#### Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Liming Lu, Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine, China

REVIEWED BY Xinchang Zhang, Nanjing University of Chinese Medicine, China Chen Zhao, China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences, China

\*CORRESPONDENCE Rongjiang Jin cdzyydxjrj@126.com Juan Li 785939016@qq.com Yue Feng fengyue714@163.com

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

#### SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Experimental Therapeutics, a section of the journal Frontiers in Neurology

RECEIVED 12 May 2022 ACCEPTED 19 July 2022 PUBLISHED 17 August 2022

#### CITATION

Xue C, Jiang C, Zhu Y, Liu X, Zhong D, Li Y, Zhang H, Tang W, She J, Xie C, Li J, Feng Y and Jin R (2022) Effectiveness and safety of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Neurol.* 13:942597. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2022.942597

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Xue, Jiang, Zhu, Liu, Zhong, Li, Zhang, Tang, She, Xie, Li, Feng and Jin. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Effectiveness and safety of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Chen Xue<sup>1†</sup>, Chengzhi Jiang<sup>2†</sup>, Yuanyuan Zhu<sup>3†</sup>, Xiaobo Liu<sup>1</sup>, Dongling Zhong<sup>1</sup>, Yuxi Li<sup>1</sup>, Huiling Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Wenjing Tang<sup>1</sup>, Jian She<sup>1</sup>, Cheng Xie<sup>1</sup>, Juan Li<sup>1\*</sup>, Yue Feng<sup>4\*</sup> and Rongjiang Jin<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Health Preservation and Rehabilitation, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chengdu, China, <sup>2</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Sichuan Science City Hospital, Mianyang, China, <sup>3</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Integrated Traditional Chinese and Western Medicine Hospital of Panzhihua City, Panzhihua, China, <sup>4</sup>The Third Hospital/Acupuncture and Tuina School, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chengdu, China

**Objective:** This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness and safety of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity.

**Methods:** Nine electronic databases were searched from their inception to 6 June 2022, to identify randomized-controlled trials (RCTs) that investigated the effectiveness and safety of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity. Two reviewers independently screened the studies, extracted the data, assessed the risk of bias. The reporting quality of interventions in controlled trials of acupuncture was evaluated using Revised Standards for Reporting Interventions in Clinical Trials of Acupuncture (STRICTA). The RevMan 5.4 and R 4.2.0 software were used for statistical analysis.

**Results:** A total of 88 eligible studies were included, involving 6,431 individuals. The pooled data demonstrated that acupuncture combined with conventional rehabilitation (CR) was superior to CR in reducing the Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS) score (standardized mean difference [SMD] = -0.73; 95% CI = -0.83 to -0.63;  $I^2 = 65\%$ ; low certainty of evidence). The favorable results were also observed in comparisons of acupuncture vs. CR (SMD = -0.22, 95% CI = -0.36 to -0.07;  $I^2 = 49\%$ ; moderate certainty of evidence). Subgroup analysis showed that acupuncture treatment with a frequency of once or twice a day was more effective than CR. In addition, the antispasmodic effect of acupuncture treatment increased with more sessions. Four studies explicitly reported slight acupuncture-related adverse events.

**Conclusion:** Acupuncture could be recommended as adjuvant therapy for spasticity after stroke. However, due to the high risk of bias and heterogeneity of the included studies, the effectiveness of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity remains to be confirmed.

#### KEYWORDS

acupuncture, spasticity, stroke, systematic review, meta-analysis

# Introduction

Spasticity is one of the most common complications after stroke with a prevalence of 30-80% (1). As a motor dysfunction after the central nervous system lesions, spasticity is characterized by a velocity-dependent increase in tonic stretch reflex with exaggerated tendon jerks (2). Spasticity often results in several clinical symptoms, including joint contractures, deformities, swelling, and pain, which severely limits the motor functions of patients with stroke (3). Moreover, the presence of spasticity may interfere with self-care ability of patients, reduce their quality of life and lead to depressive symptoms (4). More importantly, spasticity brings a heavy financial burden to families and society. According to statistics, approximately 50% family members have to reduce work hours or even stop working to take care of patients with spasticity after stroke (5). The direct cost for patients with spasticity is US\$84,195 during the 1st year after stroke, which were four times higher than those without spasticity (6).

Currently, there are quite a few therapeutic strategies (e.g., physiotherapy, oral spasmolytics, injections of botulinum toxin) to treat post-stroke spasticity, while the therapeutic effect of spasticity is unsatisfactory. In terms of physiotherapy, the limited effect and long-term treatment course may lead to poor compliance (7). The effect of oral spasmolytics is not long-lasting, and prolonged use of these drugs might cause multiple side effects, such as hepatotoxicity and muscle weakness (8). Repetitive injections of botulinum toxin may result in the formation of neutralizing antibodies and attenuate the treatment efficacy (9). Therefore, there is a need for an effective and safe therapy for post-stroke spasticity.

Acupuncture, as a pragmatic and safe traditional Chinese medicine (TCM) treatment (10), has been used for the rehabilitation of patients with post-stroke spasticity (11). Several SRs have explored the effectiveness of acupuncture for spasticity in stroke survivors. Notwithstanding, they showed inconsistent results (12–19). With the emergence of new randomized-controlled trials (RCTs) in recent years, we plan to conduct this SR and meta-analysis to update the evidence of the effectiveness and safety of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity.

# **Methods**

The protocol of this SR has been registered on PROSPERO https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display\_record. php?RecordID=129779 (registration ID: CRD42019129779) and published in advance (20). We conducted this study strictly in compliance with A Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews (AMSTAR 2.0) (21) and reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analysis 2020 (PRISMA) statement (22). The completed PRISMA checklist is shown in Supplementary File 1.

#### Literature search

We performed a literature search in the following databases from their inception to 6 June 2022: PubMed, Embase, the Cochrane Library, Web of Science, Epistemonikos Database, Chinese Biomedical Database, Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure, Chinese Science and Technology Periodical Database, and Wangfang Database. Comprehensive search strategies applied to the above databases were developed by a professional library staff (DLZ), which used logical operators to link subject terms and free words together. The detailed search strategies of all databases are shown in Supplementary File 2. We also searched the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry and ClinicalTrials.gov to identify possible eligible trials. Potential articles were hand-searched from gray literature, reference lists of included studies, and relevant SRs. In addition, we also consulted the experts in this field.

#### Inclusion criteria

#### Types of studies

We included RCTs published in English or Chinese that evaluated the effectiveness and safety of acupuncture for poststroke spasticity. The included studies should specify the randomization method in detail.

#### Types of participants

Patients with post-stroke spasticity were included. The stroke was diagnosed according to the acknowledged diagnostic criteria and confirmed by magnetic resonance imaging or computed tomography. The spasticity was defined as Brunnstrom stage II–V, the Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS) graded I–IV, or Composite Spasticity Scale (CSS)/Clinical Spasticity Index (CSI) >0 (23). There were no restrictions on age, gender, race, duration of stroke, type of stroke, and position of spasticity.

#### Types of interventions

The experimental group received acupuncture as a monotherapy or adjunctive therapy. We included manual acupuncture, electroacupuncture, body needling, abdominal acupuncture, scalp acupuncture, and eye acupuncture in accordance with definition of acupuncture <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Available online at: https://www.news-medical.net/health/What-is-Acupuncture.aspx.

#### Types of comparisons

Patients in the control group were treated with conventional rehabilitation (CR), sham acupuncture, or Western medicine (WM). CR mainly included general supportive care, kinesiotherapy, occupational therapy, and physical factor therapy. Sham acupuncture was designed using the method of "shallow needling to non-acupoints" (24).

#### Types of outcome measures

The primary outcome was the MAS score of affected limbs. The secondary outcomes included effective rate (ER) that refer to the reduction of MAS by more than one grade, Fugl–Myer Assessment (FMA), Barthel Index (BI), CSS, CSI, integral electromyography (iEMG), root mean square (RMS), a ratio of maximum H-reflex to maximum M response ( $H_{max}/M_{max}$  ratio), co-contraction rate (CCR), and acupuncture related adverse events.

#### Exclusion criteria

Studies were excluded if (1) they were quasi-RCT, crossover RCT, and cluster RCT; (2) patients had no clear diagnostic criteria or suffered from spasticity due to other reasons, such as traumatic brain injury, tumor, or poisoning; (3) studies explored the effect of different types of acupuncture; (4) other types of acupuncture (e.g., warm-needle moxibustion, acupoint injection, floating acupuncture, cutaneous needle, dry needling, and plum-blossom needle) were used as treatment for spasticity; (5) acupuncture combined with other TCM therapy (e.g., Chinese herb, massage, moxibustion, scraping, cupping, and bloodletting) to alleviate spasticity; and (6) data were unavailable by extensive searching.

#### Study selection

The retrieved records were imported into Endnote (X9). After removing duplicates, two researchers (WJT and JS) independently reviewed the titles and abstracts to eliminate irrelevant records, and then read the rest records in full text to identify eligible studies. Disagreements were settled through team discussion or consultation with the third reviewer (JL).

#### Data extraction

Two reviewers (CX and YXL) independently extracted data from the included studies using a predesigned extraction form. The following information was extracted: (1) the general characteristics of included studies, (2) demographic data of patients at study level, (3) characteristics of interventions and comparators, and (4) outcome measures. After extraction, two reviewers crosschecked to ensure accuracy. For multiarm RCTs, we extracted the eligible comparisons or extracted the comparison with inferior effect size. When the study reported indicators of spasticity more than one position, the recommended formula was used to merge the mean and standard deviation of multiple positions (25, 26). During this process, any ambiguities were resolved by the third author (RJJ).

# Evaluation of reporting quality of interventions in controlled trials of acupuncture

We used Revised Standards for Reporting Interventions in Clinical Trials of Acupuncture (STRICTA) to appraise the reporting quality of interventions in controlled trials of acupuncture (27). The STRICTA consists of six items, including acupuncture rationale, details of needling, treatment regimen, co-interventions, practitioner background, and control or comparator interventions. Each study was assessed by two independent reviewers (CZJ and YYZ) using STRICTA. Discrepancies were resolved by the third reviewer (YF).

#### Assessment of risk of bias

The risk of bias was evaluated using the revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (ROB 2.0) (28). This tool contains five domains, namely, randomization process, deviations from intended interventions, missing outcome data, measurement of the outcome, and selection of the reported result. Each domain was judged as "low risk of bias," "some concerns," or "high risk of bias." Two trained reviewers (CZJ and YYZ) pre-assessed the five included studies with ROB 2.0. Then, the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) statistic was calculated to evaluate the inter-rater agreement. If consistency reached at least 80%, formal evaluations were performed. Any disagreements were arbitrated by discussion or consensus with a third reviewer (YF).

#### Statistical analysis

The ICC was calculated using Statistical Package for Social Sciences 25.0 to test consistency between reviewers. According to the ICC, the consistency was defined as poor 0.0-0.2, fair 0.21-0.4, moderate 0.41-0.6, good 0.61-0.8, and very good 0.81-1.00 (29). The Review Manager software (RevMan, version 5.4) and R software (version 4.2.0) were used for data synthesis. Mean difference (MD) or standardized mean difference (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) was measured for continuous variables, and relative risk (RR) with 95% CI was calculated for dichotomous data. We defined *p* 

< 0.05 as a statistically significant difference. If MAS was presented as rank variable, we transformed it into continuous data. Chi-square test and  $I^2$  statistic were conducted to assess the heterogeneity among studies. When  $I^2 \leq 50\%$ , p > 0.1, we used fixed-effect model to pool data; otherwise, the random-effect model was used.

#### Subgroup analysis

We conducted subgroup analysis based on the following factors: (1) position of spasticity (upper limbs, lower limbs); (2) frequency of treatment (once a day, twice a day, once every other day); (3) total sessions of treatment (10-30, 30-60, >60 sessions); (4) needle stimulation (manual acupuncture, electroacupuncture); and (5) follow-up time (1 month after treatment, 3 months after treatment).

#### Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analysis was carried out to verify the robustness of the result by removing study one by one. Furthermore, we pooled data from the studies with unclear blinding of outcome assessors and explicit blinding of outcome assessors separately. We also explored the impact of risk of bias on the pooled estimate.

#### Publication bias

If the number of included trials over 10, funnel plots and *Egger*'s test were applied to detect publication bias.

# Grading of recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation

We assessed the certainty of evidence by using the Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach (30) and summarized the evidence profile using the GRADE profiler (version 3.6) software. Each outcome was evaluated from five considerations: limitations, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias. Then, the certainty of evidence was rated in four grades, namely, high quality, moderate quality, low quality, or very low quality.

#### Results

#### Search results

A total of 25,096 records were identified, of which 7,523 duplicates were removed. By screening titles and abstracts,

17,076 irrelevant articles were eliminated. Among the remaining 497 articles, 88 studies (31–118) fulfilled the eligible criteria and were eventually included. The reasons for excluding the studies are listed in Supplementary File 3 (Supplementary Table S1). A detailed screening process is presented in Figure 1.

#### **Studies characteristics**

The characteristics of the included studies are presented in Supplementary File 3 (Supplementary Table S2). A total of 88 studies involving 6,431 patients were identified (3,347 in the intervention group and 3,084 in the control group). The average age of the patients ranged from 50 to 78. A total of 38 studies (31, 47, 48, 52, 55, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 71-76, 79, 80, 82, 83, 88–90, 92–94, 99–101, 104, 107, 110, 112–114) included patients who suffered from stroke for the first time. The duration of stroke ranged from 2 weeks to 1 year. In addition, 19 studies (35, 40, 41, 44, 45, 47, 51, 52, 61, 65, 67, 68, 70, 77, 85, 100, 108, 109, 116) recruited patients with cerebral ischemia and 1 study (84) focused on cerebral hemorrhage; the rest studies included patients with ischemic stroke and hemorrhagic stroke. A total of 41 studies (33, 36, 38, 39, 41-43, 45, 49, 53-57, 59, 61, 65-67, 70-73, 78, 80, 82, 87, 88, 90, 96, 97, 100-102, 104-106, 108, 110, 116) observed spasticity of upper limbs, 25 studies (31, 32, 44, 47, 51, 62-64, 68, 77, 79, 81, 83, 84, 86, 89, 91, 93, 94, 98, 99, 107, 111-113) focused on lower limbs, and 22 studies (34, 35, 37, 40, 46, 48, 50, 52, 58, 60, 69, 74-76, 85, 95, 103, 109, 114, 115, 117, 118) reported both upper and lower limbs. The included studies involved the comparisons of acupuncture plus CR vs. CR, acupuncture vs. CR, acupuncture vs. WM and verum acupuncture vs. sham acupuncture.

#### Acupuncture protocols in included trials

A total of 61 studies (33, 35, 38, 39, 41-43, 45-48, 50, 52, 55-60, 63, 64, 66-73, 75, 78, 79, 81-90, 92, 94-96, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105–110, 112, 114–117) used manual acupuncture, and 27 studies (31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 40, 44, 49, 51, 53, 54, 61, 62, 65, 74, 76, 77, 80, 91, 93, 97, 98, 101, 104, 111, 113, 118) used electroacupuncture. All included studies described the choice of acupoints. As shown in Figure 2, the most frequent acupoints on upper limbs were Hegu (LI 4), Jianyu (LI 15), Quchi (LI 11), Waiguan (SJ 5), and Shousanli (LI 10). And Zusanli (ST 36), Yanglinquan (GB 34), Sanyinjiao (SP 6), Taichong (LR 3), and Xuehai (SP 10) in the lower limbs (see Figure 3). The retention time for the body acupuncture varied from 15 to 40 min. As for scalp acupuncture, the parietal median line (MS 5), parietal anterior temporal oblique line (MS 6), and parietal posterior temporal oblique line (MS 7) were commonly used. The retention time for scalp acupuncture ranged from 15 min to 6 h. Treatment frequency was once a day (31-37, 39-41, 44,



45, 47–60, 63–67, 69–81, 83–110, 112–114, 116–118) twice a day (42, 43, 61, 62, 82, 111), and once every other day (38, 68, 115). Treatment period ranged from 2 weeks (52, 109) to 6 months (68, 70). The treatment positions were mostly located on affected limbs. Only one study (54) selected acupoints on the unaffected limb (opposing acupuncture). A total of 13 studies (31, 44, 50, 55, 73, 75, 81, 85, 87, 95, 109, 111, 115) used individualized acupoint protocol according to syndrome differentiation. The remaining studies applied fixed acupoint protocol. A total of 54 studies (31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40–45, 48, 49, 52, 54, 58, 59, 61–63, 66, 67, 71, 75, 78–80, 83–86, 88, 90, 92–98, 101–103, 105–109, 111, 113–116) emphasized *De qi*, which was a unique needling sensation and was essential for clinical efficacy (119).

