

Supplementary Online Content

Vickers AJ, Cronin AM, Maschino AC, Lewith G, MacPherson H, Victor N, Foster NE, Sherman KJ, Witt CM, Linde K, for the Acupuncture Trialists' Collaboration. Acupuncture for chronic pain: individual patient data meta-analysis. *Arch Intern Med*. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2012.3654.

eAppendix. MEDLINE Search Strategy, Trial-Level Information, Descriptions of Treatment in No-Acupuncture Trial Arms by Control Types, and References

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

MEDLINE Search Strategy

Acupuncture

acupuncture OR electro-acupuncture OR electroacupuncture

Back pain:

back pain OR backache OR Intervertebral disk OR lumbar* OR sciatica

Neck pain:

neck OR cervic* OR spinal OR torticollis OR whiplash

Shoulder pain:

shoulder OR rotator cuff OR bursitis OR tendinitis OR tendonitis OR adhesive capsulitis

OA Knee pain:

Knee OR Arthralgia* OR Arthriti* OR Osteoarthritis* OR Hip

Headache pain:

headache OR migrain* OR cephalgi* OR hemicrania

Randomized trials of acupuncture for pain

Pain with "Randomized Controlled Trial" as a limit

Trial level information.

Trials evaluating acupuncture for osteoarthritis pain (n=9).

| Trial | Patient counts for those included in primary analysis | Primary outcome | Time point | Result reported by author | Drop out rate | Assessment of Blinding |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|------------------------|
| Berman 2004 ³ | <p>Total n=391</p> <p>Acupuncture n=142</p> <p>Sham</p> <p>Both penetrating and non-penetrating needles n=141</p> <p>No acupuncture control</p> <p>Non-specific advice n=108</p> | WOMAC pain subscore | 6 months | <p>Mean (SE)</p> <p>Acupuncture:-3.79 (0.33)</p> <p>Sham: - 2.92 (0.30)</p> <p>No acupuncture: -1.69 (0.33)</p> <p>Difference between groups</p> <p>Acupuncture vs Sham: 0.87 (95% CI 0.16, 1.58) p=0.003</p> <p>Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: (not given)</p> | <p>Total: 391/570 (31%)</p> <p>Acupuncture: 142/190 (25%)</p> <p>Sham: 141/191 (26%)</p> <p>Non-specific advice: 108/189 (43%)</p> | A |
| Vas 2004 ¹⁵ | <p>Total n=88</p> <p>Acupuncture n=47</p> <p>Sham</p> <p>Non-penetrating needle n=41</p> | WOMAC pain subscore | 3 months | <p>Mean (SD)</p> <p>Acupuncture: 1.7 (2.6)</p> <p>Sham: 6.4 (5.8)</p> <p>Difference between groups</p> <p>Acupuncture vs Sham: 4.7 (95% CI 2.9, 6.5) p<0.001</p> | <p>Total: 88/97 (9%)</p> <p>Acupuncture: 47/48 (2%)</p> <p>Sham: 41/49 (16%)</p> | A |
| Witt 2005 ⁸ | <p>Total n=285</p> <p>Acupuncture n=145</p> <p>Sham</p> <p>Penetrating needle n=73</p> <p>No acupuncture control</p> <p>Usual care n=67</p> | WOMAC Index | 2 months | <p>Mean (SE)</p> <p>Acupuncture: 26.9 (1.4)</p> <p>Sham:35.8 (1.9)</p> <p>No acupuncture: 49.6 (2.0)</p> <p>Difference between groups</p> <p>Acupuncture vs Sham: 8.8 (95% CI 4.2, 13.5) p<0.001</p> <p>Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 22.7 (95% CI 17.9, 27.5) p<0.001</p> | <p>Total: 285/300 (5%)</p> <p>Acupuncture: 145/150 (3%)</p> <p>Sham: 73/76 (4%)</p> <p>Usual Care: 67/74 (9%)</p> | A |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|--|-----|
| Scharf 2006 ¹² | Total n=985^b Acupuncture n=318 Sham Penetrating needle n=360 No acupuncture control Ancillary care n=307 | WOMAC pain subscore | 6 months | Mean (95% CI) Acupuncture: 2.9 (2.65, 3.17) Sham: 3.2 (2.93, 3.43) No acupuncture: 4.0 (3.69, 4.22) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 0.3 (95% CI -0.05, 0.59) (no p value given) Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 1.0 (95% CI 0.71, 1.38) (no p value given) | Total: 985/1039 (5%) Acupuncture: 318/330 (4%) Sham: 360/367 (2%) Usual Care: 307/342 (10%) | A |
| Witt 2006 ²¹ | Total n=579^b Acupuncture n=300 No acupuncture control Usual care n=279 | WOMAC Index | 3 months | Mean (SEM) Acupuncture: 30.5 (1.0) No acupuncture: 47.3 (1.0) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 16.7 (SEM 1.4) p<0.001 | Total: 579/712 (19%) Acupuncture: 300/357 (16%) Usual Care: 279/355 (21%) | n/a |
| Foster 2007 ²⁴ | Total n=325 Acupuncture n=108 Sham Non-penetrating needle n=112 No acupuncture control Ancillary care n=105 | WOMAC pain subscore | 6 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 7.07 (4.4) Sham: 6.50 (4.8) No acupuncture: 6.78 (4.5) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: (not given) Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 0.08 (95% CI -1.0, 0.9) p= 0.9 | Total: 325/352 (8%) Acupuncture: 108/117 (8%) Sham: 112/119 (6%) Usual Care: 105/116 (9%) | A |

Trials evaluating acupuncture for chronic headache pain (n=7).

