Calcium Pyrophosphate Deposition Disease: What the 2023 Criteria Enable

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Edited by Mara Voss

Calcium pyrophosphate deposition disease (CPPD) has long presented a diagnostic challenge, often masquerading as other crystalline or inflammatory arthropathies. The lack of standardised, validated classification criteria has complicated research, clinical trials, and patient management. The 2023 classification criteria aim to address this ambiguity, providing a clearer path for diagnosis and research.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: The 2023 classification criteria for CPPD introduce a points-based system integrating clinical, imaging, and laboratory findings for improved diagnostic precision.
- The Data: The criteria require a score of 4 or more points for classification, with specific weight given to crystal identification and imaging evidence.
- The Action: Clinicians should integrate these new criteria into their diagnostic workup for suspected CPPD, particularly when differentiating it from other arthritides.

Calcium pyrophosphate deposition disease (CPPD) is a prevalent crystalline arthropathy, second only to gout, affecting millions globally. Its clinical manifestations are remarkably diverse, ranging from acute, self-limiting inflammatory attacks (pseudogout) to chronic, progressive arthropathy mimicking osteoarthritis or rheumatoid arthritis. This heterogeneity has historically made accurate and consistent diagnosis difficult, leading to misclassification and suboptimal treatment strategies. The underlying pathology involves the deposition of calcium pyrophosphate dihydrate (CPPD) crystals in articular and periarticular tissues, primarily cartilage, menisci, and synovium, triggering an inflammatory response.

The unmet need for robust classification criteria has been a significant barrier in the field. Without a standardised definition, patient cohorts in research studies have been heterogeneous, hindering the development and evaluation of targeted therapies. Previous diagnostic approaches often relied heavily on the identification of CPPD crystals in synovial fluid, a procedure that is invasive, not always feasible, and can yield false negatives. Imaging techniques, particularly conventional radiography, have also played a role, but their sensitivity and specificity for CPPD, especially in early stages, are limited. The 2023 classification criteria represent a concerted effort to bring clarity and consistency to the diagnosis of this complex condition, moving beyond isolated findings to a more comprehensive, weighted assessment.

The Rationale Behind the New Criteria

The development of the 2023 classification criteria for CPPD was driven by the need for a more sensitive and specific tool that could be applied consistently across clinical practice and research. The previous lack of a universally

accepted classification system meant that different studies used varying definitions, making comparisons between research findings challenging. This fragmented approach impeded progress in understanding disease epidemiology, natural history, and response to interventions. The new criteria aim to provide a common language for researchers and clinicians, facilitating more rigorous study designs and, ultimately, better patient care. The process involved extensive collaboration among international experts, leveraging both clinical experience and available evidence to construct a robust, points-based system.

The criteria integrate three main domains: clinical features, imaging findings, and laboratory results. Each domain contributes points towards a final score, with a threshold established for classification. This multi-modal approach acknowledges the diverse ways CPPD can present and ensures that a diagnosis is not solely reliant on a single piece of evidence. For instance, while crystal identification remains the gold standard, the criteria allow for classification even when synovial fluid analysis is not available or inconclusive, provided other strong indicators are present. This pragmatic approach reflects real-world clinical scenarios where definitive crystal analysis may not always be achievable or necessary for initial management decisions. The oral-systemic link in rheumatoid arthritis, for example, highlights how complex inflammatory conditions require broad diagnostic consideration.

Components of the 2023 Classification Criteria

The new criteria assign points based on specific clinical, imaging, and laboratory parameters. Clinical features considered include the presence of acute or chronic arthritis, the pattern of joint involvement (e.g., knee, wrist, shoulder), and the absence of other inflammatory or crystalline arthropathies. For example, a history of acute inflammatory arthritis in a large joint, particularly the knee, would contribute points. The criteria also account for the age of onset, as CPPD is more common in older individuals. This clinical weighting helps to capture the typical presentations while allowing for atypical cases to still be considered if other evidence is strong.

Imaging plays a critical role, with specific attention paid to chondrocalcinosis, the hallmark radiographic finding of CPPD. Chondrocalcinosis, visible as linear calcifications within articular cartilage or menisci, is a strong indicator of CPPD. The criteria assign points for chondrocalcinosis detected by conventional radiography, particularly in characteristic joints like the knees, wrists, or hips. Advanced imaging modalities, such as computed tomography (CT) or ultrasound, may also detect calcifications not visible on plain radiographs, offering increased sensitivity. The presence of coronary artery calcium scoring, while distinct, illustrates the broader utility of calcium detection in clinical risk assessment.

Laboratory findings, specifically the identification of calcium pyrophosphate dihydrate crystals in synovial fluid, carry the highest point value. This remains the definitive diagnostic test. The crystals are typically rhomboid or rod-shaped and exhibit weakly positive birefringence under polarised light microscopy. While crystal identification is paramount, the criteria acknowledge that its absence does not rule out CPPD, especially if the sample quality is poor or the disease activity is low. Other laboratory markers, such as elevated inflammatory markers (ESR, CRP), are considered supportive but do not carry significant weight on their own, as they are non-specific. The overall score required for classification is 4 or more points, ensuring a balance of evidence is met.

Implications for Clinical Practice and Research

The adoption of the 2023 classification criteria is expected to standardise the diagnosis of CPPD, leading to more consistent patient cohorts in clinical trials. This consistency is vital for evaluating the efficacy of new treatments and understanding disease progression. For clinicians, the criteria provide a structured approach to diagnosis, reducing reliance on subjective interpretation and improving diagnostic accuracy. This is particularly important in differentiating CPPD from other conditions like gout, osteoarthritis, or even septic arthritis, which can have similar presentations but require vastly different management strategies. The Oxford Handbook of Rheumatology (5th ed) offers a concise reference for navigating such complex musculoskeletal diseases.