# STRICTA checklist for the included studies

The STRICTA checklist is shown in Supplementary File 3 (Supplementary Table S3). Almost all studies reported the style of acupuncture, needle stimulation, acupoint selection, needle retention time, frequency, and total sessions of treatment. More than half of the studies described unilateral or bilateral of acupoints, depth of insertion, De qi, and thickness of

acupuncture. A total of 23 studies (41, 49, 53–55, 59, 60, 66– 71, 75, 79, 83, 86, 87, 89, 92, 94, 95, 100) specified the rationale of acupoint protocol and 12 studies (36, 41, 53, 55, 60, 62, 69, 71, 74, 76, 79, 87) mentioned the number of needle insertions. Except for eight studies (45, 50, 55, 58, 106, 108, 114, 116), the remaining studies described the control in detail, but none of the studies elucidated the rationale of control group. A total of 80 studies (31–44, 46–49, 51–54, 56, 57, 59–105, 107, 109– 113, 115, 117, 118) reported details of co-interventions. All included studies did not specify the setting and context of treatment. Among the included studies, merely eight studies (49, 54, 68, 70, 84, 102, 113, 118) provided information about the certification of acupuncturists.

#### Risk of bias assessment

The ICC value between the two reviewers for ROB 2.0 assessment was 0.917, which indicates very good agreement. The summary of risk of bias is presented in Figure 4, and the graph of risk of bias is provided in Supplementary File 3 (Supplementary Figure S1). Due to no blinding of outcome assessors, deviations from intended interventions, and missing outcome data, the overall risk of bias of 66 studies (31, 34, 35, 37, 39–46, 48–53, 55, 57–59, 61–65, 67–70, 73–79, 81, 83, 85, 86,



89, 91–94, 96, 97, 99, 101–103, 105–112, 114–118) was evaluated as "high risk of bias," and because of selective reporting results (no protocol), 22 studies (32, 33, 36, 38, 47, 54, 56, 60, 66, 71, 72, 80, 82, 84, 87, 88, 90, 95, 98, 100, 104, 113) were categorized as "some concerns."

#### Primary outcome

#### Acupuncture plus CR vs. CR

A total of 70 trials (35–37, 40, 42–51, 53–60, 62, 63, 65, 67–71, 73–77, 79–89, 91, 93–100, 102–106, 108–112, 114–118) with 4,921 participants used the MAS score to evaluate the therapeutic effect of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity. The results of meta-analysis revealed that acupuncture plus CR was superior to the CR in decreasing MAS score (SMD = -0.73; 95% CI = -0.83 to -0.63; p < 0.00001;  $I^2 = 65\%$ ) (Figure 5). The funnel plot and *Egger*'s test (p = 0.005) indicated that potential publication bias might exist (Figure 6).

#### Acupuncture vs. CR

A total of 10 trials (33, 35, 41, 48, 56, 57, 73, 78, 96, 112) with 728 participants compared the effects of acupuncture with CR. The pooled data showed that acupuncture had a better effect than CR in ameliorating spasticity in patients with stroke (SMD

= -0.22, 95% CI = -0.36 to -0.07; p = 0.004;  $I^2 = 49\%$ ) (Figure 7). Funnel plot and *Egger*'s test (p = 0.486) showed no obvious publication bias (Figure 8).

#### Descriptive Analysis

Two trials (88, 90) reported that acupuncture was more effective than sham acupuncture in relieving spasticity. There was (92, 101) no significant difference between acupuncture and WM in reducing MAS score.

#### Subgroup analysis

The results of subgroup analysis (acupuncture plus CR vs. CR) are summarized in Table 1. With regard to sessions of acupuncture treatment, we found that acupuncture treatments of 10–30 sessions (SMD = -0.65, 95% CI -0.76 to -0.55), 30–60 sessions (SMD = -0.79, 95% CI -1.06 to -0.52), and >60 sessions (SMD = -0.97, 95% CI -1.25 to -0.69) were superior to CR in improving post-stroke spasticity. As for acupuncture frequency, acupuncture combined with CR with once a day (SMD = -0.75, 95% CI -0.86 to -0.64) or twice a day (SMD = -0.55, 95% CI -0.85 to -0.25) reduced more MAS score than CR. However, once every other day showed no significant difference in reducing MAS score compared





Study on Sub-	acupu	ncture+	CR	Marri	CR	Tetal	Wal-ht	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random. 95% C	IV. Random. 95% CI
Cheng P 2015	2.79	0.81	18	2.92	1	19	1.2%	-0.14 [-0.78, 0.51]	
Deng FH 2021	1.965	1.092	60	2.685	1.25	60	1.7%	-0.61 [-0.98, -0.24]	
Duan C 2021	1.2	1.005	41	1.79	1.105	39	1.6%	-0.55 [-1.00, -0.11]	
Duan YF 2021	1.67	1.061	30	2.17	1.053	30	1.4%	-0.47 [-0.98, 0.05]	
Fan WW 2019	1.45	0.816	32	1.92	1.014	32	1.5%	-0.50 [-1.00, -0.01]	
Feng WF 2019	2.3	0.7	30	3.2	1.5	30	1.4%	-0.76 [-1.28, -0.23]	
Feng WF 2020	1.27	1.02	30	1.63	1.07	30	1.4%	-0.34 [-0.85, 0.17]	
Feng XG 2012	1.205	1.004	100	1.71	1.043	100	1.9%	-0.49 [-0.77, -0.21]	
Guan XR 2018	1.89	0.994	19	2.95	1.433	19	1.1%	-0.84 [-1.51, -0.17]	
Guo LL 2022	0.48	0.504	60	1.22	0.739	60	1.7%	-1.16 [-1.55, -0.77]	
Han ZX 2018	1.13	0.819	30	2.2	1.349	30	1.4%	-0.95 [-1.48, -0.41]	
Hao Q 2020	1.87	0.47	36	2.23	0.62	36	1.5%	-0.65 [-1.12, -0.17]	
He X 2020	0.9	1.07	20	1.7	0.92	20	1.2%	-0.79 [-1.43, -0.14]	17 - 18 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19
Hu DX 2013	2.57	0.871	28	3.38	1.02	28	1.4%	-0.84 [-1.39, -0.29]	
Huang D 2016	1.68	0.63	20	2.71	0.32	20	1.0%	-2.02 [-2.80, -1.24]	
lia C.I 2017	1.62	0.82	26	23	0.735	25	1.3%	-0.86 [-1.43 -0.28]	
Jia CJ 2018	1.65	0.86	34	2 4 4 5	0.83	32	1.4%	-0.93 [-1.44, -0.42]	
liang XG 2019	1 33	0 884	30	1.8	0.961	30	1.4%	-0.50 [-1.02, 0.01]	
lian 7H 2009	0.885	0.870	31	1.0	0.001	30	1 4%	-0.12[-0.62_0.38]	
1 i 1 2003	1 805	0.830	72	2 265	1 024	72	1.9%	-0.12[-0.02, 0.30]	
LI JA 2022	1.005	1.033	20	4.00	1.024	20	1.070	-0.49 [-0.02, -0.10]	
Lin EC 2018	1.03	0.550	30	1.03	0.003	30	1.4%	1 20 [ 4 96 0 74]	
Lin PC 2010	1.03	1.155	30	1.0	1 107	30	1.0%	-1.30 [-1.80, -0.74]	
Liu G 2017	1.5/	0.000	00	1.83	1.167	00	1.8%	-0.22 [-0.58, 0.14]	
LIU LU 2021	1.03	0.999	30	1.7	0.952	30	1.4%	-0.08 [-1.20, -0.16]	
LIU LL 2016	2.14	0.743	29	2.5	0.694	28	1.4%	-0.49 [-1.02, 0.03]	
Lu JY2009	0.626	1.021	30	0.553	0.906	30	1.4%	0.07 [-0.43, 0.58]	
Ma AF 2022	0.74	0.857	42	1.86	1.354	42	1.6%	-0.98 [-1.43, -0.53]	
Ma ZY 2019a	1.28	1.051	50	1.86	1.246	50	1.7%	-0.50 [-0.90, -0.10]	
Ma ZY 2019b	1.63	0.28	20	2.13	1.54	20	1.2%	-0.44 [-1.07, 0.19]	
Qi LL 2018	1.23	1.006	30	2.47	1.167	30	1.4%	-1.12 [-1.67, -0.58]	
Qian S 2015	0.3	0.52	35	0.9	1.085	30	1.4%	-0.71 [-1.22, -0.21]	
Qing Y 2018	1.15	1.09	20	1.95	1.23	20	1.2%	-0.67 [-1.31, -0.04]	
Qu F 2016	2.1	0.96	30	2.67	0.922	30	1.4%	-0.60 [-1.12, -0.08]	
Ren CY 2022	2.9	1.189	30	3.135	1.309	30	1.4%	-0.19 [-0.69, 0.32]	
Rong JF 2017	1.68	0.56	25	2.61	0.38	25	1.1%	-1.91 [-2.59, -1.23]	
Rong XQ 2019	2.29	0.91	24	3.12	0.67	25	1.3%	-1.03 [-1.62, -0.43]	
Su CH 2016	0.87	1.008	30	1.67	1.269	30	1.4%	-0.69 [-1.21, -0.17]	
Wang HQ 2019	1.55	0.645	30	1.915	0.734	29	1.4%	-0.52 [-1.04, -0.00]	
Wang J 2018	2.5	0.9	30	2.97	0.795	31	1.4%	-0.55 [-1.06, -0.04]	
Wang LC 2011a	1.7	1.643	30	2.6	1.499	30	1.4%	-0.56 [-1.08, -0.05]	
Wang LC 2011b	1.11	1.173	37	2.58	1.538	36	1.5%	-1.07 [-1.56, -0.57]	
Wang R 2020	1.67	0.897	35	2.17	0.867	35	1.5%	-0.56 [-1.04, -0.08]	
Wang T 2021	1 8125	0.524	30	2 239	0.458	30	1 4%	-0.86[-1.39 -0.33]	
Wang X 2019	1.83	0.53	90	2 215	0.461	90	1.9%	-0 77 [-1 07 -0 47]	
Wang XC 2020	0.76	0.61	33	1 29	0.63	34	1.5%	-0.84 [-1.35 -0.34]	
Wang XY 2018	1.45	0.808	32	1.95	1 008	32	1.5%	-0.54 [-1.04 -0.04]	
Wang ZY 2021	1.38	0.000	30	1.07	0.50	30	1 4%	-1.10[-1.650.56]	
Wu N 2014	6.64	1 480	30	8.01	1 155	20	1 3%	-1 68 [-2 28 -1 08]	
Wu W 2014	3.76	0.42	30	4.25	0.53	20	1 30/	-1.00 [-2.20, -1.00]	
WU W 2011	3.70	0.42	30	4.55	0.55	30	1.370	-1.22 [-1.77, -0.00]	
	2.1	1 204	30	2.13	1 240	30	1.4%	-0.03 [-0.54, 0.47]	
Xie JJ 2017	1.93	1.304	45	2.62	1.248	45	1.6%	-0.54 [-0.96, -0.12]	
Xie SM 2020	1.67	1.18	30	2.3	1.09	30	1.4%	-0.55 [-1.06, -0.03]	
Xing XM 2015	2.51	0.17	30	3.07	0.11	30	0.8%	-3.86 [-4.74, -2.98]	
Xu J 2018	2.3	0.735	25	2.94	0.843	24	1.3%	-0.80 [-1.38, -0.21]	
Xu ZW 2019	2	2	30	3	1	30	1.4%	-0.62 [-1.14, -0.11]	
Yan W 2010	0.87	0.831	40	1.369	0.891	41	1.6%	-0.57 [-1.02, -0.13]	
Yang M 2019	1.33	0.59	36	1.69	0.82	36	1.5%	-0.50 [-0.97, -0.03]	
Yang Q 2020	0.8	0.9	30	1.27	1.103	30	1.4%	-0.46 [-0.97, 0.05]	
Yang S 2020	2.1	0.49	29	2.59	0.5	29	1.4%	-0.98 [-1.52, -0.43]	
Ye BY 2016	1.78	1.29	30	2.315	1.334	30	1.4%	-0.40 [-0.91, 0.11]	
Ye WC 2016	1.37	0.765	30	2.37	0.928	30	1.4%	-1.16 [-1.71, -0.61]	The second se
Yin ZL 2020	0.84	0.46	25	0.88	0.51	25	1.3%	-0.08 [-0.64, 0.47]	
Yu JY 2009	1.81	0.967	24	2.135	1.104	21	1.3%	-0.31 [-0.90, 0.28]	
Zhang CX 2021	2.088	0.63	70	3.14	1.13	70	1.8%	-1.14 [-1.50, -0.79]	1
Zhang L 2021	1	1.114	30	1.7	1.368	30	1.4%	-0.55 [-1.07, -0.04]	
Zhang OS 2022	0.955	0.69	31	1.7	0.89	30	1.4%	-0.93 [-1.46 -0.40]	
Zhang SH 2021	1 41	0.05	70	1 75	0.73	70	1.9%	-0.51 [-0.84 -0.17]	
Zhang 20 2019	1.11	0.65	14	2.07	0.55	14	1.5%	-1.58 [-2.06 -1.10]	
Zhu IM 2020	4.4	0.750	30	2.07	1 066	30	1 494	-1.00 [-2.00, -1.10]	
Zhu 3W 2020	1.1	0.739	30	2.03	0.74	20	1.4%	-0.55 [-1.55, -0.45]	
2110 20 2019	1.8	0.66	30	2.21	0.74	30	1.4%	-0.00 [-1.18, -0.14]	
Total (95% CI)			2460			2452	100 0%	0 73 [_0 22 0_2]	•
Hotorogeneity	14.01	- 400 -	2400	c0 /D	0.0000	2403	100.0%	-0.75 [-0.83, -0.63]	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = (	0.11; Chi	= 196.5	2, df =	09 (P <	0.0000.	1); 1 <sup>z</sup> = 6	00%		-4 -2 0 2 4
Loct for overall official: 7	∠ = 14.19	(P < 0.0	0001)						Favours [acupuncture+CR] Favours [CR]
rest for overall effect. 2									

with the CR (SMD = -0.56, 95% CI -1.31 to 0.18). Manual acupuncture (SMD = -0.74, 95% CI -0.84 to -0.64) and electroacupuncture (SMD = -0.71, 95% CI -0.96 to -0.46) combined with CR decreased greater MAS score than CR. For different positions of spasticity, acupuncture plus CR was better than CR in improving spasticity of both upper limbs (SMD = -0.74, 95% CI -0.87 to -0.61]) and lower limbs (SMD = -0.76, 95% CI -0.94 to -0.58). One study (54) reported that acupuncture treatment had long-term effect (3 months) in ameliorating spasticity.

#### Sensitivity analysis

As for primary outcome in the comparison of acupuncture plus CR vs. CR, we used three methods to verify the robustness of the result. By excluding studies one by one, we found that the pooled effect size of MAS score was stable (Figure 9). By synthesizing the data from studies



with unclear and explicit blinding of outcome evaluators respectively, the results demonstrated that acupuncture plus CR was superior to CR in relieving post-stroke spasticity (Figure 10). Moreover, the result was stable *via* merging studies with "some concerns" and "high risk of bias" separately (Figure 11).

Regarding the MAS score in the comparison of acupuncture vs. CR, as shown in Figure 12, the result altered when excluding Wu NA 2014 (48). As shown in Figure 13, we pooled data from studies with blinding of outcome assessors and the result changed.