| Pain Type | Trial | Patient counts for those included in primary analysis | Primary outcome | Time point | Result reported by author | Drop out rate | Assessment of Blinding |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| Migraine n=2 | Linde 2005 ¹⁰ | Total n=272 Acupuncture n=132 Sham Penetrating needle n=76 No acupuncture control Usual care n=64 | Moderate to severe pain days | 3 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 2.8 (2.3) Sham: 2.6 (2.4) No acupuncture: 4.3 (2.2) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 0.0 (95% CI -0.7, 0.7) p>0.9 Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 1.4 (95% CI 0.8, 2.1) p<0.001 | Total: 272/302 (10%) Acupuncture: 132/145 (9%) Sham: 76/81 (6%) Usual Care: 64/76 (16%) | A |
| | Diener 2006 ³¹ | Total n=794 ^a Acupuncture n=290 Sham Penetrating needle n=317 No acupuncture control Guidelined care n=187 | Migraine days | 6 months | Change from baseline, mean (SD) Acupuncture: -2.8 (3.8) Sham: -2.0 (3.9) No acupuncture: -2.7 (4.2) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 0.57 (0.09, 1.05) p=0.021 Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 0.50 (95% CI -0.06, 1.05) p=0.4 | Total: 794/960 (7%) Acupuncture: 290/313 (7%) Sham: 317/339 (6%) Guidelined care: 187/308 (39%) | B |
| Tension-type headache n=3 | Coeytaux 2005 ⁸¹ | Total n=71 Acupuncture n=34 No acupuncture control Ancillary care n=37 | Headache Impact Test | 1 month | Change from baseline, mean (95% CI) Acupuncture: -3.9 (-6.5, -1.2) No acupuncture: -0.4 (-1.8, 1.0) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 3.0 (95% CI 1.0, 4.9) (no p-value given) | Total: 71/74 (4%) Acupuncture: 34/35 (3%) Usual Care: 37/39 (5%) | n/a |
| | Melchart 2005 ¹¹ | Total n=238 Acupuncture n=118 Sham Penetrating needle n=57 No acupuncture control Usual care n=63 | Migraine days | 3 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 9.9 (8.7) Sham: 10.8 (8.3) No acupuncture: 16.3 (7.4) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 0.06 (-1.2, 2.4) p=0.5 Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 5.8 (95% CI 4.0, 7.6) p<0.001 | Total: 238/270 (12%) Acupuncture: 118/132 (11%) Sham: 57/63 (10%) Usual Care: 63/75 (16%) | A |
| | Endres 2007 ¹⁴ | Total n=398 Acupuncture n=204 Sham Penetrating needle n=194 | Headache days | 6 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 6.0 (6.2) Sham: 8.4 (7.9) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 1.94 (95% CI 0.69, 3.18) p=0.002 | Total: 398/413 (3%) Acupuncture: 204/209 (2%) Sham: 194/200 (3%) | A |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------------|--|----------------|-----------|---|---|-----|
| Both n=2 | Vickers 2004 ⁴ | Total n=301 Acupuncture n=161 No acupuncture control Usual care n=140 | Severity score | 12 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 16.2 (13.7) No acupuncture: 22.3 (17.0) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 4.6 (95% CI 2.2, 7.0) p=0.0002 | Total: 301/401 (25%) Acupuncture: 161/205 (21%) Usual Care: 140/196 (29%) | n/a |
| | Jena 2008 ²⁰ | Total n=2871 ^b Acupuncture n=1447 No acupuncture control Usual care n=1424 | Headache days | 3 months | Percent reduction, mean (95% CI) Acupuncture: 43.0 (41.0, 45.1) No acupuncture: 15.2 (13.3, 17.0) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 27.9 (95% CI 25.1, 30.6) p<0.001 | Total: 2871/3404 (16%) Acupuncture: 1447/1711 (15%) Usual Care: 1424/1693 (16%) | n/a |

Trials evaluating acupuncture for non-specific musculoskeletal pain (n=15).

| Pain Type | Trial | Patient counts for those included in primary analysis | Primary outcome | Time point | Result reported by author | Drop out rate | Assessment of Blinding |
|-----------|-----------------------------|---|--|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| Back n=10 | Carlsson 2001 ²⁷ | Total n=27 Acupuncture n=21 Sham Non-needle n=6 | Pain VAS | 6 months | Mean weekly VAS in percent of baseline, mean (SD) ^g Acupuncture Morning VAS: 75% (33) Night VAS: 68% (31) Sham Morning VAS: 132% (76) Night VAS: 101% (48) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: Morning VAS: p=0.13 (no estimate given) Night VAS: p=0.056 (no estimate given) | Total: 27/50 (46%) Acupuncture: 21/34 (38%) Sham: 6/16 (63%) | B |
| | Cherkin 2001 ⁶ | Total n=249 ^d Acupuncture n=89 No acupuncture control Non-specific advice n=83 Massage n=77 (not analyzed) | Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire | 2 months | Mean (95% CI) Acupuncture: 7.9 (6.5, 9.3) No acupuncture: 8.8 (7.4, 10.2) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: adjusted p=0.75 (no estimate given) | Total: 249/262 (7%) Acupuncture: 89/94 (5%) Usual Care: 83/90 (8%) Massage: 77/78 (1%) | n/a |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|-----------|--|--|-----|
| | Kerr 2003 ²⁹ | Total n=46 Acupuncture n=26 Sham Non-needle n=20 | Pain VAS | 1 month | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 51.3 (22.4) Sham: 61.7 (30.6) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: p=0.2 (no estimate given) | Total: 46/60 (23%) Acupuncture: 26/30 (13%) Sham: 20/30 (33%) | B |
| | Brinkhaus 2006 ⁹ | Total n=284 Acupuncture n=140 Sham Penetrating needle n=70 No acupuncture control Usual care n=74 | Pain VAS | 2 months | Mean change from baseline (SD) Acupuncture: 28.7 (30.3) Sham: 23.6 (31.0) No acupuncture 6.9 (22.0) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 5.1 (95% CI -3.7, 13.9) p=0.3 Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 21.7 (95% CI 13.9, 30.0) p<0.001 | Total: 284/301 (6%) Acupuncture: 140/147 (5%) Sham: 70/75 (7%) Usual Care: 74/79 (6%) | A |
| | Thomas 2006 ⁵ | Total n=182 Acupuncture n=123 No acupuncture control Usual care n=59 | SF36 Bodily pain | 24 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 67.8 (24.1) No acupuncture: 59.5 (23.4) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 8.0 (95% CI 2.8, 13.2) p=0.003 | Total: 182/241 (24%) Acupuncture: 123/160 (23%) Usual Care: 59/81 (27%) | n/a |
| | Witt 2006 ¹⁸ | Total n=2594 ^b Acupuncture n=1350 No acupuncture control Usual care n=1244 | Back Function measured with the Hannover Functional Ability Questionnaire | 3 months | Mean (SE) Acupuncture: 12.1 (0.4) No acupuncture: 2.7 (0.4) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 9.4 (95% CI 8.3, 10.5) p<0.001 | Total: 2594/3093 (16%) Acupuncture: 1350/1549 (13%) Usual Care: 1244/1544 (19%) | A |

Trials evaluating acupuncture for non-specific musculoskeletal pain (n=15), cont.