But the criteria are not without limitations. They are classification criteria, primarily designed for research, not diagnostic criteria for individual patient management. While they offer a robust framework, clinical judgment remains essential, especially in atypical presentations or when a patient's symptoms do not perfectly align with the scoring system. The criteria also rely on the availability of specific imaging and laboratory tests, which may not be universally accessible in all healthcare settings. For instance, polarised light microscopy for crystal identification requires specialised equipment and expertise, which may not be readily available in primary care settings.

The criteria also do not fully address the heterogeneity of CPPD phenotypes. While they aid in classifying the presence of the disease, they do not inherently stratify patients based on their clinical presentation (e.g., acute pseudogout vs. chronic arthropathy). This phenotypic diversity has implications for treatment, as different presentations may respond differently to various interventions. Future research will need to build upon these classification criteria to develop prognostic tools and treatment algorithms tailored to specific CPPD phenotypes. The ongoing challenge of calcium and vitamin D supplementation efficacy in fall prevention also highlights the broader complexities of calcium metabolism in older adults.

Still, the new criteria represent a significant step forward. They provide a much-needed framework for consistent identification of CPPD, which will undoubtedly accelerate research into its pathogenesis and treatment. The emphasis on a combination of clinical, imaging, and laboratory evidence encourages a holistic diagnostic approach, moving away from over-reliance on any single test. This comprehensive view is important for ensuring accurate diagnosis and management in a disease with such varied manifestations. The next challenge will be to validate these criteria in diverse populations and to assess their impact on clinical outcomes and healthcare resource utilisation.

Future Directions and Unanswered Questions

The introduction of the 2023 classification criteria opens several avenues for future research. One key area will be to assess the criteria's performance in real-world clinical settings, particularly in primary care, where the initial suspicion of CPPD often arises. Understanding how these criteria translate from a research setting to routine clinical practice will be important. There is also a need to explore the utility of advanced imaging techniques, such as dual-energy CT (DECT), which can specifically identify CPPD crystals, and their potential integration into future revisions of the criteria. DECT offers a non-invasive method for crystal detection, potentially overcoming some of the limitations of synovial fluid analysis.

Another important question revolves around the genetic and metabolic underpinnings of CPPD. While the criteria focus on diagnosis, a deeper understanding of the disease's etiology could lead to preventive strategies or disease-modifying therapies. The role of comorbidities, such as osteoarthritis, hyperparathyroidism, and hemochromatosis, in influencing CPPD presentation and progression also warrants further investigation. The criteria provide a solid foundation, but the

field must now build upon this to develop a more complete picture of CPPD, from its earliest stages to its long-term impact on patients' lives. This will require large, prospective studies that track patients over time, correlating their classification status with clinical outcomes and treatment responses.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The 2023 classification criteria for CPPD are a welcome, if overdue, development. For too long, CPPD has been a diagnostic chameleon, often misidentified as gout or osteoarthritis, leading to delayed or inappropriate management. These criteria offer a much-needed anchor, providing a structured, points-based system that should bring consistency to diagnosis and, critically, to research cohorts.

Clinicians should integrate these criteria into their diagnostic algorithms, particularly when faced with atypical arthropathy presentations. The emphasis on combining clinical, imaging, and laboratory data forces a more thorough workup than simply looking for crystals in synovial fluid, which is not always feasible or definitive. This holistic approach will likely reduce diagnostic errors and improve patient pathways.

But these are classification criteria, not a diagnostic oracle. They are designed for research, to homogenise study populations. Clinical judgment remains paramount; a patient's presentation does not always fit neatly into a scoring system. The criteria also highlight the ongoing need for accessible polarised light microscopy and skilled interpretation, a resource that is not uniformly available across all European primary care settings.

These criteria should accelerate the development of better treatments for CPPD, a condition for which therapeutic options remain limited and largely symptomatic. A clearer definition of the disease allows for more targeted clinical trials, moving the field beyond empirical management. The next step is to see how these criteria perform in the messy reality of everyday practice, and whether they truly translate into improved patient outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Pascart T, Filippou G, Lioté F, Sirotti S, Jauffret C, Abhishek A. Calcium pyrophosphate deposition disease. Lancet Rheumatol. 2024;6(11):e791-e804. doi:10.1016/S2665-9913(24)00122-X
2. 2. Rosenthal AK, Ryan LM. Calcium Pyrophosphate Deposition Disease. N Engl J Med. 2016;374(26):2575-84. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1511117
3. 3. {yluk A. Calcium pyrophosphate dihydrate deposition disease (chondrocalcinosis): a review. Wiad Lek. 2025;78(2):402-409. doi:10.36740/WLek/200864
4. 4. Filippou G, Dalbeth N, Tedeschi SK. Editorial: Calcium pyrophosphate deposition disease. Front Med (Lausanne). 2025;12:1557035. doi:10.3389/fmed.2025.1557035
5. 5. Abhishek A. Calcium pyrophosphate deposition disease: a review of epidemiologic findings. Curr Opin Rheumatol. 2016;28(2):133-9. doi:10.1097/BOR.0000000000000246
6.

6. Parperis K, Papachristodoulou E, Kakoullis L, Rosenthal AK. Management of calcium pyrophosphate crystal deposition disease: A systematic review. Semin Arthritis Rheum. 2021;51(1):84-94. doi:10.1016/j.semarthrit.2020.10.005