#### Secondary outcomes

The pooled data of secondary outcomes are shown in Table 2. Meta-analysis showed that patients receiving acupuncture plus CR achieved better improvements on FMA and BI than those receiving CR alone. In addition, relevant





#### TABLE 1 Subgroup analyses of MAS score.

		MAS			
Subgroups	No. of studies	Effect size (95% Cl)	P-value	$I^2$	
Positions of spasticity					
Upper limbs	50	-0.74[-0.87, -0.61]	< 0.00001	72%	
Lower limbs	39	-0.76[-0.94, -0.58]	< 0.00001	81%	
Frequency of treatment					
Once a day	62	-0.75[-0.86, -0.64]	< 0.00001	66%	
Twice a day	5	-0.55[-0.85, -0.25]	< 0.001	46%	
Once every other day	2	-0.56[-1.31, 0.18]	0.14	76%	
Total sessions of treatment, session					
10-30	42	-0.65[-0.76, -0.55]	< 0.00001	44%	
30-60	17	-0.79[-1.06, -0.52]	< 0.00001	82%	
$\geq 60$	10	-0.97[-1.25, -0.69]	< 0.00001	66%	
Needle stimulation					
Manual acupuncture	49	-0.74[-0.84, -0.64]	< 0.00001	50%	
Electroacupuncture	21	-0.71[-0.96, -0.46]	< 0.00001	79%	
Follow-up time					
Immediately	70	-0.73[-0.83, -0.63]	< 0.00001	65%	
1 month after-treatment	2	-1.28[-1.98, -0.57]	< 0.001	79%	
3 months after-treatment	1	-1.17[-1.72, -0.62]	<0.00001	/	

MAS, Modified Ashworth Scale; 95% CI: 95% confidence interval.

indicators of surface electromyogram such as CCR and  $H_{max}/M_{max}$  indicated that acupuncture plus CR was effective in relieving the post-stroke spasticity in patients. We also found that acupuncture was better than CR in improving BI and the upper limbs of FMA and ER.

#### Adverse events

A total of 12 studies (33, 48, 60, 69, 75, 87, 88, 92, 94, 95, 106, 117) reported no treatment-related adverse events occurred, whereas, four studies (52, 54, 78, 118) explicitly reported adverse events, such as punctate hemorrhage (118), subcutaneous hematoma (52), subcutaneous ecchymosis (54), and needle syncope (52, 78).

#### Certainty of evidence

The ER of upper limbs and MAS score in comparison of acupuncture vs. CR was rated as "moderate" certainty of evidence, while the rest outcomes were considered as "low" or "very low". The certainty of evidence was downgraded primarily because of the high risk of bias of the included studies and inconsistency of results. A summary of findings table from the GRADE profiler is provided in Supplementary File 3 (Supplementary Figures S2, S3).

# Discussion

This SR and meta-analysis showed that acupuncture as an adjuvant therapy could effectively reduce MAS score, CCR, and  $H_{max}/M_{max}$ , and improve FMA and BI. Subgroup analysis demonstrated that once or twice a day acupuncture treatment and a greater total sessions of acupuncture treatment might be associated with better antispasmodic effects. Notably, 66 studies were evaluated as "high risk of bias," 22 studies were categorized as "some concerns," and publication bias might exist. Therefore, the above results should be treated with caution.

Our result showed that acupuncture exerted a better effect than CR in relieving post-stroke spasticity, which was consistent with the previous findings (13, 15, 16). As is known, the minimum clinically important difference (MCID) refers to the smallest change in the outcome measurements, which is considered to be clinically meaningful for patients (120). Chen et al. (120) reported the MCID of MAS with moderate clinical significance and high clinical significance were 0.48 and 0.76, respectively. The effect size of MAS (acupuncture plus CR vs. CR) in our study was 0.73, which indicated that acupuncture combined with CR had a moderate clinical effect to attenuate post-stroke spasticity.

The results of subgroup analysis demonstrated that acupuncture treatment one or two times a day was better than CR in alleviating spasticity after stroke, whereas acupuncture treatment once every other day showed no significant difference.