| Pain Type | Trial | Patient counts for those included in primary analysis | Primary outcome | Time point | Result reported by author | Drop out rate | Assessment of Blinding |
|-----------|-------|---|-----------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
|-----------|-------|---|-----------------|------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------------------|

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|----------|---|--|---|
| Back n=10 (cont.) | Haake 2007 ¹³ | Total n=1117 ^e Acupuncture n=377 Sham Penetrating needle n=376 No acupuncture control Guideline care n=364 | Von Korff Chronic Pain Scale | 6 months | Mean (SD) of Von Korff Chronic Pain Scale Acupuncture: 40.2 (22.5) Sham 43.3 (23.0) No acupuncture: 52.3 (21.2) Difference between groups in treatment success ^h Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 20.2% (95% CI 13.4%, 26.7%) p<.001 Acupuncture vs Sham: 3.4% (95% CI -3.7%, 10.3%) p=0.4 | Total: 1117/1162 (4%) Acupuncture: 377/387 (3%) Sham: 376/387 (3%) Usual Care: 364/388 (6%) | A |
| | Molsberger 2002 ⁸² | Total n=124 Acupuncture n=47 Sham Penetrating needle n=41 No acupuncture control Ancillary care n=36 | Pain VAS | 3 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 23 (20) Sham: 43 (23) No acupuncture control: 52 (19) Difference between groups ⁱ Acupuncture vs Sham: p<0.001 (no estimate given) Acupuncture vs No acupuncture control: p<0.001 (no estimate given) | Total: 124/186 (33%) Acupuncture: 47/65 (28%) Sham: 41/61 (33%) Usual Care: 36/60 (40%) | (not evaluated) |
| | Kennedy 2008 ³⁰ | Total n=40 Acupuncture n=22 Sham Needle, non-penetrating n=18 | Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire | 3 months | Mean (SEM) Acupuncture: 5.0 ± 1.0 Sham: 7.7 ± 1.5 Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 2.6 (95% CI -0.7, 5.9) p= 0.12 | Total: 40/48 (17%) Acupuncture: 22/24 (8%) Sham: 18/24 (25%) | A |
| | Cherkin 2009 ⁸³ | Total n=606 Acupuncture n=299 ^j Individualized n=147 Standardized n=152 Sham Non-needle n=159 No acupuncture control Usual care n=148 | Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire | 2 months | Mean (SD) Individualized Acupuncture: 6.4 (5.3) Standardized Acupuncture: 6.3 (5.7) Sham: 5.4 (4.9) No acupuncture: 8.9 (6.0) Difference between groups Individualized vs standardized: 0.16 (95% CI -0.90 to 1.22) p≥0.05 Individualized vs Sham: 0.45 (95% CI -0.61 to 1.50) p≥0.05 Individualized vs No acupuncture: -2.47 (95% CI -3.53, -1.40) p<0.05 | Total: 606/638 (5%) Acupuncture: Individualized: 147/157 (6%) Standardized: 152/158 (4%) Sham: 159/162 (2%) Usual Care: 148/161 (8%) | (not evaluated) |
| | Neck n=5 | Irnich 2001 ⁷ | Total n=108 Acupuncture n=51 Sham Non-needle n=57 Massage n=57 (not analyzed) | Pain VAS | 1 month | Change from baseline, Mean (95% CI) Acupuncture: 24.22 (16.5, 31.9) Sham: 17.28 (10.0, 24.6) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 6.9 (-5.0, 18.9) p=0.3 | Total: 165/177 (8%) Acupuncture: 51/56 (9%) Sham: 57/61 (7%) Massage: 57/60 (5%) |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|----------|---------|---|---|---|
| | White 2004 ²² | Total n=124 ^f Acupuncture n=63 Sham Non-needle n=61 | Pain VAS | 1 month | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 20.39 (20.26) Sham: 30.69 (22.00) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 6.3 (95% CI 1.4, 11.3) p =0.012 | Total: 124/135 (8%) Acupuncture: 63/70 (10%) Sham: 61/65 (6%) | A |
|--|--------------------------|---|----------|---------|---|---|---|

Trials evaluating acupuncture for non-specific musculoskeletal pain (n=15), cont.

| Pain Type | Trial | Patient counts for those included in primary analysis | Primary outcome | Time point | Result reported by author | Drop out rate | Assessment of Blinding |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|--|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| Neck n=5 (cont.) | Salter 2006 ²⁶ | Total n=21 Acupuncture n=9 No acupuncture control Usual care n=12 | Northwick Park Neck Pain Questionnaire | 3 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 22.73 (18.64) No acupuncture: 25.72 (16.29) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 1.75 (no confidence interval given) p = 0.8 | Total: 21/24 (13%) Acupuncture: 9/10 (10%) Usual Care: 12/14 (14%) | n/a |
| | Vas 2006 ¹⁶ | Total n=123 ^c Acupuncture n=61 Sham Non-needle n=62 | Pain VAS | 1 month | Change from baseline, Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 42.1 (21.1) Sham: 14.0 (15.7) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 28.1 (95% CI 21.4, 34.7) p<0.001 | Total: 115/123 (7%) Acupuncture: 58/61 (5%) Sham: 57/62 (8%) | A |
| | Witt 2006 ¹⁹ | Total n=3162 ^b Acupuncture n=1618 No acupuncture control Usual care n=1544 | Neck Pain and Disability Scale | 3 months | Change from baseline, Mean (SE) Acupuncture: 16.2 (0.4) No acupuncture: 3.9 (0.4) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 12.3 (95% CI 11.3, 13.3) p < 0.001 | Total: 3162/3766 (16%) Acupuncture: 1618/1880 (14%) Usual Care: 1544/1886 (18%) | n/a |

Trials evaluating acupuncture for osteoarthritis pain (n=9), cont.

