

The Phantom Injury Hypothesis

Absurd Health Institute | Frontier Medical Concept Paper 08 | Volume 7

Series: Biological Ghosts of Previous Injury

Article type: Causal hypothesis and mechanistic argument; not an original clinical study

Corrective edition: 17 October 2026

The proposition we defend

An injury can finish structurally without finishing physiologically. We argue that selected chronic pain and guarding syndromes persist because peripheral nerves, immune cells and motor predictions remain organized around an injury that no longer requires the same protection. The location still behaves as if the insult is current even when conventional imaging finds no active lesion.

An injury can disappear on imaging while pain, guarding or threat responses continue. This paper asks whether peripheral sensory nerves, local immune cells and tissue mechanics sometimes preserve a response to an injury that is no longer present. Phantom injury is not a new diagnosis: it is a proposed multi-compartment account of selected persistent symptom patterns.

Why the mechanism deserves to be taken seriously

Peripheral nerve injury may alter excitability; spinal and supraspinal networks can undergo sensitization; macrophages, mast cells and glial cells influence nociception; extracellular matrix stiffness can change mechanical input. Together, these interactions may produce a self-reinforcing loop in which expectation, afferent traffic and local biology each sustain the others. Central sensitization alone is not an explanation for every symptom, but it offers one mechanism for persistence.

The causal argument

Three memories may coincide. Nociceptors can change excitability after injury; locally activated immune cells can preserve a sensitizing chemical environment; and central motor systems can learn a protective movement strategy that alters loading. The loop is self-reinforcing: guarded movement changes tissue forces, abnormal force generates fresh sensory signals, and the brain interprets those signals through a threat-weighted prior. A peripheral intervention alone may fail if the learned movement keeps renewing the signal; psychological therapy alone may fail if damaged peripheral fibers continue spontaneous discharge.

Causal architecture under closer examination

A compelling phantom-injury model has to explain why protection continues after the tissue no longer benefits from it. Peripheral nociceptors may retain altered thresholds; spinal and cortical circuits may assign greater salience to familiar signals; movement patterns may redistribute force onto structures not intended to bear the load. These components form potential loops. Guarded movement creates altered pressure, altered pressure generates sensory input, and the input maintains the expectation of danger. The fact that central and peripheral mechanisms coexist is not a reason to leave the hypothesis vague. We can ask which link is necessary and which is merely correlated. Peripheral anesthetic block, for example, may briefly attenuate one source of input, but a durable outcome requires more than temporary pain relief. Similarly, retraining movement without identifying mechanical instability can place the patient at risk. A well-defined phenotype therefore requires confirmation that the original tissue has reached reasonable structural healing, measurement of functional compensation, and an account of the remaining sensory signal.

A concrete physiological case

Consider a healed ankle injury with persistent asymmetrical gait and pain. Strength and ligament stability are objectively restored, yet pressure distribution remains altered and certain movements provoke alarm. A mechanistic evaluation would measure movement kinematics, local nerve sensitivity, autonomic response and tissue mechanics. A normal MRI does not prove pain lacks a substrate; conversely pain at a previously injured site does not prove a hidden microlesion persists.

What established physiology already supports

Peripheral and central sensitization, neuroimmune activation and learned movement adaptations are established research domains. The distinctive integration is to test whether their coupling maintains symptoms once the initiating tissue injury has resolved. This is not a claim that pain is merely expectation; real neural activity and tissue loading are part of the model.

The strongest counterargument—and the answer

Occult structural pathology remains a serious alternative: instability, entrapment neuropathy, inflammatory arthritis or recurrent tissue damage can escape a simple screen. The model should not be used until such causes receive appropriate examination. It also must not redescribe all persistent pain as the same phenotype; inflammatory and neuropathic pain have distinguishable mechanisms.