Omiting Yuo Y 2009       -0.738       -	Study	S	tandardised Mean Difference	SMD	95%-CI
Omiting Yun X 2000        0.73        0.87        0.88        0.88        0.73        0.88        0.88        0.73        0.88        0.88        0.73        0.88        0.73        0.88         -0.88         -0.73        0.88         -0.88         -0.73        0.88         -0.88         -0.73        0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.73         -0.88         -0.88         -0.72         -0.88         -0.82         -0.72         -0.88         -0.82         -0.72         -0.83         -0.82         -0.72         -0.83         -0.82         -0.72         -0.83         -0.82         -0.72         -0.83         -0.82         -0.72         -0.83         -0.82         -0.72         -0.83         -0.83         -0.83         -0.83         -0.83         -0.83         -0.83	Omitting Jiao 7H 2009		Ĩ	-0.736	[-0.839: -0.633]
Omitting Yam W 2010         -0.730         -0.035         -0.625	Omitting Yu JY 2009	-10-		-0.733	[-0.837; -0.629]
Omitting Wu W 2011         +         -0.722         [-0.838]-0.633]           Omitting Wu R 2013         -0.734         [-0.838]-0.632]           Omitting Cheng P 2015         -0.734         [-0.838]-0.632]           Omitting Ging Y 2018         -0.731         [-0.838]-0.632]           Omitting Ging Y 2019         -0.731         [-0.838]-0.632]           Omitting Fang W 2019         -0.731         [-0.838]-0.632]           Omitting Mang X 2019         -0.731         [-0.838]-0.632]           Omitting Mang X 2019         -0.731         [-0.838]-0.632]           Omitting Mang X 2019         -0.731         [-0.838]-0.622]           Omitting Wang X 2019         -0.731         [-0.838]-0.622]           Omitting Yang M 2020         -0.732         [-0.831]-0.622]           Omitting Yang X 2020         -0.732         [-0.831]-0.622]           Omitting Wang X C 2020         -0.731         [-0.8	Omitting Yan W 2010	-181-		-0.730	[-0.835; -0.625]
Omitting W1P 2011       -0.727       [-0.831-0.621]         Omitting Cheng P 2015       -0.728       [-0.831-0.621]         Omitting Cheng P 2015       -0.731       [-0.833-0.622]         Omitting Cheng P 2016       -0.731       [-0.833-0.622]         Omitting Cheng P 2016       -0.731       [-0.833-0.622]         Omitting Cheng V 2019       -0.731       [-0.836-0.622]         Omitting Kang XU 2019       -0.731       [-0.836-0.626]         Omitting Vang XU 2019       -0.731       [-0.836-0.626]         Omitting Vang XU 2019       -0.731       [-0.836-0.626]         Omitting Vang XU 2019       -0.731       [-0.836-0.626]         Omitting Yang ZU 2019       -0.731       [-0.836-0.626]         Omitting Yang ZU 2019       -0.731       [-0.831-0.622]         Omitting Yang ZU 2019       -0.731       [-0.831-0.622] </td <td>Omitting Wu W 2011</td> <td>120</td> <td></td> <td>-0.720</td> <td>[-0.824; -0.617]</td>	Omitting Wu W 2011	120		-0.720	[-0.824; -0.617]
Omitting Line J2 2013	Omitting Wu YH 2011	-181-		-0.737	[-0.839; -0.634]
Omiting Cing Y 2018       -0.721       -0.833       -0.623         Omiting Ving Y 2018       -0.731       -0.833       -0.623         Omiting Yang W 2019       -0.731       -0.838       -0.6221         Omiting Yang W 2019       -0.731       -0.838       -0.6221         Omiting Kang W 2019       -0.731       -0.838       -0.6221         Omiting Kang W 2019       -0.731       -0.638       -0.6221         Omiting Kang W 2019       -0.731       -0.638       -0.6221         Omiting Yang W 2019       -0.731       -0.638       -0.6221         Omiting Yang W 2019       -0.731       -0.638       -0.6221         Omiting Yang X0 2019       -0.731       -0.638       -0.731         Omiting Yang X0 2019       -0.731       -0.638       -0.721         Omiting Yang X0 2019       -0.731       -0.638       -0.721         Omiting Yang X0 2020       -0.721       -0.638       -0.721         Omiting Yang X0 2020       -0.721       -0.638       -0.721         Omiting Yang X0 2021       -0.721       -0.638       -0.721         Omiting Yang X0 2021       -0.722       -0.638       -0.731         Omiting Yang X0 2021       -0.732       -0.637       -	Omitting Hu DX 2013			-0.726	[-0.831; -0.621]
Omitaining Vang X* 2018	Omitting Cheng P 2015	100		-0.734	[-0.838; -0.631]
Omitting Fan WW 2019	Omitting Wang XY 2018	101		-0.720	[-0.835; -0.624]
Omitting Party VE 2019	Omitting Fan WW 2019			-0.731	[-0.836; -0.626]
Omitting Nag XV 2019        0.731         -0.832         -0.821           Omitting Nag XO 2019        0.731         -0.832         -0.821           Omitting Vang XO 2019        0.731         -0.832         -0.821           Omitting Vang XO 2019        0.731         -0.833         -0.821           Omitting Xu ZW 2019        0.731         -0.833         -0.821           Omitting Xu ZW 2019        0.731         -0.834         -0.824           Omitting Xu ZW 2019        0.731         -0.834         -0.824           Omitting Xu ZW 2019        0.731         -0.834         -0.824           Omitting Xu ZW 2019        0.731         -0.831         -0.821           Omitting Vang XC 2020        0.737         -0.831         -0.821           Omitting Vang XC 2020        0.731         -0.831         -0.821           Omitting Vang XC 2020        0.731         -0.831         -0.821           Omitting Vang XC 2020        0.731         -0.832         -0.831           Omitting Vang XC 2020        0.731         -0.732         -0.837         -0.832           Omitting Vang XC 2021        0.731         -0.732         -0.837<-0.822	Omitting Feng WF 2019	-		-0.727	[-0.832; -0.622]
Omitting Nong XQ 2019	Omitting Ma ZY b 2019	-160-		-0.731	[-0.836; -0.627]
Omitting Wang HQ 2019	Omitting Rong XQ 2019	-181-		-0.724	[-0.828; -0.619]
Omitting Varg X 2019	Omitting Wang HQ 2019	- 191		-0.731	[-0.835; -0.626]
Omitting Yang Xu 2019         -0.73         -0.83         -0.624           Omitting Zhang ZQ 2019         -0.731         -0.834         -0.624           Omitting Zhang ZQ 2019         -0.731         -0.834         -0.624           Omitting Yang ZQ 2019         -0.731         -0.834         -0.624           Omitting Yang ZQ 2019         -0.731         -0.834         -0.624           Omitting Yang XQ 2020         -0.737         -0.834         -0.624           Omitting Yang XQ 2021         -0.737         -0.835         -0.621           Omitting Yang XQ 2021         -0.737         -0.835         -0.621           Omitting Yang XQ 2021         -0.738         -0.839         -0.636           Omitting Yang XQ 2011         -0.721         -0.837         -0.638           Omitting Yang XQ 2011         -0.721         -0.731         -0.835         -0.622           Omitting Yang XQ 2011         -0.721 <td>Omitting Wang X 2019</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> <td>-0.727</td> <td>[-0.833; -0.621]</td>	Omitting Wang X 2019	100		-0.727	[-0.833; -0.621]
Omitting Zinag X2 2019         -0.73         -0.83         -0.63	Omitting Xu ZVV 2019	100		-0.729	[-0.834; -0.624]
Omiting Zhu Zi 2019         -0.73         -0.834         -0.621           Omiting Fang WF 2020         -0.73         -0.834         -0.621           Omiting Hav 2020         -0.73         -0.834         -0.624           Omiting Wang XC 2020         -0.73         -0.834         -0.624           Omiting Yang XC 2020         -0.73         -0.834         -0.624           Omiting Yang XC 2020         -0.736         -0.834         -0.624           Omiting Yang XC 2021         -0.736         -0.834         -0.624           Omiting Yang XC 2021         -0.736         -0.839         -0.633           Omiting Wang XC 2021         -0.736         -0.835         -0.625           Omiting Uang XC 2021         -0.736         -0.835         -0.625           Omiting Uang XC 2011         -0.732         -0.837         -0.627           Omiting Uang XC 2016         -0.738         -0.833         -0.623           Omiting Uang XC 2016         -0.731         -0.833         -0.623           Omiting Yang Y2016         -0.731         -0.833         -0.623           Omiting Yang Y2016         -0.724         -0.831         -0.621           Omiting Yang Y2018         -0.724         -0.831         -0.622 </td <td>Omitting Thang M 2019</td> <td>1011</td> <td></td> <td>-0.731</td> <td>[-0.813: -0.612]</td>	Omitting Thang M 2019	1011		-0.731	[-0.813: -0.612]
Omitting Feng WF 2020	Omitting Zhang ZG 2019	100		-0.729	[-0.813, -0.612]
Omitting Har Q 2020	Omitting Feng WF 2020	-100-		-0.733	[-0.837: -0.629]
Omiting He X 2020	Omitting Hao Q 2020	- 181		-0.729	[-0.834; -0.624]
Omiting Wang XC 2020      0.726       -0.831:-0.621         Omiting Xis S 2020      0.736       -0.839:-0.633         Omiting Wang ZX 2021      0.722       -0.839:-0.631         Omiting Wang ZX 2021      0.722       -0.826:-0.618         Omiting Zhang CX 2021      0.722       -0.839:-0.625         Omiting Zhang CX 2021      0.722       -0.826:-0.618         Omiting Zhang CX 2021      0.722       -0.826:-0.618         Omiting Wang LC 2021      0.722       -0.827:-0.627         Omiting Wang LC 2011      0.722       -0.828:-0.618         Omiting Wang LC 2011      0.722       -0.828:-0.628         Omiting Wang LC 2011      0.722       -0.828:-0.618         Omiting Gian S 2015      0.724       -0.838:-0.628         Omiting Gian S 2015      0.724       -0.833:-0.623         Omiting Gian S 2016       -0.731       -0.838:-0.628         Omiting Wang ZX 2018       -0.724       -0.838:-0.628         Omiting Xia J 2017       -0.724       -0.838:-0.628         Omiting Ma ZX 2018       -0.724       -0.838:-0.628         Omiting Gian S 2017       -0.721       -0.836:-0.628         Omiting Gian S 2018       -0.724       -0.826:-0.618	Omitting He X 2020	-101-		-0.727	[-0.832; -0.622]
Omiting Xie SM 2020       -0.734       -0.835       -0.639         Omiting Yin ZL 2020       -0.734       -0.839       -0.839       -0.839         Omiting Wang XL 2021       -0.736       -0.826       -0.618]         Omiting Zhang SH 2021       -0.736       -0.826       -0.618]         Omiting Zhang SH 2021       -0.732       -0.826       -0.618]         Omiting Zhang SH 2021       -0.732       -0.837       -0.827         Omiting Mang CX 2021       -0.732       -0.837       -0.827         Omiting Vang CX 2021       -0.732       -0.837       -0.627         Omiting Wang CX 2021       -0.732       -0.837       -0.627         Omiting Wang CX 2021       -0.732       -0.837       -0.623         Omiting Wang CX 2021       -0.732       -0.837       -0.623         Omiting Wang CX 2016       -0.731       -0.726       -0.837       -0.628         Omiting Wang Y 2016       -0.732       -0.836       -0.832       -0.832       -0.632         Omiting Gua XR 2018       -0.726       -0.831       -0.622       -0.831       -0.622         Omiting Gua XR 2018       -0.726       -0.831       -0.622       -0.831       -0.622       -0.731       -0.835       <	Omitting Wang XC 2020	-10-		-0.726	[-0.831; -0.621]
Omiting Yang S 2020       -0.724       -0.829       -0.633         Omiting Wang ZX 2021       -0.724       -0.826       -0.833         Omiting Zhang SH 2021       -0.724       -0.826       -0.818         Omiting Wang ZX 2021       -0.724       -0.824       -0.816         Omiting Zhang SH 2021       -0.723       -0.837       -0.837       -0.838         Omiting Wang LC a 2011       -0.733       -0.838       -0.838       -0.638         Omiting Wang LC a 2011       -0.732       -0.838       -0.628       -0.628	Omitting Xie SM 2020			-0.730	[-0.835; -0.625]
Omitting Yin ZL 2020       -0.738       -0.6389       -0.6389         Omitting Wang ZX 2021       -0.722       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Zhang CX 2021       -0.722       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Zhang CX 2021       -0.722       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Lu Y 2009       -0.738       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Lo Z 2011       -0.732       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Ling LG 2011       -0.732       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Ling XG 2012       -0.732       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Qins S 2015       -0.728       -0.738       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Qins S 2015       -0.728       -0.738       -0.837       -0.827         Omitting Qins S 2016       -0.731       -0.728       -0.833       -0.825         Omitting Vin Z2 2016       -0.721       -0.728       -0.831       -0.825         Omitting Xin J 2017       -0.731       -0.839       -0.831       -0.822         Omitting Xin J 2017       -0.731       -0.839       -0.821       -0.829       -0.821         Omitting Xin J 2017       -0.731       -0.726       -0.831       -0.822       -0.821       -0.821	Omitting Yang S 2020			-0.724	[-0.829; -0.619]
Omitting Vang Z 2021	Omitting Yin ZL 2020			-0.736	[-0.839; -0.633]
Omitting Yang SH 2021       -0.732       10.0337       -0.621         Omitting Zhang CX 2021       -0.732       10.0337       -0.621         Omitting Vang LC & 2011       -0.732       10.0337       -0.625         Omitting Vang LC & 2011       -0.732       10.0337       -0.627         Omitting Vang LC & 2011       -0.732       10.0337       -0.627         Omitting Qiang LC & 2011       -0.732       10.0337       -0.627         Omitting Qiang LC & 2015       -0.732       10.0337       -0.627         Omitting LU L 2016       -0.731       10.0335       -0.628         Omitting Su CH 2016       -0.732       10.0337       -0.628         Omitting VW C2016       -0.732       10.0337       -0.628         Omitting Li D 2017       -0.736       10.0337       -0.628         Omitting Xie JJ 2017       -0.736       -0.0387       -0.628         Omitting Xie JJ 2017       -0.726       10.0331       -0.622         Omitting Air X 2018       -0.727       10.0331       -0.628         Omitting Xie JJ 2017       -0.726       -0.726       10.0331       -0.628         Omitting Jia CJ 2018       -0.727       10.0331       -0.628       -0.628         Omittin	Omitting Wang ZX 2021	190		-0.722	[-0.826; -0.618]
Omitting Zhang CX 2021       -0.720       [-0.824; -0.616]         Omitting Wang LC a 2011       -0.738       [-0.839; -0.625]         Omitting Wang LC a 2011       -0.732       [-0.839; -0.625]         Omitting Wang LC a 2011       -0.732       [-0.839; -0.625]         Omitting Yang XC 2012       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting LL 2016       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting UL 2016       -0.731       [-0.839; -0.626]         Omitting UL 2016       -0.731       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting UL 2016       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.628]         Omitting UL 2016       -0.738       [-0.839; -0.626]         Omitting UL 2016       -0.738       [-0.839; -0.626]         Omitting VE BY 2016       -0.728       [-0.839; -0.626]         Omitting UL 2017       -0.736       [-0.839; -0.626]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.726       [-0.831; -0.622]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.727       [-0.832; -0.622]         Omitting Marg X 2018       -0.727       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Marg X 2018       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Marg X 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Marg 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.	Omitting Zhang SH 2021	100		-0.732	[-0.837: -0.627]
Omitting Lu JY 2009       →	Omitting Zhang CX 2021	- 100		-0.720	[-0.824: -0.616]
Omitting Wang LC a 2011	Omitting Lu JY 2009			-0.738	[-0.839; -0.636]
Omitting Wang LC b 2011       -0.722 [-0.827; -0.618]         Omitting Qian S 2015       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.623]         Omitting Lin FC 2016       -0.719 [-0.822; -0.616]         Omitting Qu F 2016       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Ye BY 2016       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.628]         Omitting Ye BY 2016       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Ye BY 2016       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.628]         Omitting Ye BY 2016       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.628]         Omitting Ye WC 2016       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.721 [-0.825; -0.617]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.724 [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.722 [-0.826; -0.618]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang X 2019       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang X 2020       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.	Omitting Wang LC a 2011	-181-		-0.730	[-0.835; -0.625]
Omitting Feng XG 2012	Omitting Wang LC b 2011	-181-		-0.722	[-0.827; -0.618]
Omitting Qian S 2015	Omitting Feng XG 2012			-0.732	[-0.837; -0.627]
Omitting Lin LC 2016	Omitting Qian S 2015	-181-		-0.728	[-0.833; -0.623]
Omitting Cu F 2016       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Ye W2 2016       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.623]         Omitting Ye W2 2016       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.628]         Omitting Ye W2 2016       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.628]         Omitting Ye W2 2016       -0.736       [-0.833; -0.621]         Omitting Ye W2 2016       -0.736       [-0.831; -0.621]         Omitting Xie JJ 2017       -0.736       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.724       [-0.826; -0.617]         Omitting Jia CJ 2018       -0.725       [-0.826; -0.626]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang R 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Wang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan YE 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Duan YE 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Duan YE 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.730	Omitting Lin FC 2016	- 100		-0.719	[-0.822; -0.616]
Omitting Gu C + 2016       -0.732       [-0.833, -0.623]         Omitting Ye WC 2016       -0.732       [-0.833, -0.623]         Omitting Ye WC 2016       -0.721       [-0.835, -0.628]         Omitting Jia C J 2017       -0.736       [-0.831, -0.628]         Omitting Liu G 2017       -0.736       [-0.831, -0.628]         Omitting Liu G 2017       -0.736       [-0.831, -0.628]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.726       [-0.831, -0.628]         Omitting Man ZX 2018       -0.726       [-0.826, -0.618]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.727       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Man J 2018       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Mary A 2019       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Mary A 2019       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Thu JM 2020       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731	Omitting Liu LL 2016	100		-0.731	[-0.836; -0.626]
Omitting Ye BY 2016       -0.732       [-0.837, -0.628]         Omitting Ye BY 2016       -0.721       [-0.837, -0.628]         Omitting Liu G 2017       -0.736       [-0.837, -0.628]         Omitting Kis JJ 2017       -0.736       [-0.837, -0.628]         Omitting Gua XR 2018       -0.726       [-0.837, -0.628]         Omitting Mar X 2018       -0.726       [-0.829, -0.620]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.727       [-0.835, -0.625]         Omitting Wang X 2019       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Mar X 2019       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Mar X 2020       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.627]         Omitting Mar Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.627]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.627]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.732       [-0.837, -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.627]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.732       [-	Omitting Qu F 2016	1		-0.730	[-0.833; -0.623]
Omitting Ye WC 2016       -0.721       [-0.825       -0.617]         Omitting Jia CJ 2017       -0.736       [-0.839       -0.626]         Omitting Xie JJ 2017       -0.736       [-0.839       -0.626]         Omitting Xie JJ 2017       -0.736       [-0.839       -0.626]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.726       [-0.831       -0.626]         Omitting Jia CJ 2018       -0.724       [-0.829       -0.620]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.731       [-0.835       -0.620]         Omitting Xu J 2018       -0.731       [-0.836       -0.626]         Omitting Marg XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836       -0.626]         Omitting Marg Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836       -0.626]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.731       [-0.835       -0.625]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.732	Omitting Ye BY 2016			-0.732	[-0.837: -0.628]
Omitting Jia CJ 2017       -0.726       -0.831; -0.621         Omitting Xie J 2017       -0.736       -0.736; -0.839; -0.622         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.726       -0.736; -0.626         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.726       -0.736; -0.626         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.726       -0.831; -0.622         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.726       -0.835; -0.626         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.727       -0.836; -0.626         Omitting Jia CJ 2019       -0.731       -0.835; -0.625         Omitting Jian XG 2019       -0.731       -0.836; -0.626         Omitting Wang X G 2019       -0.731       -0.836; -0.626         Omitting Wang X 2020       -0.731       -0.836; -0.627         Omitting Wang X 2020       -0.731       -0.836; -0.627         Omitting Dang FH 2021       -0.730       -0.836; -0.625         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.730       -0.738; -0.633         Omitting Liu D 2021       -0.731       -0.735; -0.838; -0.625         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       -0.733; -0.835; -0.625         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.736       -0.738; -0.631         Omitting Riug XM 2015       -0.696       -0.712       -0.835; -0.625         Omitting Riug XM 2015 <t< td=""><td>Omitting Ye WC 2016</td><td></td><td></td><td>-0.721</td><td>[-0.825: -0.617]</td></t<>	Omitting Ye WC 2016			-0.721	[-0.825: -0.617]
Omitting Liu G 2017       -0.736       -0.736       -0.639; -0.632]         Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.724       -0.622;       -0.724       -0.622;         Omitting Jia CJ 2018       -0.725       -0.832; -0.620]       -0.725       -0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Van J 2018       -0.726       -0.829; -0.620]       -0.726       -0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Wan J 2018       -0.727       -0.836; -0.626]       -0.726       -0.832; -0.622]         Omitting Li Q 2019       -0.731       -0.736; -0.832; -0.622]       -0.731       -0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Ma ZY a 2019       -0.731       -0.736; -0.835; -0.626]       -0.731       -0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Ma ZY a 2019       -0.731       -0.736; -0.835; -0.626]       -0.731       -0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Ma ZY a 2019       -0.731       -0.736; -0.835; -0.626]       -0.731       -0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ma ZY a 2019       -0.731       -0.736; -0.835; -0.624]       -0.731       -0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan G 2020       -0.731       -0.736; -0.835; -0.624]       -0.731       -0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.731       -0.736; -0.835; -0.624]       -0.731       -0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Li L D 2021       -0.735       -0.736; -0.835;	Omitting Jia CJ 2017	-18-		-0.726	[-0.831; -0.621]
Omitting Xie JJ 2017       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Guan XR       2018       -0.724       [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Jia CJ       2018       -0.725       [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Wang J       2018       -0.725       [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Wang J       2018       -0.721       [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Wang J       2018       -0.721       [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Ling ZO19       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Mag XG       2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Mag XG       2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Mag XG       2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Mag XG       2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Vang Q       2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan YF       2021       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.623]         Omitting Ling D       2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.623]         Omitting Ling L       2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.623]         Omitting Ling C       2016       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.623]         Omitting Kong JF 2017       -0.732       [-	Omitting Liu G 2017	-18-		-0.736	[-0.839; -0.632]
Omitting Guan XR 2018       -0.726 [-0.831; -0.622]         Omitting Jia ZX 2018       -0.724 [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Qi LL 2018       -0.725 [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Qi LL 2018       -0.725 [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Qi LL 2018       -0.727 [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Xu J 2018       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Li RQ 2019       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang X 2019       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang R 2020       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.624]         Omitting Li LD 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Li LD 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Li LD 2021       -0.731 [-0.835; -0.623]         Omitting Li LD 2021       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting King XL 2014       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735 [-0.838; -0.631]         Omitting Rom JF 2017       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Rom JF 2017       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting King XM 2014       -0.713 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Rom GF 2017       -0.714 [-0.	Omitting Xie JJ 2017	-181-		-0.731	[-0.836; -0.626]
Omitting Han ZX 2018       -0.724       [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Jia CJ 2018       -0.725       [-0.829; -0.620]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Jia CZ 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang R 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu L 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.833; -0.631]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.712       [-0.813; -0.612]         Omitting Rong JK 2015       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Rong JK 2015       -0.696       [-0.783; -0.624]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714       [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Mang L 2022       -0.724	Omitting Guan XR 2018			-0.726	[-0.831; -0.622]
Omitting Jia CJ 2018       -0.725       [-0.829; -0.520]         Omitting Wang J 2018       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Jiang XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Marg J 2018       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Marg XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Marg XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Marg XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Duen FH 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duen FH 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Li U LD 2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.833; -0.631]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.732       [-0.833; -0.631]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.620]         Omitting Marg XM 2015       -0.696       [-0.783] -0.612]         Omitting Marg XM 2015       -0.696	Omitting Han ZX 2018	- 100		-0.724	[-0.829; -0.620]
Omitting Varue J 2018       -0.722       [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Xu J 2018       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Li RQ 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang X 2 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang X 2 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang X 2 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Dung Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Dung FH 2021       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.624]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Lu LD 2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Lu LD 2021       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Rung JF 2017       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Rung XM 2015       -0.696       [-0.783; -0.613]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714       [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Man F 2022       -0.724<	Omitting Jia CJ 2018	1000		-0.725	[-0.829; -0.620]
Omitting Yuang Vang Q 2018       -0.727       [-0.832, -0.622]         Omitting Li RQ 2019       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Marg X 2020       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Wang R 2020       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Zhu JM 2020       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.626]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.627]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.627]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.731       [-0.836, -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.732       [-0.833, -0.623]         Omitting Liu X 2022       -0.732       [-0.833, -0.625]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.838, -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.838, -0.625]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.838, -0.626]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.838, -0.631]         Omitting King XM 2015       -0.696       [-0.783, -0.612]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714       [-0.811, -0.612]         Omitting Mang K 2022       -0.725	Omitting Wang 1 2018	100		-0.722	[-0.826, -0.616]
Omitting Jiang XG 2019       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang X2 020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang R 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Deng FH 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Rang L 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Rang L 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Rang L 2021       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Rang L 2021       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Rang L 2021       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Rang L 2021       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Rang L 2021       -0.735       [-0.838; -0.631]         Omitting Rung D 2016       -0.713       [-0.813; -0.612]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.696	Omitting Xu J 2018	101		-0.727	[-0.832; -0.622]
Omitting Li RQ 2019       -0.735       [-0.838; -0.631]         Omitting Wang R 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Zhu JM 2020       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.628]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Lin LD 2021       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Rhor CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       [-0.831; -0.612]         Omitting Ron JF 2017       -0.713       [-0.813; -0.612]         Omitting King XM 2015       -0.696       [-0.783; -0.628]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.724       [-0.828; -0.619]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724       [-0.830; -0.620]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724       [-0.830; -0.624]         -0.725       [-0.830; -0.624]       -0.724       [-0.830; -0.624]         -0.727       [-0.830; -0.6	Omitting Jiang XG 2019	- 100		-0.731	[-0.836; -0.626]
Omitting Ma ZY a 2019       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Wang R 2020       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Dung FH 2021       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.628]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Run Y 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Ren C 2021       -0.731 [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Ren GY 2022       -0.733 [-0.838; -0.631]         Omitting Ron JF 2017       -0.712 [-0.813; -0.613]         Omitting Wu NA 2015       -0.696 [-0.783; -0.608]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.720 [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724 [-0.828; -0.613]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.725 [-0.830; -0.620]         Matting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725 [-0.830; -0.624]         -0.727 [-0.830; -0.624]       -0.727 [-0.830; -0.624]	Omitting Li RQ 2019	-18-		-0.735	[-0.838; -0.631]
Omitting Wang R 2020       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Dung Yu JM 2020       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.624]         Omitting Dung FH 2021       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.624]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.624]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.730 [-0.835; -0.624]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.625]         Omitting Rung L 2021       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732 [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732 [-0.836; -0.626]         Omitting Ren GY 2022       -0.735 [-0.838; -0.631]         Omitting King XM 2015       -0.696 [-0.783; -0.613]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.720 [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Mu A F 2022       -0.724 [-0.836; -0.622]         Omitting Mang QS 2022       -0.725 [-0.830; -0.624]         Omitting Mang QS 2022       -0.725 [-0.830; -0.624]         Omitting Mang QS 2022       -0.727 [-0.830; -0.624]         Omitting Mang QS 2022       -0.727 [-0.830; -0.624]         -0.727 [-0.830; -0.624]       -0.727 [-0.830; -0.624] <td>Omitting Ma ZY a 2019</td> <td>-181</td> <td></td> <td>-0.731</td> <td>[-0.836; -0.626]</td>	Omitting Ma ZY a 2019	-181		-0.731	[-0.836; -0.626]
Omitting Yang Q 2020       -0.731       -0.731       -0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Dung C 2021       -0.734       -0.734       -0.828; -0.619]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.730       -0.730       -0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731       -0.731       -0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731       -0.730       -0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.731       -0.732       -0.731       -0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.731       -0.732       -0.732       -0.635; -0.625]         Omitting Liu X 2022       -0.732       -0.732       -0.635; -0.625]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       -0.626]       -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       -0.626]       -0.627]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.732       -0.732       [-0.833; -0.627]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.712       -0.712       [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.724       -0.724       [-0.828; -0.619]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.620]       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.624]         Omitting Man F 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.620]       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.62	Omitting Wang R 2020	-10-		-0.730	[-0.835; -0.625]
Omitting Zhu JM 2020	Omitting Yang Q 2020			-0.731	[-0.836; -0.627]
Omitting Deng FH 2021       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.624]         Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Zhang L 2021       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu X 2022       -0.730       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Rung D 2016       -0.731       [-0.838; -0.613]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.712       [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Wu NA 2015       -0.714       -0.714         Omitting Wu NA 2015       -0.720       [-0.823; -0.626]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714       [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Wu NA 2015       -0.720       [-0.823; -0.626]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.724       [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724       [-0.823; -0.620]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.624]         -0.720       [-0.830; -0.624]       -0.727         -0.5       0       0.5	Omitting Zhu JM 2020	-10		-0.724	[-0.828; -0.619]
Omitting Duan C 2021       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.625]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.731       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Liu LD 2021       -0.730       [-0.835; -0.623]         Omitting Liu X 2022       -0.732       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.713       [-0.813; -0.612]         Omitting Xing XM 2015       -0.712       [-0.813; -0.612]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714       -0.720         Omitting Ma F 2022       -0.724       -0.723         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.620]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.624]         -0.5       0       0.5	Omitting Deng FH 2021			-0.730	[-0.835; -0.624]
Omitting Duan YF 2021       -0.731 [-0.836; -0.627]         Omitting Zhang L 2021       -0.732 [-0.833; -0.623]         Omitting Li JX 2022       -0.732 [-0.833; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.733 [-0.838; -0.631]         Omitting Ron JF 2017       -0.713 [-0.813; -0.613]         Omitting Wung D 2016       -0.712 [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Wu NA 2015       -0.720 [-0.823; -0.626]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714 [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Mar F 2022       -0.720 [-0.823; -0.626]         Omitting Mar AF 2022       -0.724 [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Mar GS 2022       -0.725 [-0.830; -0.626]         Random effects model       -0.727 [-0.830; -0.624]	Omitting Duan C 2021	101		-0.730	[-0.835; -0.625]
Omitting Lut LD 2021       -0.726       [-0.835, -0.625]         Omitting Li JX 2022       -0.732       [-0.836, -0.625]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       [-0.838, -0.631]         Omitting King JX 2016       -0.713       [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Wu NA 2015       -0.696       [-0.783; -0.608]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.720       [-0.823; -0.613]         Omitting Mu AF 2022       -0.724       [-0.828; -0.619]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.624]         -0.5       0       0.5	Omitting Duan YF 2021	10.03		-0.731	[-0.836; -0.627]
Omitting Li JX 2022       -0.732       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       [-0.837; -0.627]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.713       [-0.813; -0.613]         Omitting Wun X 2015       -0.712       [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.714       [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.720       [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.724       [-0.826; -0.627]         Random effects model       -0.727       [-0.830; -0.624]	Omitting Theng L 2021	101		-0.720	[-0.835; -0.625]
Omitting Ren CY 2022       -0.735       [-0.838; -0.631]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.713       [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Wing XM 2015       -0.714       [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.724       [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724       [-0.830; -0.624]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.624]	Omitting Li IX 2022	101		-0.732	[-0.837: -0.627]
Omitting Huang D 2016       -0.713       [-0.813; -0.613]         Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.712       [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Xing XM 2015       -0.696       [-0.783; -0.608]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714       [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.720       [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724       [-0.823; -0.612]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.624]         Random effects model       -0.5       0       0.5	Omitting Ren CY 2022			-0.735	[-0.838: -0.631]
Omitting Rong JF 2017       -0.712 [-0.811; -0.612]         Omitting Xing XM 2015       -0.696 [-0.783; -0.608]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714 [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.720 [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724 [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725 [-0.830; -0.624]         Random effects model       -0.5         -0.5       0       0.5	Omitting Huang D 2016	- 100		-0.713	[-0.813; -0.613]
Omitting Xing XM 2015       -0.696       [-0.783; -0.608]         Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714       [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.720       [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Xhang QS 2022       -0.724       [-0.826; -0.619]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.727 [-0.830; -0.624]         Random effects model       -0.5       0       0.5	Omitting Rong JF 2017	100		-0.712	[-0.811; -0.612]
Omitting Wu NA 2014       -0.714       -0.714       [-0.814; -0.613]         Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.720       [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724       [-0.828; -0.619]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.620]         Random effects model       -0.727       [-0.830; -0.624]         -0.5       0       0.5	Omitting Xing XM 2015	-		-0.696	[-0.783; -0.608]
Omitting Guo LL 2022       -0.720 [-0.823; -0.616]         Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724 [-0.828; -0.619]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725 [-0.830; -0.624]         Random effects model       -0.5 0 0.5	Omitting Wu NA 2014	10000		-0.714	[-0.814; -0.613]
Omitting Ma AF 2022       -0.724 [-0.828; -0.619]         Omitting Zhang QS 2022       -0.725 [-0.830; -0.620]         Random effects model       -0.5 0 0.5	Omitting Guo LL 2022			-0.720	[-0.823; -0.616]
Contraining 2 hang QS 2022       -0.725       [-0.830; -0.624]         Random effects model       -0.5       0       0.5	Omitting Ma AF 2022	100		-0.724	[-0.828; -0.619]
Random effects model -0.5 0 0.5	Omitting Zhang QS 2022	- 100		-0.725	[-0.830; -0.620]
-0.5 0 0.5	Random effects model	~		-0.727	[-0.830; -0.624]
			· · · · ·		

Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% Cl	I IV. Random, 95% CI
6.1.1 Explicit blinding	of evalu	uator	- 1042 (10)			errouit de			10.000 (10.000) (10.000 (10.00
Duan C 2021	1.2	1.005	41	1.79	1.105	39	1.6%	-0.55 [-1.00, -0.11]	
Hu DX 2013	2.57	0.871	28	3.38	1.02	28	1.4%	-0.84 [-1.39, -0.29]	
Jia CJ 2017	1.62	0.82	26	2.3	0.735	25	1.3%	-0.86 [-1.43, -0.28]	
Jia CJ 2018	1.65	0.86	34	2.445	0.83	32	1.4%	-0.93 [-1.44, -0.42]	
LI RQ 2019	1.63	1.033	30	1.83	1.053	30	1.4%	-0.19 [-0.70, 0.32]	
Lin FG 2016	1.03	0.555	30	1.8	0.61	30	1.3%	-1.30 [-1.86, -0.74]	
Liu LL 2016	2.14	0.743	29	2.5	0.694	28	1.4%	-0.49 [-1.02, 0.03]	
Lu JY2009	0.626	1.021	30	0.553	0.906	30	1.4%	0.07 [-0.43, 0.58]	
Oing X 20190	1.03	1.00	20	1.05	1.04	20	1.270	-0.44 [-1.07, 0.19]	
Quing 1 2016	2.1	0.96	20	2.67	0.022	30	1.2%	-0.60 [-1.31, -0.04]	
Wang HO 2019	1.55	0.645	30	1.915	0.734	29	1.4%	-0.52 [-1.04 -0.00]	
Wang R 2020	1.67	0.897	35	2.17	0.867	35	1.5%	-0.56 [-1.04, -0.08]	
Wang XC 2020	0.76	0.61	33	1.29	0.63	34	1.5%	-0.84 [-1.35, -0.34]	
Yang M 2019	1.33	0.59	36	1.69	0.82	36	1.5%	-0.50 [-0.97, -0.03]	
Yang Q 2020	0.8	0.9	30	1.27	1.103	30	1.4%	-0.46 [-0.97, 0.05]	
Yin ZL 2020	0.84	0.46	25	0.88	0.51	25	1.3%	-0.08 [-0.64, 0.47]	
Zhang CX 2021	2.088	0.63	70	3.14	1.13	70	1.8%	-1.14 [-1.50, -0.79]	
Zhang SH 2021	1.41	0.6	70	1.75	0.73	70	1.8%	-0.51 [-0.84, -0.17]	
Zhang ZQ 2019	1.11	0.65	44	2.07	0.55	44	1.5%	-1.58 [-2.06, -1.10]	2
Subtotal (95% CI)			691			685	28.8%	-0.66 [-0.83, -0.48]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	0.09; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 47.54	1, df = 1	9 (P = 0	.0003);	$l^2 = 609$	6		
Test for overall effect: 2	2 = 7.29	(P < 0.00)	0001)						
64 5 U									
6.1.2 Unclear blinding	or evalu	uator		0.00			1.00	0.1// 0.70 0.7	
Cheng P 2015	2.79	0.81	18	2.92	1 25	19	1.2%	-0.14 [-0.78, 0.51]	
Duon VE 2021	1.965	1.092	00	2.085	1.25	00	1./%	-0.01 [-0.98, -0.24]	
Ean WW 2010	1.0/	0.816	30	1.02	1.003	30	1.470	-0.47 [-0.98, 0.05]	
Feng WF 2019	2.40	0.010	30	3.2	1.014	30	1.0%	-0.00 [-1.00, -0.01]	
Feng WE 2010	1 27	1.02	30	1.63	1.07	30	1 4%	-0.34 [-0.85 0.17]	
Feng XG 2012	1 205	1.004	100	1.71	1.043	100	1.9%	-0.49[-0.77 -0.21]	
Guan XR 2018	1.89	0.994	19	2.95	1.433	19	1.1%	-0.84 [-1.51, -0.17]	
Guo LL 2022	0.48	0.504	60	1.22	0.739	60	1.7%	-1.16 [-1.55, -0.77]	
Han ZX 2018	1.13	0.819	30	2.2	1.349	30	1.4%	-0.95 [-1.48, -0.41]	
Hao Q 2020	1.87	0.47	36	2.23	0.62	36	1.5%	-0.65 [-1.12, -0.17]	
He X 2020	0.9	1.07	20	1.7	0.92	20	1.2%	-0.79 [-1.43, -0.14]	
Huang D 2016	1.68	0.63	20	2.71	0.32	20	1.0%	-2.02 [-2.80, -1.24]	
Jiang XG 2019	1.33	0.884	30	1.8	0.961	30	1.4%	-0.50 [-1.02, 0.01]	
Jiao ZH 2009	0.885	0.879	31	1	0.994	30	1.4%	-0.12 [-0.62, 0.38]	
Li JX 2022	1.805	0.839	72	2.265	1.024	72	1.8%	-0.49 [-0.82, -0.16]	
Liu G 2017	1.57	1.155	60	1.83	1.167	60	1.8%	-0.22 [-0.58, 0.14]	
Liu LD 2021	1.03	0.999	30	1.7	0.952	30	1.4%	-0.68 [-1.20, -0.16]	
Ma AF 2022	0.74	0.857	42	1.86	1.354	42	1.6%	-0.98 [-1.43, -0.53]	
Ma ZY 2019a	1.28	1.051	50	1.86	1.246	50	1.7%	-0.50 [-0.90, -0.10]	
QILL 2018	1.23	1.006	30	2.47	1.167	30	1.4%	-1.12 [-1.67, -0.58]	
Qian 5 2015	0.3	1 1 90	35	0.9	1.065	30	1.4%	-0.71 [-1.22, -0.21]	
Ren CT 2022	1 60	1.109	30	3.133	1.309	30	1.470	-0.19 [-0.69, 0.32]	
Rong JF 2017 Rong XO 2019	2 20	0.50	20	3.12	0.30	25	1.176	-1.91 [-2.59, -1.25]	
Su CH 2016	0.87	1.008	30	1.67	1 269	30	1.4%	-0.69[-1.210.17]	
Wang 1 2018	2.5	0.9	30	2 97	0.795	31	1.4%	-0.55[-1.06 -0.04]	
Wang LC 2011a	1.7	1.643	30	2.6	1,499	30	1.4%	-0.56 [-1.08, -0.05]	
Wang LC 2011b	1.11	1.173	37	2.58	1.538	36	1.5%	-1.07 [-1.56, -0.57]	
Wang T 2021	1.8125	0.524	30	2.239	0.458	30	1.4%	-0.86 [-1.39, -0.33]	
Wang X 2019	1.83	0.53	90	2.215	0.461	90	1.9%	-0.77 [-1.07, -0.47]	-
Wang XY 2018	1.45	0.808	32	1.95	1.008	32	1.5%	-0.54 [-1.04, -0.04]	
Wang ZX 2021	1.38	0.46	30	1.97	0.59	30	1.4%	-1.10 [-1.65, -0.56]	
Wu N 2014	6.64	1.489	30	8.91	1.155	29	1.3%	-1.68 [-2.28, -1.08]	
Wu W 2011	3.76	0.42	30	4.35	0.53	30	1.3%	-1.22 [-1.77, -0.66]	
Wu YH 2011	2.1	0.8	30	2.13	0.9	30	1.4%	-0.03 [-0.54, 0.47]	
Xie JJ 2017	1.93	1.304	45	2.62	1.248	45	1.6%	-0.54 [-0.96, -0.12]	
Xie SM 2020	1.67	1.18	30	2.3	1.09	30	1.4%	-0.55 [-1.06, -0.03]	
Xing XM 2015	2.51	0.17	30	3.07	0.11	30	0.8%	-3.86 [-4.74, -2.98]	
Xu J 2018	2.3	0.735	25	2.94	0.843	24	1.3%	-0.80 [-1.38, -0.21]	
Xu ZW 2019	2	2	30	3	1	30	1.4%	-0.62 [-1.14, -0.11]	
Yan W 2010	0.87	0.831	40	1.369	0.891	41	1.6%	-0.57 [-1.02, -0.13]	
Yang S 2020	2.1	0.49	29	2.59	0.5	29	1.4%	-0.98 [-1.52, -0.43]	
Ye BY 2016	1.78	1.29	30	2.315	1.334	30	1.4%	-0.40 [-0.91, 0.11]	
Yu IV 2000	1.3/	0.765	30	2.3/	1.104	30	1.4%	-1.10[-1.71, -0.61]	
Zhang L 2024	1.81	1 1 1 1 4	24	4.130	1 909	21	1.3%	-0.51 [-0.90, 0.28]	
Zhang C 2021	0.955	0.60	30	17	0.90	30	1.4%	-0.00 [-1.07, -0.04]	
Zhu JM 2020	0.900	0.09	30	2 02	1.066	30	1 4%	-0.00 [-1.40, -0.40]	
Zhu Z.I 2019	1.8	0.66	30	2 27	0.74	30	1 4%	-0.66 [-1.18 -0.14]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	1.0	0.00	1777	2.21	0.14	1768	71.2%	-0.76 [-0.880.63]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = (	13 Ch	2 = 148 4	G df =	49 (P -	0 0000	1)  2 = 0	7%	arra [ araa, -araa]	
Test for overall effect: 7	= 12 12	- 140.0	00001	70 (P <	0.0000	<i>h</i> 1' = 6	10.00		
, cot for overall ellebt. 2	- 12.12	0 -00							20
Total (95% CI)			2468			2453	100.0%	-0.73 [-0.83, -0.63]	•
Matagenerative Tou? - (	).11; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 196.5	52, df =	69 (P <	0.0000	1);  2 = 6	5%		
Heterogeneity: Tau* = t		P < 0.0	00011	5633W		4600 - 5			-4 -Z U Z 4
Test for overall effect: 2	= 14.19	11 0.1	100017						Equoure Jacupuncture+CP1 Equoure ICP1
Test for overall effect: 2 Test for subgroup differ	c = 14.19 ences: C	Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.8	36. df =	1 (P = 0	.35). I <sup>2</sup>	= 0%			Favours [acupuncture+CR] Favours [CR]

Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random. 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
11.1.1 some concerns	menn			mean		1.9101			
Duan C 2021	1.2	1.005	41	1.79	1.105	39	1.6%	-0.55 [-1.000.11]	
Hu DX 2013	2.57	0.871	28	3.38	1.02	28	1.4%	-0.84 [-1.39, -0.29]	
Jia CJ 2017	1.62	0.82	26	2.3	0.735	25	1.3%	-0.86 [-1.43, -0.28]	
LI RQ 2019	1.63	1.033	30	1.83	1.053	30	1.4%	-0.19 [-0.70, 0.32]	
Lin FC 2016	1.03	0.556	30	1.8	0.61	30	1.3%	-1.30 [-1.86, -0.74]	
Lu JY2009	0.626	1.021	30	0.553	0.906	30	1.4%	0.07 [-0.43, 0.58]	
Ma ZY 2019b	1.63	0.28	20	2.13	1.54	20	1.2%	-0.44 [-1.07, 0.19]	
Qing Y 2018	1.15	1.09	20	1.95	1.23	20	1.2%	-0.67 [-1.31, -0.04]	
Qu F 2016	2.1	0.96	30	2.67	0.922	30	1.4%	-0.60 [-1.12, -0.08]	
Wang HQ 2019	1.55	0.645	30	1.915	0.734	29	1.4%	-0.52 [-1.04, -0.00]	
Wang R 2020	1.67	0.897	35	2.17	0.867	35	1.5%	-0.56 [-1.04, -0.08]	
Yang M 2019	1.33	0.59	36	1.69	0.82	36	1.5%	-0.50 [-0.97, -0.03]	
Yang Q 2020	0.84	0.9	30	0.88	0.51	30	1,470	-0.46 [-0.97, 0.05]	
7hm2L 2020	1 11	0.46	20	2.07	0.51	25	1.5%	-1.58 [-2.06 -1.10]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	1.11	0.00	455	2.07	0.00	451	20.9%	-0.61 [-0.83, -0.38]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	12; Chi = 5.37 (	e = 37.10 P < 0.00	), df = 1 0001)	4 (P = 0	.0007);	l <sup>2</sup> = 62 <sup>4</sup>	%	- 18.1 - 20 - 20	
11.1.2 high risk of bias									
Cheng P 2015	2.79	0.81	18	2.92	1	19	1.2%	-0.14 [-0.78, 0.51]	
Deng FH 2021	1.965	1.092	60	2.685	1.25	60	1.7%	-0.61 [-0.98, -0.24]	<b>T</b>
Duan YF 2021	1.67	1.061	30	2.17	1.053	30	1.4%	-0.47 [-0.98, 0.05]	
Fan WW 2019	1.45	0.816	32	1.92	1.014	32	1.5%	-0.50 [-1.00, -0.01]	
Feng WF 2019	2.3	0.7	30	3.2	1.5	30	1.4%	-0.76 [-1.28, -0.23]	
Feng WF 2020	1.27	1.02	30	1.63	1.07	30	1.4%	-0.34 [-0.85, 0.17]	
Feng XG 2012	1.205	1.004	100	1.71	1.043	100	1.9%	-0.49 [-0.77, -0.21]	
Guan XR 2018	1.89	0.994	19	2.95	1.433	19	1.1%	-0.84 [-1.51, -0.17]	
Guo LL 2022	0.48	0.504	60	1.22	0.739	60	1.7%	-1.16 [-1.55, -0.77]	
Han 2X 2018	1.13	0.819	30	2.2	1.349	30	1.4%	-0.95 [-1.48, -0.41]	
Hat Q 2020	1.87	1.07	30	1.23	0.02	30	1.0%	-0.05 [-1.12, -0.17]	
Huana D 2016	1.69	0.62	20	2 71	0.92	20	1.2.70	-0.78[-1.43, -0.14]	
lia C I 2018	1.65	0.86	34	2 445	0.83	32	1.4%	-2.02 [-2.00, -1.24]	
Jiang XG 2019	1.33	0.884	30	1.8	0.961	30	1.4%	-0.50 [-1.02, 0.01]	
Jiao ZH 2009	0.885	0.879	31	1	0.994	30	1.4%	-0.12 [-0.62, 0.38]	
Li JX 2022	1.805	0.839	72	2.265	1.024	72	1.8%	-0.49 [-0.82, -0.16]	-
Liu G 2017	1.57	1.155	60	1.83	1.167	60	1.8%	-0.22 [-0.58, 0.14]	
Liu LD 2021	1.03	0.999	30	1.7	0.952	30	1.4%	-0.68 [-1.20, -0.16]	
Liu LL 2016	2.14	0.743	29	2.5	0.694	28	1.4%	-0.49 [-1.02, 0.03]	
Ma AF 2022	0.74	0.857	42	1.86	1.354	42	1.6%	-0.98 [-1.43, -0.53]	
Ma ZY 2019a	1.28	1.051	50	1.86	1.246	50	1.7%	-0.50 [-0.90, -0.10]	
Qi LL 2018	1.23	1.006	30	2.47	1.167	30	1.4%	-1.12 [-1.67, -0.58]	
Qian S 2015	0.3	0.52	35	0.9	1.085	30	1.4%	-0.71 [-1.22, -0.21]	
Ren CY 2022	2.9	1.189	30	3.135	1.309	30	1.4%	-0.19 [-0.69, 0.32]	
Rong JF 2017	1.68	0.56	25	2.61	0.38	25	1.1%	-1.91 [-2.59, -1.23]	
Rong XQ 2019	2.29	1.009	24	3.12	1.000	25	1.3%	-1.03 [-1.62, -0.43]	
Wang 12019	0.07	1.000	30	2.07	0.705	30	1.4470	-0.09 [-1.21, -0.17]	
Wang LC 2011a	17	1 643	30	2.01	1 499	30	1.4%	-0.55 [-1.08 -0.05]	
Wang LC 2011b	1 11	1 173	37	2.58	1.538	36	1.5%	-1 07 [-1 56 -0 57]	
Wang T 2021	1 8125	0.524	30	2 239	0.458	30	1.4%	-0.86 [-1.39 -0.33]	
Wang X 2019	1.83	0.53	90	2.215	0.461	90	1.9%	-0.77 [-1.07, -0.47]	
Wang XC 2020	0.76	0.61	33	1.29	0.63	34	1.5%	-0.84 [-1.35, -0.34]	
Wang XY 2018	1.45	0.808	32	1.95	1.008	32	1.5%	-0.54 [-1.04, -0.04]	
Wang ZX 2021	1.38	0.46	30	1.97	0.59	30	1.4%	-1.10 [-1.65, -0.56]	
Wu N 2014	6.64	1.489	30	8.91	1.155	29	1.3%	-1.68 [-2.28, -1.08]	
Wu W 2011	3.76	0.42	30	4.35	0.53	30	1.3%	-1.22 [-1.77, -0.66]	
Wu YH 2011	2.1	0.8	30	2.13	0.9	30	1.4%	-0.03 [-0.54, 0.47]	
Xie JJ 2017	1.93	1.304	45	2.62	1.248	45	1.6%	-0.54 [-0.96, -0.12]	
Xie SM 2020	1.67	1.18	30	2.3	1.09	30	1.4%	-0.55 [-1.06, -0.03]	
Xing XM 2015	2.51	0.17	30	3.07	0.11	30	0.8%	-3.86 [-4.74, -2.98]	
Xu J 2018	2.3	0.735	25	2.94	0.843	24	1.3%	-0.80 [-1.38, -0.21]	
Xu ZW 2019	0.07	0.024	30	1 200	0.004	30	1.4%	-0.62 [-1.14, -0.11]	
Tan W 2010 Vana S 2020	0.87	0.831	40	2.50	0.691	41	1.6%	-0.57 [-1.02, -0.13]	
Ye BY 2016	1 79	1.20	29	2.09	1 994	29	1.4%	-0.90 [-1.52, -0.43]	
Ye WC 2016	1 37	0.765	30	2 37	0.928	30	1 4%	-1.16[-1.710.61]	
Yu JY 2009	1.81	0.967	24	2.135	1.104	21	1.3%	-0.31 [-0.90, 0.28]	
Zhang CX 2021	2 088	0.63	70	3 14	1 13	70	1.8%	-1 14 [-1 50 -0 79]	
Zhang L 2021	1	1.114	30	1.7	1.368	30	1.4%	-0.55 [-1.07, -0.04]	
Zhang QS 2022	0.955	0.69	31	1.7	0.89	30	1.4%	-0.93 [-1.46, -0.40]	
Zhang SH 2021	1.41	0.6	70	1.75	0.73	70	1.8%	-0.51 [-0.84, -0.17]	
Zhu JM 2020	1.1	0.759	30	2.03	1.066	30	1.4%	-0.99 [-1.53, -0.45]	
Zhu ZJ 2019	1.8	0.66	30	2.27	0.74	30	1.4%	-0.66 [-1.18, -0.14]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			2013			2002	79.1%	-0.76 [-0.87, -0.64]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	11; Chi = 13.17	° = 157.3 (P < 0.0	l5, df = 10001)	54 (P <	0.0000	1); l² = (	36%		
Total (95% CI)			2460			2452	100.0%	.0 73 [.0 93 .0 63]	
Hotomassaithe T-uite C	11.05	2 - 100 -	2408	0.0	0.0000	2453	100.0%	-0.75 [-0.83, -0.63]	
neterogeneity: rau* = 0.	= 14 40	- 190,5	2, UT =	09 (P<	0.0000	1), 14 = 6	1070		-4 -2 0 2 4
Test for overall offect.	- 14.12	11 - 0.0	(1000						Favours Jacupuncture+CR1 Eavours [CR]
Test for overall effect: Z	nnee. P	hi2 = 4 4	6 df -	1 (P - 0	221 12	= 34 50			ravous lacabaliciais, and in avous ford



Sensitivity analysis by excluding studies one by one for MAS score (acupuncture vs. CR).

	acu	punctu	re		CR		S	td. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
6.2.1 Explicit blinding	g of eval	luator							100
He J 2019	1.55	1.1	47	2	0.95	50	13.2%	-0.44 [-0.84, -0.03]	
Qu F 2016	2.6	0.814	30	2.67	0.922	30	8.4%	-0.08 [-0.59, 0.43]	
Wang XC 2020	1.24	0.7	33	1.29	0.63	34	9.4%	-0.07 [-0.55, 0.40]	
Zhang SH 2021	1.69	0.66	72	1.75	0.73	70	19.9%	-0.09 [-0.41, 0.24]	
Zhang ZM 2008	0.77	1.194	30	1.03	1.326	30	8.4%	-0.20 [-0.71, 0.30]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			212			214	59.2%	-0.18 [-0.37, 0.01]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	2.20, df =	= 4 (P =	0.70);	$1^2 = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.83	(P = 0.	07)						
6.2.2 Unclear blindin	g of eva	luator							
Chen M 2011	1.23	0.971	30	1.27	0.828	30	8.4%	-0.04 [-0.55, 0.46]	
Jiao ZH 2009	1.24	1.059	33	1	0.994	30	8.7%	0.23 [-0.27, 0.73]	
Su CH 2016	1.47	1.106	30	1.67	1.269	30	8.4%	-0.17 [-0.67, 0.34]	
Wang J 2018	2.63	0.928	30	2.97	0.795	31	8.4%	-0.39 [-0.90, 0.12]	
Wu N 2014	7.405	1.376	29	8.91	1.155	29	6.9%	-1.17 [-1.73, -0.61]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			152			150	40.8%	-0.27 [-0.50, -0.04]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	14.95, dt	f=4 (P	= 0.005	5); l <sup>2</sup> = 7	'3%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.31	(P = 0.	02)						
Total (95% CI)			364			364	100.0%	-0.22 [-0.36, -0.07]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	17.52, di	f=9 (P	= 0.04)	; l <sup>2</sup> = 49	%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.88	(P = 0.	004)						-Z -1 U 1 Z
Test for subaroup diffe	erences:	Chi <sup>2</sup> = (	).37. df	= 1 (P =	= 0.54).	$ ^2 = 0\%$			Favours [acupuncture] Favours [CR]
URE 13									
nsitivity analysis has	od on b	linding	ofout	como	200000	ar lacu	nuncturo		

The possible explanation was that, as the prolongation of treatment interval, the effector substance gradually attenuated and the therapeutic effect was unsustainable (121). Besides, our result suggested that more sessions of acupuncture treatment might yield greater effect to relieve spasticity. This result might be attributed to the cumulative effect of acupuncture. Notwithstanding, considering apparent heterogeneity and high risk of bias, rigorous clinical trials are required to explore the

optimal protocol of acupuncture treatment for spasticity in the future.

As the spasticity worsens, movement function and daily activities of patients would be unavoidably affected. Our results showed that acupuncture plus CR enhanced motor function and activities of daily living in patients with spasticity following stroke. The MCID of FMA of upper limbs and lower limbs were 4.48 and 3.31, separately, the MCID of

Outcomes	No. of studies	Effect size (95% CI)	P-value	$I^2$
Acupuncture plus CR vs.	. CR			
ER-U	18	RR 1.31[1.15, 1.50]	< 0.0001	78%
ER-L	10	RR 1.15[1.01, 1.32]	< 0.05	67%
FMA-U	36	MD 5.56[4.42, 6.71]	< 0.00001	89%
FMA-L	23	MD 3.68[2.72, 4.65]	< 0.00001	86%
BI	50	MD 8.61[6.76, 10.45]	< 0.00001	90%
iEMG	6	SMD 1.49[-0.05, 3.02]	0.06	97%
CCR	3	SMD -2.42[-4.69, -0.15]	< 0.05	97%
RMS	5	SMD 0.02[-1.31, 1.35]	0.97	97%
CSS	3	MD -0.15[-1.47, 1.16]	0.82	77%
CSI	10	MD -1.59[-2.17, -1.01]	< 0.00001	92%
H <sub>max</sub> /M <sub>max</sub>	3	SMD -0.75[-1.01, -0.49]	< 0.00001	9%
Acupuncture vs. CR				
ER-U	5	RR 1.08[0.97, 1.21]	0.16	0%
CSI	3	MD -0.97[-2.23, 0.3]	0.13	79%
FMA-U	9	MD 2.87[0.46, 5.28]	< 0.05	84%
FMA-L	4	MD 0.14[-0.92, 1.19]	0.8	0%
BI	9	MD 4.27[0.67, 7.88]	< 0.05	69%

TABLE 2 Meta-analysis of secondary outcomes.

No. of studies, number of studies; MD, mean difference; SMD, standardized mean difference; RR, relative risk; CR, conventional rehabilitation; 95% CI: 95% confidence interval; ER-U, effective rate of upper limb; ER-L, effective rate of lower limb; FMA-U: Fugl–Myer Assessment of upper limb; FMA-L, Fugl–Myer Assessment of lower limb; BI, Barthel Index; iEMG, integral electromyography; CCR, co-contraction rate; RMS: root mean square; CSS, composite spasticity scale; CSI, clinical spasticity index; H<sub>max</sub>/M<sub>max</sub>: ratio of maximum H reflex to maximum M response.

BI was 1.85 (122, 123). The effect size of FMA of upper limbs and lower limbs (acupuncture plus CR vs. CR) were 5.56 and 3.68, respectively, and the effect size of BI was 8.61 in our study, which demonstrated that the effects of acupuncture plus CR in improving FMA and BI were clinically meaningful.

Several problems existed in the RCTs of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity, for example, no blinding of patients and outcome assessors, without objective outcome measures, lack of follow-up, and absence of detailed acupuncture protocol. Such problems hinder us from comprehensively and objectively evaluating the authentic efficacy of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity. Hence, sham acupuncture should be set as comparison. Additionally, it is crucial to assess spasticity with objective indicators to obtain objective data. Future studies should also focus on the long-term effect of acupuncture for spasticity after stroke. To improve the reporting quality, researchers should report studies in accordance with the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (124) and STRICTA (27).