| Trial | Patient counts for those included in primary analysis | Primary outcome | Time point | Result reported by author | Drop out rate | Assessment of Blinding |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| Williamson 2007 ²³ | Total n=181 ^c Acupuncture n=60 No acupuncture control Non-specific advice n=61 Physiotherapy n=60 (not analyzed) | Oxford Knee Score | 2 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 36.8 (7.20) No acupuncture: 40.3 (8.48) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 3.5 (95% CI 0.66, 6.33) Bonferroni p=0.016 | Total: 161/181 (11%) Acupuncture: 59/60 (2%) Usual Care: 49/61 (20%) Physiotherapy: 53/60 (12%) | n/a |
| Lansdown 2009 ⁸⁴ | Total n=30 Acupuncture n=15 No acupuncture control Usual care n=15 | WOMAC pain subscore | 3 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 3.6 (2.92) No acupuncture: 6.57 (4.54) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: -2.62 (95% CI -0.77, -4.47) p= 0.007 | Total: 28/30 (7%) Acupuncture: 14/15 (7%) Usual Care: 14/15 (7%) | (not evaluated) |
| Suarez-Almazor 2010 ⁸⁵ | Total n=496 Acupuncture n=139 Sham Penetrating needle n=283 No acupuncture control Ancillary care n=72 | WOMAC pain subscore | 3 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 30.8 (17.9) Sham: 31.0 (19.1) No acupuncture: 42.4 (16.8) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: p=0.0002 (no estimate given) Acupuncture vs Sham: p>0.20 (no estimate given) | Acupuncture: (9%) Sham: (6%) Usual Care: (0%) | (not evaluated) |

Trials evaluating acupuncture for specific shoulder pain (n=4).

| Trial | Patient counts for those included in primary analysis | Primary outcome | Time point | Result reported by author | Drop out rate | Assessment of Blinding |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------|--|---|------------------------|
| Kleinhenz 1999 ²⁵ | Total n=45 Acupuncture n=22 Sham Non-penetrating needle n=23 | Constant-Murley-score | 1 month | Mean change from baseline (SD) Acupuncture: 19.2 (16.1) Sham: 8.4 (14.6) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: (no estimate given) (95% CI 2.3, 19.4) p=0.001 | Total: 45/52 (13%) Acupuncture: 22/25 (12%) Sham: 23/27 (15%) | A |
| Guerra de Hoyos 2004 ²⁸ | Total n=110 Acupuncture n=55 Sham Non-penetrating needle n=55 | Pain VAS | 6 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 3.5 (3.0) Sham: 1.2 (1.9) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 2.0 (95% CI 1.2, 2.9) p<0.0005 | Total: 110/130 (15%) Acupuncture: 55/65 (15%) Sham: 55/65 (15%) | A |
| Vas 2008 ¹⁷ | Total n=425 ^f Acupuncture n=205 Sham Non-needle n=220 | Constant-Murley-score | 1 month | Mean change from baseline (SD) Acupuncture: 16.6 (15.6) Sham: 10.6 (13.5) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 6.0 (95% CI 3.2, 8.8) p<0.001 | Total: 409/425 (4%) Acupuncture: 202/205 (1%) Sham: 207/220 (6%) | A |
| Molsberger 2010 ⁸⁶ | Total n=308 Acupuncture n=128 Sham Non-penetrating needle n=74 No acupuncture control Usual care n=106 | VAS | 6 months | Mean (SD) Acupuncture: 19 (23.3) Sham: 33 (29.6) No acupuncture: 33 (26.6) Difference between groups Acupuncture vs Sham: 14 (95% CI 7.87–20.13) p<0.001 Acupuncture vs No acupuncture: 14 (95% CI 8.22–19.78) p<0.001 | Total: 308/424 (27%) Acupuncture: 128/154 (17%) Sham: 74/135 (45%) Usual Care: 106/135 (21%) | (not evaluated) |

Notes

Ancillary care: Programme of care received by both acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups (e.g. trial comparing physiotherapy plus acupuncture to physiotherapy alone).

Usual Care: Protocol did not specify treatments received in control group (e.g. trials with “waiting list controls”). Non-specific advice: Patients in control group receive general advice and support (“attention control”).

Guidelined care: Patients in control group received care according to national guidelines

a These differ from the patient counts in the forest plot. Authors confirmed this was an error on their part and have published an *erratum*.

b Patient counts lower in the forest plots due to missing baseline scores for some patients.

c Patient counts lower in the forest plots as number reported in paper includes imputed data.

d One person in the no acupuncture control group was missing Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire data but this was not reported in the paper

e Lower patient counts in our analyses are due to missing randomization stratification variables: baseline Von Korff, chronification, fear avoidance belief, levels of activity, patient expectations, or trial center.

f We averaged weeks 4, 5, & 6 to get a 1 month score.

g These numbers were taken from data provided, can only be estimated from what is given in the paper

h Values are given as percentage of patients (95% confidence interval). Success was defined as 33% improvement or better on 3 pain-related items on the CPGS.

i Pain relief \geq 50%

j We combine the individualized and standardized acupuncture estimates in our analyses

Descriptions of Treatment in No Acupuncture Trial Arms by Control Type

Ancillary Care: Programme of care received by both acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups (e.g. trial comparing physiotherapy plus acupuncture to physiotherapy alone)

| Trialist | Pain Type | Short Description | Quotation from Published Manuscript |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| Coeytaux 2005 ⁸¹ | Headache | Medical management as provided by their personal healthcare providers | We randomly allocated study patients to receive either medical management only or medical management plus a series of 10 acupuncture treatments during a 6-week intervention period. All patients received medical management as provided by their personal healthcare providers and by a neurologist at the headache clinic at UNC Hospitals. |
| Molsberger 2002 ⁸² | Low back pain | Conventional orthopedic therapy | a) nil + COT (conventional orthopedic therapy exclusively). These patients received the conventional conservative orthopedic treatment only. On a standardized, daily basis they received physiotherapy, physical exercise, back school, mud packs, infrared heat therapy. On demand they received 50 mg diclofenac up to three times a day. Injections or cortisone application of any kind were not allowed. Other than that, information and handling of these patients was identical to those of the other two groups. |
| Scharf 2006 ¹² | Osteoarthritis | Conservative therapy (medication, 6 physiotherapy sessions) | Conservative therapy involved 10 visits to practitioners with consultation and a prescription for diclofenac, up to 150 mg/d, or rofecoxib, 25 mg/d, as needed until week 23. The protocol permitted 5 additional visits in weeks 7 to 13 if patients were graded as having a “partially successful” result (10% to 50% reduction in pain after 6 weeks based on the von Korff pain intensity scale) during a telephone interview. Each of the 3 treatment groups had up to 6 physiotherapy sessions. Corticosteroids and other analgesics besides diclofenac and rofecoxib were explicitly excluded for all patients. |
| Foster 2007 ²⁴ | Osteoarthritis | Advice and exercise group | Participants allocated to the advice and exercise group received advice supplemented by a leaflet modeled on the Arthritis Research Campaign leaflet on knee osteoarthritis (www.arc.org.uk). Participants who were receiving non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs were permitted to continue with their stable dose. The advice and exercise package was developed from reviews of best evidence, clinical guidelines, a survey of physiotherapy practice for knee pain, and a consensus workshop. Exercises were individualized using PhysioTools (www.physiotools.net), oriented towards lower limb strengthening, stretching, and balance. This could include concentric, eccentric, and isometric exercise; non-weight bearing exercise; and weight bearing exercise plus a home exercise programme. Intensity was progressed, when appropriate, at each supervised exercise session. The package consisted of up to six sessions of 30 minutes (including the pre-randomisation session) over six weeks. Data on participants’ self reported adherence to exercise were collected. |