Ongoing occult structural disease, neuropathy, inflammatory arthritis, fracture and neuropathic injury must not be dismissed because imaging appears unremarkable. Imaging sensitivity, test selection and physical examination differ by disorder; absence of a visible lesion does not equal absence of pathology.

The discriminating experiment

A decisive study would track healing and function from early injury onward, measuring peripheral sensitivity, motor adaptations and pain. Compare interventions that target only tissue, only movement predictions and both. If the coupled intervention succeeds specifically in patients with the predicted peripheral-plus-motor pattern, the integrated model gains force. Failure of the interaction prediction would favor simpler independent mechanisms.

A discriminating account should separate tissue-derived nociceptive input from centrally maintained amplification using repeated objective evaluation and carefully interpreted response patterns. The hypothesis weakens if symptoms consistently map to an active peripheral pathology without independent evidence for persistent feedback.

Decisive comparisons and limits of inference

The model predicts a distinct temporal arc. Early after injury, pain and guarding should align with actual tissue threat; later, the protective behavior may become partly autonomous. During that transition, the relationship between mechanical loading and reported pain may shift: patients may show protective movement before meaningful nociceptive input, or a familiar movement may trigger a response out of proportion to present tissue strain. Prospective studies can record this transition rather than reconstruct it years afterward. Distinguishing the phenotype from complex regional pain syndrome, neuropathy and occult inflammatory disease is essential because these conditions may require specific evaluation. The strongest competing account is persistent tissue pathology missed by standard imaging; improved physical examination and appropriate investigations take priority over the phantom label. When clinical safety permits, experimentally changing local loading or sensory prediction can help test whether the persistent response is modifiable independently of tissue healing. Success would not prove the pain was “psychological.” It would show that pain is generated by an adaptable multisystem circuit in which structural danger is no longer the only input.

A second prediction from the original model

Spatially restricted symptoms create a stronger test than generalized discomfort: can local tissue measurements explain why one region retains the painful response? If not, circuit-level or systemic explanations may be more powerful.

Why the hypothesis matters if correct

The hypothesis offers a research route between two unsatisfactory extremes: assuming every persistent pain proves unrepaired tissue injury, and assuming that normal structural imaging proves a purely psychological problem. Nerves, local immune signals and protective movement can remain functionally altered after gross structural repair. The model should identify what part of that network is still generating a costly response. For one patient a scar may mechanically stimulate a nerve; for another, motor guarding may perpetuate uncomfortable loading after an old instability has healed. The mechanism predicts that selective modification of one link will have different effects according to each patient's pattern. Such specificity matters because indiscriminate stretching, exercise escalation or reassurance can be unhelpful or unsafe when occult neuropathy or structural pathology remains. A convincing demonstration would show that the coupled peripheral–central system continues to respond as if the original injury were present even after the current tissue threat has been carefully evaluated and found insufficient to explain it.

The clinical and conceptual consequence

The thesis challenges a false binary between “still injured” and “all in the mind.” Tissue, nerves and learned protection may together preserve an obsolete injury state. The practical payoff would be more precise phenotyping and better-matched rehabilitation rather than generic reassurance.

The clinical value is avoiding a false choice between “all tissue” and “all psychology.” Pain is experienced through a nervous system but can have complex and changing biological inputs. No single imaging result settles causation.

The clinical value is avoiding a false choice between “all tissue” and “all psychology.” Pain is experienced through a nervous system but can have complex and changing biological inputs. No single imaging result settles causation.

Source bibliography: verification pending

- Astrocyte regulation of synaptic signaling in psychiatric disorders. Front Mol Neurosci. 2022.
- Fibroblast Yap/Taz Signaling in Extracellular Matrix Homeostasis and Tissue Fibrosis. Int J Mol Sci. 2024.

Editorial and clinical boundaries

This paper advances a causal thesis and identifies observations that would support or defeat it. It does not establish a new diagnosis or treatment, and it should not be used to discontinue medically indicated care. Bibliographic entries inherited from the original edition have not all been independently verified.