This is the latest SR and meta-analysis that comprehensively evaluated the effectiveness and safety of acupuncture for

post-stroke spasticity. The protocol of this SR and metaanalysis was registered in advance. This SR and meta-analysis was conducted strictly in accordance with AMSTAR 2.0 and reported complying with PRISMA 2020. However, some limitations should also be acknowledged. First, we used MAS score as the primary outcome measure, which is a subjective assessment scale, unclear blinding of outcome assessors and explicit blinding of outcome assessors separately, measurement bias was inevitable. Second, the published language of included RCTs in this SR and meta-analysis was limited to Chinese or English, hence, language bias might exist. Third, the overall risk of bias of the included studies was evaluated as "high risk of bias" and "some concerns."

# Conclusion

Acupuncture could be recommended as adjuvant therapy for spasticity after stroke. However, due to the high risk of bias and heterogeneity of the included studies, the effectiveness of acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity remains to be confirmed.

### Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

# Author contributions

RJ, JL, and YF designed the study. DZ designed the search strategy. WT and JS selected the studies. CXu and YL extracted the data. CJ and YZ assessed the risk of bias and reporting quality. XL, HZ, and CXi analyzed the data. CXu, CJ, and YZ wrote and drafted the manuscript. All authors approved the manuscript.

# Funding

This study was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant no. 81674047), the Sichuan Province Science and Technology Program (grant no. 2019YFS0019), and the Sichuan Province Science and Technology Support Program (grant no. 2014SZ0154).

# References

1. Kuo CL, Hu GC. Post-stroke spasticity: a review of epidemiology, pathophysiology, and treatments. *Int J Gerontol.* (2018) 12:280-4. doi: 10.1016/j.ijge.2018.05.005

2. Young RR. Spasticity: a review. Neurology. (1994) 44:S12-20.

3. Ward AB. A literature review of the pathophysiology and onset of post-stroke spasticity. *Eur J Neurol.* (2012) 19:21-7. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-1331.2011.03448.x

4. Kwon S, Park JH, Kim WS, Han K, Lee Y, Paik NJ. Health-related quality of life and related factors in stroke survivors: data from Korea national health and nutrition examination survey (KNHANES) 2008 to 2014. *PLoS One.* (2018) 13:e0195713. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195713

5. Barnes M, Kocer S, Murie Fernandez M, Balcaitiene J, Fheodoroff K. An international survey of patients living with spasticity. *Disabil Rehabil.* (2017) 39:1428–34. doi: 10.1080/09638288.2016.1198432

6. Lundström E, Smits A, Borg J, Terént A. Four-fold increase in direct costs of stroke survivors with spasticity compared with stroke survivors without spasticity: the first year after the event. *Stroke.* (2010) 41:319–24. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.109.558619

7. Thibaut A, Chatelle C, Ziegler E, Bruno MA, Laureys S, Gosseries O. Spasticity after stroke: physiology, assessment and treatment. *Brain Inj.* (2013) 27:1093–105. doi: 10.3109/02699052.2013.804202

8. Montané E, Vallano A, Laporte JR. Oral antispastic drugs in nonprogressive neurologic diseases: a systematic review. *Neurology.* (2004) 63:1357-63. doi: 10.1212/01.wnl.0000141863.52691.44

9. Dressler D, Bigalke H. Immunological aspects of botulinum toxin therapy. *Expert Rev Neurother*. (2017) 17:487–94. doi: 10.1080/14737175.2017.1262258

10. NIH Consensus Conference. Acupuncture. Jama. (1998) 280:1518-24.

11. Chavez LM, Huang SS, MacDonald I, Lin JG, Lee YC, Chen YH. Mechanisms of acupuncture therapy in ischemic stroke rehabilitation: a literature review of basic studies. *Int J Mol Sci.* (2017) 18:2270. doi: 10.3390/ijms18112270

12. Lim SM, Yoo J, Lee E, Kim HJ, Shin S, Han G, et al. Acupuncture for spasticity after stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med.* (2015) 2015;870398. doi: 10.1155/2015/870398

# **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

### Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

### Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/ fneur.2022.942597/full#supplementary-material

13. Cai YY, Zhang CS, Liu SN, Wen ZH, Zhang AL, Guo XF, et al. Electroacupuncture for post-stroke spasticity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* (2017) 98:2578–89. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.03.023

14. Fan WJ, Kuang X, Hu JW, Chen XW, Yi W, Lu LM, et al. Acupuncture therapy for post-stroke spastic hemiplegia: a systematic review and metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials. *Complement Ther Clin Pract.* (2020) 40:13. doi: 10.1016/j.ctcp.2020.101176

15. Zhang J, Zhu L, Tang Q. Electroacupuncture with rehabilitation training for limb spasticity reduction in post-stroke patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Top Stroke Rehabil.* (2020) 5:1–22. doi: 10.1080/10749357.2020. 1812938

16. Zhu JM, Zhuang R, He J, Ding YQ, Jiang LL. Acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training in the treatment of hemiplegic upper limb spasm after stroke: a meta-analysis. *Chin J Integrat Med Cardio-Cerebrovasc Dis.* (2021) 19:1892–8.

17. Park SW, Yi SH, Lee JA, Hwang PW, Yoo HC, Kang KS. Acupuncture for the treatment of spasticity after stroke: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Altern Complement Med.* (2014) 20:672–82. doi: 10.1089/acm.2014.0097

18. Yang L, Tan JY, Ma H, Zhao H, Lai J, Chen JX, et al. Warm-needle moxibustion for spasticity after stroke: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Nurs Stud.* (2018) 82:129–38. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2018.03.013

19. Li Y. Acupuncture and Moxibustion for Spastic Paralysis After Stroke: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials [Master thesis]. Heilongjiang University of Chinese Medicine Haerbin, China (2017).

20. Shi LH, Guo LX, Zhang HL, Li YX, Zhong DL, Xiao QW, et al. Acupuncture for post-stroke spasticity: a protocol of a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*. (2019) 98:e17124. doi: 10.1097/md.000000000017124

21. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomized or non-randomized studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *Bmj.* (2017) 358:j4008. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4008

22. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj.* (2021) 372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

23. Balci BP. Spasticity measurement. Noro Psikiyatr Ars. (2018) 55:S49-53. doi: 10.29399/npa.23339

24. Birch S, Lee MS, Kim TH, Alraek T. Historical perspectives on using sham acupuncture in acupuncture clinical trials. *Integr Med Res.* (2022) 11:100725. doi: 10.1016/j.imr.2021.100725

25. Zhang B, Kang J, Chen XM. Methods to combine standard deviations of different subgroups in meta-analysis. *Chin J Evid Based Med.* (2016) 16:851–4. doi: 10.7507/1672-2531.20160130

26. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.3 (2022). Available online at: www.training.cochrane.org/handbook

27. MacPherson H, Altman DG, Hammerschlag R, Youping L, Taixiang W, White A, et al. Revised standards for reporting interventions in clinical trials of acupuncture (STRICTA): extending the CONSORT statement. *J Altern Complement Med.* (2010) 16:St1-14. doi: 10.1089/acm.2010.1610

28. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized trials. *Bmj.* (2019) 366:14898. doi: 10.1136/bmj.14898

29. Ludbrook, J. Practical statistics for medical research. *Aust NZ J Surg.* (1991) 61:12. doi: 10.1111/j.1445-2197.1991.tb00019.x

30. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Falck-Ytter Y, Flottorp S, et al. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *Bmj.* (2004) 328:1490. doi: 10.1136/bmj.328.7454.1490

31. Shi LT. Clinical Study of Electroacupuncture Combined With Exercise Therapy for Lower Limb Spasm After Stroke [Master thesis]. Heilongjiang: Academy of Traditional Chinese Medicine Haerbin (2004).

32. He J. Surface Electromyography Observe of Different Frequent Electric Acupuncture [Master thesis]. Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine Guangzhou, China (2008).

33. Zhang ZM, Feng CL, Pi ZK, Fan XY, Chen HQ, Zhang J. Observation on clinical therapeutic effect of acupuncture on upper limb spasticity in the patient of poststroke. *Chin Acup Moxib*. (2008) 28:257–60.

34. Chu GX, Yi XQ. Clinical research of electroacupuncture combined with rehabilitation therapy in the treatment of spastic paralysis of apoplexy. *J Hubei Trad Chin Med.* (2009) 31:13–4. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1000-0704.2009.08.006

35. Jiao ZH. Regulate Effects of Yin-Yang Balancing Penetration Acupuncture on Treating Ischemic Patients With Muscle Tension A Randomized Controlled Clinical Observation [Master thesis]. Shanghai University of Chinese Medicine Shanghai, China (2009).

36. Lu JY. The Corresponds and Central Axis Acupuncture Treatment on Muscle Spasm, Motor Function and ADL of Stroke Patients With Hemiplegia [Master thesis]. Wenzhou Medical University Wenzhou, China (2009).

37. Yu JY. Therapeutic observation of electroacupuncture and rehabilitation therapy for post-stroke spasm. *J Ext Therapy of Trad Chin Med.* (2009).

38. Ni HH. Clinical observation on the treatment of post-stroke upper limb spasticity by acupuncture plus rehabilitation. *Shanghai J Acup Moxib*. (2010) 29::767–9. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-0957.2010.12.767

39. Xu YL. Jing JJ. Effect of acupuncture on F wave amplitude of median nerve of hemiplegic upper limb muscle spasm and therapeutic effect. *Chin J Viral Dis.* (2010) 12:44–6. doi: 10.16505/j.2095-0136.2010.01.013

40. Yan W. Therapeutic observation of electroacupuncture and rehabilitation therapy for muscle spasm following cerebral infarction. *Chin J Phys Med Rehabil.* (2010) 32:139–41. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0254-1424.2010.02.017

41. Chen M. The Clinical Research on Regulation of Flaccid Paralysis and Spastic Paralysis After Cerebral Infarction by Acupuncture of Regulation of Yin-Yang Balancing Penetration [Doctoral thesis]. Shanghai University of Chinese Medicine Shanghai, China (2011).

42. Wang LC. A control study of acupuncture Neiguan combined with Bobath rehabilitation training in the treatment of whole hand muscle spasm after stroke. *Chin J Infom Tradit Chin Med.* (2011) 18:82. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-5304.2011.06.040

43. Wang LC. Clinical research on acupuncture Neiguan combined with rehabilitation training in the treatment of hand muscle spasm after stroke. *Chin J Integrat Med Cardio-Cerebrovasc Dis.* (2011) 9:689–90. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-1349.2011.06.026

44. Wu W. Combined acupuncture and rehabilitation training for post-stroke strephenopodia. *Shanghai J Acup Moxib.* (2011) 30:321–3. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-0957.2011.05.321

45. Wu YH, Zhu GQ, Shao Y, Zuo B, Hu R, Zhong XY. Observation on the efficacy of acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on hand function recovery of patients with cerebral infarction. *Proceedings of 2011 Annual Conference of Chinese Society of Acupuncture and Moxibustion*. Beijing (2011). p. 45–9.

46. Feng XG. Clinical observation of acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training in the treatment of cerebral apoplexy spasm paralysis. *Contemporary Med.* (2012) 18:83–4. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-4393.2012.27.055

47. Hu DX, Peng H. Effect of rehabilitation training combined with scalp acupuncture on muscle tension and nerve function in patients with limb spasm after cerebral infarction. *Pract Clin Med.* (2013) 14:25–9. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-8194.2013.07.010

48. Wu N. Therapeutic study of abdominal acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on hemiplegia and spasm of ischemic stroke [Master thesis]. Shanxi College of Traditional Chinese Medicine Taiyuan, China. (2014).

49. Cheng P. Clinical research on transcranial direct current stimulation and electrical acupuncture therapy for upper limb spasticity after stroke. *Chin Arch Tradit Chin Med.* (2015) 33:1994–7. doi: 10.13193/j.issn.1673-7717.2015.08.061

50. Qian S, Zhang LJ, Fu XP. Observation on the preventive effect of acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on the increase of hind limb muscular tension in stroke. *J Sichuan Trad Chin Med.* (2015) 33:144–6.

51. Xing XM. Acupuncture and moxibustion combined with rehabilitation treatment of 30 case of spastic hemiplegia after ischemic stroke. *J Liaoning Trad Chin Med.* (2015) 42:595–7. doi: 10.13192/j.issn.1000-1719.2015.03.062

52. Yao XH. A Clinical Study on the Treatment of Spastic Paralysis After Ischemic Stroke by a Acupuncture Method Called "Three Parts as a Whole" [Master thesis]. Gansu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine Lanzhou, China (2015).

53. Huang D, Zhong Y, Yi N, Zhang HF. Electroacupuncture of scalp motor area and foot motor sensory area combined with manipulative treatment for spastic hemiplegia of upper limbs after cerebral apoplexy. *Pract Clin Med.* (2016) 17:13–5.

54. Lin FC. Clinical Research on Effect of Treating the Upper Limb Spasticity Caused by Stroke Using Contralateral Needling and Rehabilitation Training [Master thesis]. Chengdu University of Chinese Medicine Chengdu, China (2016).

55. Liu LL, Xu YL. Clinical study of Jingjin Aligning Needling combined with rehabilitation exercise treatmenting upper limb spasm after cerebral apoplexy. *Proceedings of the 12th Annual National Conference on Integrative Medicine and Neurology*. Lanzhou (2016). p. 128–33.

56. Qu F, Min Y, Liu YW, Huang Z. Effect of acupuncture combined with vibroacoustic therapy on upper limb spasticity post stroke. *Chin J Rehabil Theory Pract.* (2016) 22:927–31. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1006-9771.2016.08.010

57. Su CH. Clinical study of acupuncture combined with rood therapy for poststroke upper limb functional disorder. *J Guangzhou Trad Chin Med.* (2016) 33:35– 8. doi: 10.13359/j.cnki.gzxbtcm.2016.01.010

58. Ye BY, Lin Y, Kang JJ. Clinical observation of twelve Jing Acupoints Acupuncture and rehabilitation on muscle tension increase after cerebral apoplexy. *Nei Mongol J Trad Chin Med.* (2016) 35:71–2. doi: 10.16040/j.cnki.cn15-1101.2016.03.083

59. Ye WC, Wang J, Pei J, Chen YJ. Therapeutic observation of acupuncture at Waiguan (TE5) and Zhigou (TE6) for post-stroke hand spasm. *Shanghai J Acup Moxib.* (2016) 35:935–8. doi: 10.13460/j.issn.1005-0957.2016.08. 0935

60. Jia CJ, Zhang HR, Ni GX, Zhang YA, Su B, Xu XL. Spasmodic hemiplegia after stroke treated with scalp acupuncture, music therapy and rehabilitation: a randomized controlled trial. *Chin Acup Moxib*. (2017) 37:1271–5. doi: 10.13703/j.0255-2930.2017.12.005

61. Li BJ, Hou Q, Wang XN. Observation on the effect of antagonistic acupuncture combined with modified constraint-induced movement therapy in upper limb spasticity after acute cerebral infarction. *China Medical Herald.* (2017) 14:97–100.

62. Liu G, Gong P, Liu Y, Shi S, Han SW. Clinical study of needling antagonistic muscle with electro-acupuncture combined with bobath therapy in the treatment of strephenopodia after stroke. *J Clin Acu Mox.* (2017) 33:9–12. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-0779.2017.12.003

63. Rong JF, Huang QM, Liu L, Wang WN, Zhu HW, Shi W. Effects of acupuncture at myofascial trigger points on spastic foot drop and inversion after stroke. *Chin J Rehabil Theory Pract.* (2017) 23:591-4. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1006-9771.2017.05.022

64. Su CH, Zhang JS, Tang MF. Effects of acupuncture combined with Rood therapy on the efficacy, motor function and ability of daily living in patients with ankle dysfunction after stroke. *J Sichuan Trad Chin Med.* (2017) 35:183–5.

 $\,$  65. Xie JJ, Sun Q, Li JX. Effect of electroacupuncture antagonistic muscle acupoint combined with rehabilitation training on patients with

upper limb spasm after stroke. Chin J Rehabil Med. (2017) 32:1417-9. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1001-1242.2017.12.022

66. Deng SJ, Zhu D. The effect of acupuncture du meridian combined with occupational therapy on upper limb motor function in stroke patients. *China Modern Doctor*. (2018) 56:120–3.

67. Guan XR. The Clinical Observation of Scalp-Acupuncture Combined With DMS Treating Upper Extremity Muscle Tension After Stroke [Master thesis]. Xinjiang Medical University Urumqi, China. (2018).

68. Han ZX, Chen WH, Zhou YX, Qi LL, Lu JJ, Xu WJ, et al. Effect of interactive scalp acupuncture on balance function in spastic hemiplegia after stroke. *Chin J Rehabil Med.* (2018) 33:948–52. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1001-1242.2018.08.013

69. Jia CJ. Clinical Study on Scalp Acupuncture Combined With Music Therapy For Spastic Hemiplegia After Stroke [Doctoral thesis]. Nanjing University of Chinese Medicine Nanjing, China. (2018).

70. Qi LL, Han ZX, Zhou YX, Chen WH, Chu LX, Lu JY, et al. Dynamic scalp acupuncture combined with PNF therapy for upper limb motor impairment in ischemic stroke spastic hemiplegia. *Chin Acup Moxib.* (2018) 38:234–8. doi: 10.13703/j.0255-2930.2018.03.002

71. Qing Y, Huang DE, Kang GH, Liu Y, Lin MN. Effect observation on repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation at scalp acupoints on spastic hemiplegia of upper extremity after stroke. *Rehabil Med.* (2018) 28:21–5. doi: 10.3724/SP.J.1329.2018.06021

72. Qiu LF. Clinical Study of Abdominal Acupuncture Combined With Bobath Therapy in the Treatment of Spastic Paralysis of the Upper Limb After Stroke [Master thesis]. Guangxi University of Chinese Medicine Nanning, China. (2018).

73. Wang J, Bao YX, Xiang YM, Hao CH, Hou ZP. Observation of curative effect of acupuncture of unblocking meridians and releasing spasticity plus rehabilitation on upper limb spastic paralysis after stroke. *Mod J Integr Trad Chin Western Med.* (2018) 27:699–702. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-8849.2018.07.005

74. Wang XY, Zhang HF. Effects of electroacupuncture stimulating projection zone of decussation of pyramid on muscular hypertonia after stroke. *J Shanghai Trad Chin Med.* (2018) 52:46–9. doi: 10.16305/j.1007-1334.2018.11.013

75. Xu J, Zhang J, Wei L, Yang FM, Han RX, Liu J. Clinical observation of "relieving spasm and correcting deviation" acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on the treatment of hemiplegia spasm. *Chin J Integrat Med Cardio-Cerebrovasc Dis.* (2018) 16:2782–5. doi: 10.12102/j.issn.1672-1349.2018.19.005

76. Fan WW, Wang XY, Zhang HF. Clinical study on electroacupuncture at conical cross-projection region for increased muscle tone due to stroke. *J New Chin Med.* (2019) 51:178–81. doi: 10.13457/j.cnki.jncm.2019.01.047

77. Feng WF, Mai FY, Zeng SJ, Du SJ, Dou YX. Effect observation on acupuncture combined with extracorporeal shock wave in the treatment of gastrocnemius spasm after stroke. *J Yunnan Trad Chin Med.* (2019) 40:60–1. doi: 10.16254/j.cnki.53-1120/r.2019.02.024

78. He J, Yan MM. Clinical observation of hand three needles combined with temporal three needles in the treatment of stroke patients with hand dysfunction. *Lishizhen Med Mat Medica Res.* (2019) 3:377-80. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-0805.2019.02.038

79. Jiang XG. The Clinical Study of Scalp Acupuncture Combined With MOTOmed Intelligent Training on Spasticity of Lower Limbs After Stroke [Master thesis]. Anhui University of Traditional Chinese Medicine Hefei, China (2019).

80. Li RQ, Liu CM, Xi JM, Feng HX, Liu FL, Feng XD. Effects of electro-acupuncture at Du meridian in stroke patients with upper-extremity spasticity and its character of sEMG. *Chin J Rehabil Med.* (2019) 34:1157–61. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1001-1242.2019.10.004

81. Ma ZY. Effect of acupuncture plus low-frequency neuromuscular electrical stimulation on limb function in cerebral stroke patients with lower-limb hemiplegia. *Shanghai J Acup Moxib.* (2019) 38:964–8. doi: 10.13460/j.issn.1005-0957.2019.09.0964

82. Ma ZY, Xu MF, Yu XF. Clinical study on scalp acupuncture combined with mirror therapy for spastic paralysis of upper limbs due to stroke. *J New Chin Med.* (2019) 51:182–5. doi: 10.13457/j.cnki.jncm.2019.01.048

83. Rong XQ. Effect of Acupuncture Combine With DMS on Walking Ability of Patients With Foot Drooping After Stroke [Master thesis]. Xinjiang Medical University Urumqi, China. (2019).

84. Wang HQ, Hou M, Bao CL, Min L, Li H. Effects of acupuncture treatment on lower limb spasticity in patients following hemorrhagic stroke: a pilot study. *Eu neurol.* (2019) 81:5–2. doi: 10.1159/000499133

85. Wang X, Hu ZG, Dai CH, Chen XY, Zhan Y. Effect of acupuncture and functional exercise on recovery of patients with cerebral apoplexy and recovery of

cerebral blood flow and function. Chin Arch Tradit Chin Med. (2019) 37:2588-91. doi: 10.13193/j.issn.1673-7717.2019.11.005

86. Xu ZW. Observation on the Efficacy of Huangdi NeiZhen Combined With New Bobath Technique in Hemiplegic Lower Extremity Spasm After Stroke [Master thesis]. Guangxi University of Chinese Medicine Nanning, China. (2019).

87. Yang M. Clinical Study of Convalescent Upper Extremity Spasm in Stroke Patients Treated by Head Acupuncture and Bobath [Master thesis]. Yunnan University of Chinese Medicine Kunming, China (2019).

88. Zhang ZQ. Clinical Study on Acupuncture at "Feng Fascia Point" to Relieve Hand Spasm After Stroke [Master thesis]. Shanghai University of Chinese Medicine Shanghai, China (2019).

89. Zhu ZJ, Xiao HB, Chen RQ, Rao ML, Chen DD, Liu HS. Effects of scalp acupuncture interaction MOTOmed intelligent motor training on lower limb spasm and motor function in stroke patients with hemiplegia. J Anhui Med. (2019) 40:642–5. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1000-0399.2019.06.012

90. Duan C, Li ZL, Xia WG, Zheng CJ, Zhang YP, Li SC. Effect of acupuncture plus mirror therapy on upper limb functional recovery in stroke patients. *Neural Injury and Functional Reconstruction*. (2020) 15:155–8. doi: 10.16780/j.cnki.sjssgncj.2020.03.009

91. Feng WF, Xian CJ, Yuan J, Mai FY. Clinical research on electroacupuncture combined with extracorporeal shock wave in the treatment of gastrocnemius spasm after stroke. *Henan Tradit Chin Med.* (2020) 40:1281–4.

92. Guo QQ, Zhao H, Huang ZY, Zhang Y, Gou CY, Wang YG. Observation on the effect of dynamic needle retention on upper arm flexor spasm after stroke. *J Emerg Tradit Chin Med.* (2020) 29:882–4. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1004-745X.2020.05.037

93. Hao Q, Hao CH, Zhuang H, Xia MF. Clinical observation on effect of electroacupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on poststroke strephenopodia. *J Shangdong Trad Chin Med.* (2020) 39:957–60. doi: 10.16295/j.cnki.0257-358x.2020.09.012

94. He X. Clinical Observation of Acupuncture Combined With Whole Body Vertical Vibration in the Treatment of Triceps Spasm After Cerebral Apoplexy [Master thesis]. Hunan University of Chinese Medicine Changsha, China. (2020).

95. Wang R. Clinical Research of Acupuncture on Antagonistic Muscles Combined With Rehabilitation Training for Treatment of Spastic Hemiplegia After Stroke [Master thesis]. Liaoning University of Traditional Chinese Medicine Shenyang, China. (2020).

96. Wang XC, Liu T, Wang JH, Zhang JJ. Post-stroke hand spasm treated with penetrating acupuncture combined with kinesiotherapy: a randomized controlled trial. *Chin Acup Moxib*. (2020) 40:21–5. doi: 10.13703/j.0255-2930.20190106-k0003

97. Xie SM, Li JX. Clinical study on effects of electroacupuncture (EA) by reciprocal inhibition method on upper limb spasticity post-stroke. *Chin Manip Rehabil Med.* (2020) 11:11–6. doi: 10.19787/j.issn.1008-1879.2020.03.004

98. Yang Q, Ni L. Rehabilitation effects of acupuncture combined with mirror feedback therapy on the rehabilitation of lower limb spasm in patients with cerebral apoplexy. *World Chin Med.* (2020) 15:2983–7. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1673-7202.2020.19.027

99. Yang S. Clinical Application and Time-Dependent Effect Study of Eye Acupuncture and Rehabilitation Training in Spasm of Cerebral Apoplexy [Doctoral thesis]. Liaoning University of Traditional Chinese Medicine Shenyang, China (2020).

100. Yin ZL, Meng ZX, Ge S, Zhang MJ, Huang LH. Clinical observation of dynamic scalp acupuncture combined with task-oriented mirror therapy for upper limbs function impairment in patients with hemiplegia after ischemic stroke. *Chin Acup Moxib*. (2020) 40:918–22. doi: 10.13703/j.0255-2930.20190819-0001

101. Zhang Q, Qing H, Song YN, Gao LJ. Application effect of acupuncture and modern rehabilitation exercise therapy in the cerebral vascular disease of upper limb with spasmodic pattern. *China Medical Herald.* (2020) 17:152–9.

102. Zhu JM, Zhuang R, He J, Wang XX, Wang H, Zhu HY. Yin-yang balance penetrating acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on upper limb spasticity in stroke hemiplegia. *Chin Acup Moxib*. (2020) 40:697–701. doi: 10.13703/j.0255-2930.20190531-k0005

103. Deng FH. Acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training to treat 60 cases of spastic hemiplegia after stroke. *J Guangxi Univer Chin Med.* (2021) 24:35–8. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.2095-4441.2021.02.011

104. Duan C, Li ZL, Xia WG, Zheng CJ, Zhang PY Li SC. Effect of "Nourishing Liver and Kidney" acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on upper limb functional recovery in stroke patients. *J Clin Acu Mox.* (2021) 37:15–9. doi: 10.19917/j.cnki.1005-0779.021027

105. Duan YF, Li YH, Sun WJ, Li Y, Yan RR, Chen SQ, et al. Observation on therapeutic effect of yuan-source points and collateral-points combination with

rehabilitation training on hand spasm after stroke. *Mod J Integr Trad Chin Western Med.* (2021) 30:497–501. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-8849.2021.05.009

106. Liu LD. Clinical Study of Needling in Antagonistic Muscle Combined With Rehabilitation Exercise in the Treatment of Upper Limb Spasm After Stroke [Master thesis]. Changchun University of Chinese Medicine Changchun, China. (2021).

107. Song YJ, Zhang DQ, Xu SB, Jia J, Qu YY, Sun XW. Therapeutic research of extracorporeal shock wave combined with acupuncture on lower limb spasm after stroke. *Neural Inj Funct.* (2021) 16:414–22. doi: 10.16780/j.cnki.sjssgncj.20201247

108. Wan ZX, Luo Q. Clinical effect of Hegu penetration acupuncture Houxi point in the treatment of increased muscle tension of whole hand after cerebral infarction and its influence on the daily activity ability of patients. *Clin Res Pract.* (2021) 6:125–7. doi: 10.19347/j.cnki.2096-1413.202122038

109. Wang T, Liu K, Li PF, Sun PY, Wu J, Liu H. Clinical efficacy of acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training in treatment of ischemic stroke. *Chin Arch Tradit Chin Med.* (2021) 39:215–8. doi: 10.13193/j.issn.1673-7717.2021.08.052

110. Zhang CX, Wang YL, Zhang SH, Li QF, Liang WR, Pan XH, et al. Effects of scalp acupuncture combined with intelligent upper-limb feedback training for post-stroke upper-limb spasticity. *Shanghai J Acup Moxib*. (2021) 40:937–44. doi: 10.13460/j.issn.1005-0957.2021.08.0937

111. Zhang L, Ran MH, Xin GL, Wang L, Guan Y, Guo XJ, et al. Effect of acupuncture-rehabilitation method on muscle tension and motor function in patients with post-stroke lower limb spasm. *J Clin Acu Mox.* (2021) 37:34–8. doi: 10.19917/j.cnki.1005-0779.021158

112. Zhang SH, Wang YL, Zhang CX, Xiao P, Li QF, Pan XH, et al. Combining scalp acupuncture with feedback can relieve post-stroke spasticity and paralysis of the lower extremities. *Chin J Phys Med Rehabil.* (2021) 43:787–92. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0254-1424.2021.09.004

113. Huang H, Chen J, Qiu F, Lin XM, Lin ZK. Effect of electroacupuncture on motor function and gait in patients with post-stroke spasticity in lower limbs. *Chin Acup Moxib*. (2022) 42:23–7. doi: 10.13703/j.0255-2930.20201201-k0004

114. Li JX, Zheng J. Clinical observation antispasmodic balanced acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on spasmodic hemiplegia after stroke. *Chin J Tradit Med Sci Technol.* (2022) 29:119–21. Available online at: https://knscnki-net-443.webvpn.cams.cn/kcms/detail.detail.aspx?dbcode=CJFD&dbname= CJFDLAST2022&filename=TJYY202201052&uniplatform=NZKPT&v=-EdV-GZVRok-8bNAYYkiXdzc159JGTBatDLNo5SPcDflEpObEjNk8fa2Q2YCtnE0 115. Ren CY. Acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on clinical effect, CSI and MAS score of patients with limb spasm after cerebral apoplexy. *Trad Chin Med Res.* (2022) 35:12–5. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1001-6910.2022. 02.04

116. Guo LL, Liu J. Effect of acupuncture in the treatment of patients with poststroke upper limb hemiplegia and its influence on limb motor function. *China Medical Herald.* (2022) 19.

117. Ma AF, Xing YS. Effects of acupuncture combined with rehabilitation training on the electromyographic physiological indicators and motor function rehabilitation in patients with post-stroke plastic hemiplegia. *Shanghai J Acup Moxib.* (2022) 41:213–8. doi: 10.13460/j.issn.1005-0957.2022.03. 0213

118. Zhang QS, Zhang Y, Ji GC, Xu XH, Wang YF, Song BL. Clinical observation on cluster acupuncture at scalp points combined with exercise therapy in treatment of limb spasm after stroke. *Chin Acup Moxib*. (2022) 42:377–80. doi: 10.13703/j.0255-2930.20210506-k0001

119. Hui KK, Nixon EE, Vangel MG, Liu J, Marina O, Napadow V, et al. Characterization of the "deqi" response in acupuncture. *BMC Complement Altern Med.* (2007) 7:33. doi: 10.1186/1472-6882-7-33

120. Chen CL, Chen CY, Chen HC, Wu CY, Lin KC, Hsieh YW, et al. Responsiveness and minimal clinically important difference of modified ashworth scale in patients with stroke. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med.* (2019) 55:754–60. doi: 10.23736/s1973-9087.19.05545-x

121. Zong CS. Clinical significance of study on time-effect relationship of acupuncture. J Clin Acu Mox. (2008) 3:1–3.

122. Chen R, WU J, Shen X. A research on the minimal clinically important differences of Chinese version of the Fugl-Meyer motor scale. J Anhui Med Univ. (2015) 50:519–22. doi: 10.19405/j.cnki.issn1000-1492.2015.04.025

123. Hsieh YW, Wang CH, Wu SC, Chen PC, Sheu CF, Hsieh CL. Establishing the minimal clinically important difference of the Barthel Index in stroke patients. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* (2007) 21:233–8. doi: 10.1177/1545968306 294729

124. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, CONSORT. 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials. *Ann Intern Med.* (2010) 152:726–32. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-152-11-2010060 10-0023