Usual Care: Protocol did not specify treatments received in control group (e.g. trials with “waiting list controls”).

| Trialist | Pain Type | Short Description | Quotation from Published Manuscript |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Linde 2005 ¹⁰ | Migraine | Waiting list; no prophylactic treatment | Patients in the waiting list control group did not receive any prophylactic treatment for their headaches for a period of 12 weeks after randomization. After that period they received 12 sessions of the acupuncture treatment described above. |
| Melchart 2005 ¹¹ | TTH | Waiting list; no prophylactic treatment | Patients in the waiting list control group did not receive any prophylactic treatment for their headaches for a period of 12 weeks after randomisation. After that time, they received 12 sessions of the acupuncture treatment described above. All patients were allowed to treat acute headaches as needed. |
| Thomas 2006 ⁵ | Low back pain | Usual GP care | All patients remained under the care of their general practitioner. Patients in the usual care group received NHS treatment according to their general practitioner’s assessment of need. We collected information from patients at 3, 12, and 24 months on treatments received for low back pain. |
| Salter 2006 ²⁶ | Neck | Usual GP care | Usual GP care was available to both groups, and at three months patients were asked to record all treatments they had received. |
| Vickers 2004 ⁴ | Headache | Usual GP care | Patients randomised to “avoid acupuncture” received usual care from their general practitioner but were not referred to acupuncture. |
| Witt 2005 ⁸ | Osteoarthritis | Waiting list group (oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs if necessary) | Patients in the waiting list group did not receive acupuncture treatment for 8 weeks after randomisation; from week 9 they received 12 sessions of the acupuncture treatment described above. In all treatment groups, patients were allowed to treat osteoarthritis knee pain with oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs if necessary. The use of other pain treatments, such as drugs acting through the central nervous system, or corticosteroids, was not allowed. |
| Witt 2006 ¹⁹ | Neck | Usual care (additional conventional treatments as needed) | The control group was not allowed to use any kind of acupuncture during the first three months. In all three treatment groups, the patients were allowed to use any additional conventional treatments as needed. |
| Witt 2006 ²¹ | Osteoarthritis | Usual care (additional conventional treatments as needed) | The control group was not allowed to receive any kind of acupuncture during the first 3 months. In all 3 treatment groups, the patients were permitted to receive any additional conventional treatments as needed. |
| Jena 2008 ²⁰ | Headache | Usual care (additional conventional treatments as needed) | The control group was not allowed to use any kind of acupuncture during the first 3 months. In all three treatment groups, patients were allowed to use any additional conventional treatments as needed. |
| Witt 2006 ¹⁸ | Low back pain | Usual care (additional conventional treatments as needed) | In all three treatment groups, the patients were allowed to use additional conventional treatments as needed. |
| Brinkhaus 2006 ⁹ | Low back pain | Waiting list group (oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs if necessary) | Patients in the waiting list group did not receive acupuncture treatment for 8 weeks after randomization. After that period, they received 12 sessions of the acupuncture treatment previously described. Patients were allowed to treat chronic low back pain with oral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, if required. The use of corticosteroids or pain-relieving drugs that act through the central nervous system was prohibited. |
| Suarez-Almazor 2010 ⁸⁵ | Osteoarthritis | Waiting list | No description |
| Molsberger 2010 ⁸⁶ | Shoulder | Conservative orthopaedic treatment (COT) | The patients received conventional orthopaedic therapy with 50 mg diclofenac daily. Additionally 15 treatment sessions were individually selected from physiotherapy, physical exercise, heat or cold therapy, ultra-sonic treatment and TENS. Injections or cortisone applications of any kind were not allowed. Other than that management of these patients and information provided to them was identical to that in the other two groups. |
| Cherkin 2009 ⁸³ | Low back pain | Usual GP care | Participants in the usual care group received no study-related care—just the care, if any, they and their physicians chose (mostly medications, primary care, and physical therapy visits). All participants received a self-care book with information on managing flare-ups, exercise, and lifestyle modifications. ¹⁸ |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Lansdown 2009 ⁸⁴ | Osteoarthritis | Usual care (from any health provider) | Both groups received 'usual care', which included any appointments, medications (prescribed or over the counter) and interventions sought by participants from any health practitioner. Data on all usual care treatments received by both groups were collected using follow-up postal questionnaires at 3 and 12 months. |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|

Non-specific support and advice: Controls were given educational materials and general advice in an effort to equalize experimental contact across groups ("attention control")

| Trialist | Pain Type | Short Description | Quotation from Published Manuscript |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Berman 2004 ³ | Osteoarthritis | Education Control | Education Control The education–attention control consisted of 6 two hour group sessions based on the Arthritis Self-Management Program (24) and taught by an experienced, Arthritis Foundation–trained patient education specialist. In addition, we periodically mailed educational materials to the education group in an attempt to equalize the amount of experimental contact in all groups. |
| Cherkin 2001 ⁶ | Low back pain | Self-care Education | Self-care Education Patients allocated to usual care alone might believe that they had been denied useful therapies, resulting in dissatisfaction and worse outcomes. Therefore, this comparison group received high-quality and relatively inexpensive educational materials designed for persons with chronic back pain: a book ⁸ and 2 professionally produced videotapes ⁹ : a 40- minute videotape on self-management of back pain and a 25-minute videotape demonstrating exercises. These unpublished materials included information about back pain and its treatment, techniques for controlling and preventing pain and for improving quality of life, and suggestions for coping with the emotional and interpersonal problems often accompanying chronic illness. The content of the book has been published in a slightly modified form. |
| Williamson 2007 ²³ | Osteoarthritis | Exercise and advice leaflet | The control group received an exercise and advice leaflet, which had been designed by consensus between the physiotherapy, rheumatology and orthopaedic departments. In this way, we standardized the advice received by the control group to reflect best current practice. At enrolment, patients were told that they were in the 'home exercise group'. |

Guideline care: Patients in control group received care according to national guidelines

| Trialist | Pain Type | Short Description | Quotation from Published Manuscript |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Haake 2007 ¹³ | Low back pain | Conventional therapy (10 sessions physiotherapy, exercise, and such plus medication) | Patients in the conventional therapy group received a multimodal treatment program according to German guidelines. ¹¹ The guidelines provide the treating physician with recommendations about the treatment algorithm and assess the various therapy forms according to the degree of evidence based on a literature search and recommendations of the specialist associations. Conventional therapy included 10 sessions with personal contact with a physician or physiotherapist who administered physiotherapy, exercise, and such. Physiotherapies were supported by nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs or pain medication up to the maximum daily dose during the therapy period. Rescue medication was identical to that for the acupuncture groups. |
| Diener 2006 ³¹ | Migraine | Standard migraine prophylactic treatment with medication | Standard migraine prophylactic treatment in the third study group was undertaken according to the guidelines of the German Migraine and Headache Society. ⁸ Following these guidelines, the use of beta blockers was the first choice, flunarizine the second, and valproic acid the third. Between six and seven contacts between the investigator and the patient were allowed during the trial to establish the standard treatment. |

References

1. Zheng Z, Guo RJ, Helme RD, Muir A, Da Costa C, Xue CC. The effect of electroacupuncture on opioid-like medication consumption by chronic pain patients: a pilot randomized controlled clinical trial. *Eur J Pain* 2008;12:671-6.
2. Coan RM, Wong G, Coan PL. The acupuncture treatment of neck pain: a randomized controlled study. *Am J Chin Med* 1981;9:326-32.
3. Berman BM, Lao L, Langenberg P, Lee WL, Gilpin AM, Hochberg MC. Effectiveness of acupuncture as adjunctive therapy in osteoarthritis of the knee: a randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;141:901-10.
4. Vickers AJ, Rees RW, Zollman CE, et al. Acupuncture for chronic headache in primary care: large, pragmatic, randomised trial. *Bmj* 2004;328:744.
5. Thomas KJ, MacPherson H, Thorpe L, et al. Randomised controlled trial of a short course of traditional acupuncture compared with usual care for persistent non-specific low back pain. *Bmj* 2006;333:623.
6. Cherkin DC, Eisenberg D, Sherman KJ, et al. Randomized trial comparing traditional Chinese medical acupuncture, therapeutic massage, and self-care education for chronic low back pain. *Arch Intern Med* 2001;161:1081-8.
7. Irnich D, Behrens N, Molzen H, et al. Randomised trial of acupuncture compared with conventional massage and "sham" laser acupuncture for treatment of chronic neck pain. *Bmj* 2001;322:1574-8.
8. Witt C, Brinkhaus B, Jena S, et al. Acupuncture in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2005;366:136-43.
9. Brinkhaus B, Witt CM, Jena S, et al. Acupuncture in patients with chronic low back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Intern Med* 2006;166:450-7.
10. Linde K, Streng A, Jurgens S, et al. Acupuncture for patients with migraine: a randomized controlled trial. *Jama* 2005;293:2118-25.
11. Melchart D, Streng A, Hoppe A, et al. Acupuncture in patients with tension-type headache: randomised controlled trial. *Bmj* 2005;331:376-82.
12. Scharf HP, Mansmann U, Streitberger K, et al. Acupuncture and knee osteoarthritis: a three-armed randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2006;145:12-20.
13. Haake M, Muller HH, Schade-Brittinger C, et al. German Acupuncture Trials (GERAC) for chronic low back pain: randomized, multicenter, blinded, parallel-group trial with 3 groups. *Arch Intern Med* 2007;167:1892-8.
14. Endres HG, Bowling G, Diener HC, et al. Acupuncture for tension-type headache: a multicentre, sham-controlled, patient-and observer-blinded, randomised trial. *J Headache Pain* 2007;8:306-14.
15. Vas J, Mendez C, Perea-Milla E, et al. Acupuncture as a complementary therapy to the pharmacological treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee: randomised controlled trial. *Bmj* 2004;329:1216.
16. Vas J, Perea-Milla E, Mendez C, et al. Efficacy and safety of acupuncture for chronic uncomplicated neck pain: a randomised controlled study. *Pain* 2006;126:245-55.
17. Vas J, Ortega C, Olmo V, et al. Single-point acupuncture and physiotherapy for the treatment of painful shoulder: a multicentre randomized controlled trial. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2008;47:887-93.

18. Witt CM, Jena S, Selim D, et al. Pragmatic Randomized Trial Evaluating the Clinical and Economic Effectiveness of Acupuncture for Chronic Low Back Pain. *Am J Epidemiol* 2006;164:487-96.
19. Witt CM, Jena S, Brinkhaus B, Liecker B, Wegscheider K, Willich SN. Acupuncture for patients with chronic neck pain. *Pain* 2006.
20. Jena S, Witt CM, Brinkhaus B, Wegscheider K, Willich SN. Acupuncture in patients with headache. *Cephalalgia* 2008;28:969-79.
21. Witt CM, Jena S, Brinkhaus B, Liecker B, Wegscheider K, Willich SN. Acupuncture in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee or hip: a randomized, controlled trial with an additional nonrandomized arm. *Arthritis Rheum* 2006;54:3485-93.
22. White P, Lewith G, Prescott P, Conway J. Acupuncture versus placebo for the treatment of chronic mechanical neck pain: a randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;141:911-9.
23. Williamson L, Wyatt MR, Yein K, Melton JT. Severe knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial of acupuncture, physiotherapy (supervised exercise) and standard management for patients awaiting knee replacement. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2007;46:1445-9.
24. Foster NE, Thomas E, Barlas P, et al. Acupuncture as an adjunct to exercise based physiotherapy for osteoarthritis of the knee: randomised controlled trial. *Bmj* 2007;335:436.
25. Kleinhenz J, Streitberger K, Windeler J, Gussbacher A, Mavridis G, Martin E. Randomised clinical trial comparing the effects of acupuncture and a newly designed placebo needle in rotator cuff tendinitis. *Pain* 1999;83:235-41.
26. Salter GC, Roman M, Bland MJ, MacPherson H. Acupuncture for chronic neck pain: a pilot for a randomised controlled trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2006;7:99.
27. Carlsson CP, Sjolund BH. Acupuncture for chronic low back pain: a randomized placebo-controlled study with long-term follow-up. *Clin J Pain* 2001;17:296-305.
28. Guerra de Hoyos JA, Andres Martin Mdel C, Bassas y Baena de Leon E, et al. Randomised trial of long term effect of acupuncture for shoulder pain. *Pain* 2004;112:289-98.
29. Kerr DP, Walsh DM, Baxter D. Acupuncture in the management of chronic low back pain: a blinded randomized controlled trial. *Clin J Pain* 2003;19:364-70.
30. Kennedy S, Baxter GD, Kerr DP, Bradbury I, Park J, McDonough SM. Acupuncture for acute non-specific low back pain: a pilot randomised non-penetrating sham controlled trial. *Complement Ther Med* 2008;16:139-46.
31. Diener HC, Kronfeld K, Boewing G, et al. Efficacy of acupuncture for the prophylaxis of migraine: a multicentre randomised controlled clinical trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2006;5:310-6.
32. Franca DL, Senna-Fernandes V, Cortez CM, Jackson MN, Bernardo-Filho M, Guimaraes MA. Tension neck syndrome treated by acupuncture combined with physiotherapy: a comparative clinical trial (pilot study). *Complement Ther Med* 2008;16:268-77.
33. Ezzo J, Vickers A, Richardson MA, et al. Acupuncture-point stimulation for chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:7188-98.
34. He D, Veiersted KB, Hostmark AT, Medbo JI. Effect of acupuncture treatment on chronic neck and shoulder pain in sedentary female workers: a 6-month and 3-year follow-up study. *Pain* 2004;109:299-307.
35. Razavi M, Jansen GB. Effects of acupuncture and placebo TENS in addition to exercise in treatment of rotator cuff tendinitis. *Clin Rehabil* 2004;18:872-8.

36. Grant DJ, Bishop-Miller J, Winchester DM, Anderson M, Faulkner S. A randomized comparative trial of acupuncture versus transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation for chronic back pain in the elderly. *Pain* 1999;82:9-13.
37. Itoh K, Katsumi Y, Kitakoji H. Trigger point acupuncture treatment of chronic low back pain in elderly patients--a blinded RCT. *Acupunct Med* 2004;22:170-7.
38. Johansson KM, Adolfsson LE, Foldevi MO. Effects of acupuncture versus ultrasound in patients with impingement syndrome: randomized clinical trial. *Phys Ther* 2005;85:490-501.
39. Streng A, Linde K, Hoppe A, et al. Effectiveness and tolerability of acupuncture compared with metoprolol in migraine prophylaxis. *Headache* 2006;46:1492-502.
40. David J, Modi S, Aluko AA, Robertshaw C, Farebrother J. Chronic neck pain: a comparison of acupuncture treatment and physiotherapy. *Br J Rheumatol* 1998;37:1118-22.
41. Ga H, Choi JH, Park CH, Yoon HJ. Acupuncture needling versus lidocaine injection of trigger points in myofascial pain syndrome in elderly patients--a randomised trial. *Acupunct Med* 2007;25:130-6.
42. Ng MM, Leung MC, Poon DM. The effects of electro-acupuncture and transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation on patients with painful osteoarthritic knees: a randomized controlled trial with follow-up evaluation. *J Altern Complement Med* 2003;9:641-9.
43. Melchart D, Hager S, Hager U, Liao J, Weidenhammer W, Linde K. Treatment of patients with chronic headaches in a hospital for traditional Chinese medicine in Germany. A randomised, waiting list controlled trial. *Complement Ther Med* 2004;12:71-8.
44. Weiner DK, Rudy TE, Morone N, Glick R, Kwok CK. Efficacy of periosteal stimulation therapy for the treatment of osteoarthritis-associated chronic knee pain: an initial controlled clinical trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007;55:1541-7.
45. Inoue M, Kitakoji H, Ishizaki N, et al. Relief of low back pain immediately after acupuncture treatment--a randomised, placebo controlled trial. *Acupunct Med* 2006;24:103-8.
46. Nabeta T, Kawakita K. Relief of chronic neck and shoulder pain by manual acupuncture to tender points--a sham-controlled randomized trial. *Complement Ther Med* 2002;10:217-22.
47. Berry H, Fernandes L, Bloom B, Clark RJ, Hamilton EB. Clinical study comparing acupuncture, physiotherapy, injection and oral anti-inflammatory therapy in shoulder-cuff lesions. *Curr Med Res Opin* 1980;7:121-6.
48. Fernandes L, Berry N, Clark RJ, Bloom B, Hamilton EB. Clinical study comparing acupuncture, physiotherapy, injection, and oral anti-inflammatory therapy in shoulder-cuff lesions. *Lancet* 1980;1:208-9.
49. Moore ME, Berk SN. Acupuncture for chronic shoulder pain. An experimental study with attention to the role of placebo and hypnotic susceptibility. *Ann Intern Med* 1976;84:381-4.
50. Ma T, Kao MJ, Lin IH, et al. A study on the clinical effects of physical therapy and acupuncture to treat spontaneous frozen shoulder. *Am J Chin Med* 2006;34:759-75.
51. Giles LG, Muller R. Chronic spinal pain syndromes: a clinical pilot trial comparing acupuncture, a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug, and spinal manipulation. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 1999;22:376-81.
52. Melchart D, Thormaehlen J, Hager S, Liao J, Linde K, Weidenhammer W. Acupuncture versus placebo versus sumatriptan for early treatment of migraine attacks: a randomized controlled trial. *J Intern Med* 2003;253:181-8.

53. Coan RM, Wong G, Ku SL, et al. The acupuncture treatment of low back pain: a randomized controlled study. *Am J Chin Med* 1980;8:181-9.
54. Christensen BV, Iuhl IU, Vilbek H, Bulow HH, Dreijer NC, Rasmussen HF. Acupuncture treatment of severe knee osteoarthritis. A long-term study. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 1992;36:519-25.
55. Molsberger A, Bowing G, Jensen KU, Lorek M. [Acupuncture treatment for the relief of gonarthrosis pain-a controlled clinical trial.]. *Schmerz* 1994;8:37-42.
56. Linde M, Fjell A, Carlsson J, Dahlof C. Role of the needling per se in acupuncture as prophylaxis for menstrually related migraine: a randomized placebo-controlled study. *Cephalalgia* 2005;25:41-7.
57. Muller R, Giles LG. Long-term follow-up of a randomized clinical trial assessing the efficacy of medication, acupuncture, and spinal manipulation for chronic mechanical spinal pain syndromes. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2005;28:3-11.
58. Sator-Katzenschlager SM, Scharbert G, Kozek-Langenecker SA, et al. The short- and long-term benefit in chronic low back pain through adjuvant electrical versus manual auricular acupuncture. *Anesth Analg* 2004;98:1359-64, table of contents.
59. Karst M, Reinhard M, Thum P, Wiese B, Rollnik J, Fink M. Needle acupuncture in tension-type headache: a randomized, placebo-controlled study. *Cephalalgia* 2001;21:637-42.
60. Ceccheerelli F, Bordin M, Gagliardi G, Caravello M. Comparison between superficial and deep acupuncture in the treatment of the shoulder's myofascial pain: a randomized and controlled study. *Acupunct Electrother Res* 2001;26:229-38.
61. Ceccherelli F, Rigoni MT, Gagliardi G, Ruzzante L. Comparison of superficial and deep acupuncture in the treatment of lumbar myofascial pain: a double-blind randomized controlled study. *Clin J Pain* 2002;18:149-53.
62. Leibing E, Leonhardt U, Koster G, et al. Acupuncture treatment of chronic low-back pain -- a randomized, blinded, placebo-controlled trial with 9-month follow-up. *Pain* 2002;96:189-96.
63. Meng CF, Wang D, Ngeow J, Lao L, Peterson M, Paget S. Acupuncture for chronic low back pain in older patients: a randomized, controlled trial. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2003;42:1508-17.
64. Berman BM, Singh BB, Lao L, et al. A randomized trial of acupuncture as an adjunctive therapy in osteoarthritis of the knee. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 1999;38:346-54.
65. Takeda W, Wessel J. Acupuncture for the treatment of pain of osteoarthritic knees. *Arthritis Care Res* 1994;7:118-22.
66. Tukmachi E, Jubb R, Dempsey E, Jones P. The effect of acupuncture on the symptoms of knee osteoarthritis--an open randomised controlled study. *Acupunct Med* 2004;22:14-22.
67. Itoh K, Hirota S, Katsumi Y, Ochi H, Kitakoji H. A pilot study on using acupuncture and transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) to treat knee osteoarthritis (OA). *Chin Med* 2008;3:2.
68. Alecrim-Andrade J, Maciel-Junior JA, Carne X, Severino Vasconcelos GM, Correa-Filho HR. Acupuncture in migraine prevention: a randomized sham controlled study with 6-months posttreatment follow-up. *Clin J Pain* 2008;24:98-105.
69. Alecrim-Andrade J, Maciel-Junior JA, Cladellas XC, Correa-Filho HR, Machado HC. Acupuncture in migraine prophylaxis: a randomized sham-controlled trial. *Cephalalgia* 2006;26:520-9.
70. Giles LG, Muller R. Chronic spinal pain: a randomized clinical trial comparing medication, acupuncture, and spinal manipulation. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2003;28:1490-502; discussion 502-3.

71. Itoh K, Hirota S, Katsumi Y, Ochi H, Kitakoji H. Trigger point acupuncture for treatment of knee osteoarthritis--a preliminary RCT for a pragmatic trial. *Acupunct Med* 2008;26:17-26.
72. Itoh K, Katsumi Y, Hirota S, Kitakoji H. Effects of trigger point acupuncture on chronic low back pain in elderly patients--a sham-controlled randomised trial. *Acupunct Med* 2006;24:5-12.
73. Itoh K, Katsumi Y, Hirota S, Kitakoji H. Randomised trial of trigger point acupuncture compared with other acupuncture for treatment of chronic neck pain. *Complement Ther Med* 2007;15:172-9.
74. Jubb RW, Tukmachi ES, Jones PW, Dempsey E, Waterhouse L, Brailsford S. A blinded randomised trial of acupuncture (manual and electroacupuncture) compared with a non-penetrating sham for the symptoms of osteoarthritis of the knee. *Acupunct Med* 2008;26:69-78.
75. Stener-Victorin E, Kruse-Smidje C, Jung K. Comparison between electro-acupuncture and hydrotherapy, both in combination with patient education and patient education alone, on the symptomatic treatment of osteoarthritis of the hip. *Clin J Pain* 2004;20:179-85.
76. Tsui ML, Cheing GL. The effectiveness of electroacupuncture versus electrical heat acupuncture in the management of chronic low-back pain. *J Altern Complement Med* 2004;10:803-9.
77. Yeung CK, Leung MC, Chow DH. The use of electro-acupuncture in conjunction with exercise for the treatment of chronic low-back pain. *J Altern Complement Med* 2003;9:479-90.
78. Facco E, Liguori A, Petti F, et al. Traditional acupuncture in migraine: a controlled, randomized study. *Headache* 2008;48:398-407.
79. White AR, Resch KL, Chan JC, et al. Acupuncture for episodic tension-type headache: a multicentre randomized controlled trial. *Cephalalgia* 2000;20:632-7.
80. Sun KO, Chan KC, Lo SL, Fong DY. Acupuncture for frozen shoulder. *Hong Kong Med J* 2001;7:381-91.
81. Coeytaux RR, Kaufman JS, Kaptchuk TJ, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of acupuncture for chronic daily headache. *Headache* 2005;45:1113-23.
82. Molsberger AF, Mau J, Pawelec DB, Winkler J. Does acupuncture improve the orthopedic management of chronic low back pain--a randomized, blinded, controlled trial with 3 months follow up. *Pain* 2002;99:579-87.
83. Cherkin DC, Sherman KJ, Avins AL, et al. A randomized trial comparing acupuncture, simulated acupuncture, and usual care for chronic low back pain. *Arch Intern Med* 2009;169:858-66.
84. Lansdown H, Howard K, Brealey S, MacPherson H. Acupuncture for pain and osteoarthritis of the knee: a pilot study for an open parallel-arm randomised controlled trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2009;10:130.
85. Suarez-Almazor ME, Looney C, Liu Y, et al. A randomized controlled trial of acupuncture for osteoarthritis of the knee: effects of patient-provider communication. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2010;62:1229-36.
86. Molsberger AF, Schneider T, Gotthardt H, Drabik A. German Randomized Acupuncture Trial for chronic shoulder pain (GRASP) - a pragmatic, controlled, patient-blinded, multi-centre trial in an outpatient care environment. *Pain* 2010;151:146-54.

