○	●						●		●		●	●	●	
• Detailed				●		●				●											●
Radiological imaging (MRI)					○	●	○	●	●		●	●	●		●					●	●
Neuropathic pain identification questionnaire						●	○		●		●	●									
Quantitative sensory testing (QST)		●	●			●			●									●			
Nerve conduction studies (NCS)						●												●			
Intra-epidermal nerve fibre density (IENFD)						●												●			
Inflammatory markers						●			●												
Body chart								●													
Psychological measures (HADS)									●												

^a Open circles relate to studies reporting on multiple cohorts, with different phenotyping methods described for each cohort;

^b Costigan et al., 2010 [11]: Six independent cohorts each with different phenotyping methods;

^c Dominguez et al., 2013 [14]: Two independent cohorts each with different phenotyping methods;

^d 'brief' and 'detailed' describe the level of detail provided in the text of the paper, not necessarily that the assessment was 'brief' or 'detailed';

MRI: Magnetic resonance imaging;

HADS: Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale