

1 **Acupuncture for the treatment of pregnancy-related low**
2 **back pain: a systematic review and network meta-**
3 **analysis**

4 Min Li^{1*}, Zongyi Xiao^{1*}, Dongling Tan^{2*}, Daqiang Zhao³, Qi Chen¹

5

6 ¹Department of Anesthesiology, Chongqing University Cancer Hospital, Chongqing, People's
7 Republic of China; ²Department of Anesthesiology, People's Hospital of Shizhu, Chongqing,
8 China; ³Department of Anesthesiology, Taikang Southwest Medical Center, Chengdu, People's
9 Republic of China;

10

11 *These authors contributed equally to this work

12

13 Correspondence: Daqiang Zhao

14 Department of Anesthesiology, Sichuan Taikang Hospital, Chengdu, People's Republic of China,

15 Email: hellinsky@163.com

16 Correspondence: Qi Chen

17 Department of Anesthesiology, Chongqing University Cancer Hospital, Chongqing, People's

18 Republic of China

19 Email: mozzie0518@cqu.edu.cn

20

21

22 **Abstract:**

23 **Background:** Despite the effectiveness of acupuncture in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain,
24 many physical therapists are unwilling to use it on pregnant women. A recent systematic review
25 of acupuncture for pregnant women did not include a comparison with sham acupuncture (SAcu).

26 Thus, we aimed to explore the effects of acupuncture, SAcu, and standard care (SC) on
27 pregnancy-related low back pain.

28 **Methods:** We searched five different medical literature databases (PubMed, Embase, MEDLINE,
29 Springer, and Google Scholar) from inception to September 30, 2022. After screening, the
30 following methods were identified: acupuncture, SAcu, and SC. The primary outcome was visual
31 analog scale (VAS) intensity after the intervention. The secondary outcomes were the overall
32 effects of treatment, quality of life (QOL), and QOL evaluated using the Short Form-36 Health
33 Survey Questionnaire (SF-36).

34 **Results:** The network meta-analysis included eight studies and 864 patients. Acupuncture and
35 SAcu were relatively more advantageous in terms of analgesic effects after intervention than SC,
36 but there were no differences between them. In terms of overall effects in number of remissions
37 and the SF-36, Acupuncture was found to be superior to other methods, and SAcu was better
38 than SC. Acupuncture had the highest surface under the cumulative ranking curve, followed by
39 SAcu and SC for all outcomes.

40 **Conclusions:** Acupuncture performs similarly to SAcu in pain relief and is more efficient than
41 SC. Regarding the effectiveness of treatment and QOL, acupuncture therapy was superior to
42 SAcu and SC.

43 **Keywords:** acupuncture, sham acupuncture; low back pain; pregnancy; standard care; SF-36
44

45 **Background**

46 Low back pain (LBP) and pelvic girdle pain (PGP) during pregnancy are common and
47 characterized by musculoskeletal pain located between the hip crease and the ribs, with or
48 without leg pain, with a prevalence ranging from 45–77%.¹⁻⁴ LBP usually starts at 12–24 weeks
49 and reaches its maximum intensity from weeks 24–36 in most pregnant women.¹ Symptoms are
50 usually milder in the morning and worsen at night. Strenuous work, standing, and physical
51 exercise involving the lower back and pelvis can aggravate LBP, which affects work or other daily
52 activities to a large extent.^{5,6}

53 Some interventions that have been proposed include education, pelvic belts,
54 physiotherapy, exercises, pharmacological therapy, transcutaneous nerve stimulation, and
55 acupuncture,⁷ but the effects remain to be discussed. In 2015, the American Congress of
56 Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG)⁸ suggested that moderate-intensity (Borg 13-14)
57 exercise should be encouraged for all women with uncomplicated pregnancies during pregnancy,
58 which could strengthen the abdominal and back muscles and minimize the risk on the low back.
59 Nevertheless, adherence to exercise is difficult with advancing pregnancy; inappropriate exercise
60 posture may lead to instability and misalignment, resulting in an increased load on the affected
61 joints and ligaments, causing micro-damage or unacceptable falls, and threatening the fetus.
62 Acupuncture originated from traditional Chinese medicine and has been used for the prevention
63 and treatment of pain for millennia. Since it was introduced to the West centuries ago, new styles
64 and forms of acupuncture have developed, including hand, foot, scalp, ear (auricular), and body
65 acupuncture. The most common method is to use a thin, solid, metallic needle to gently penetrate
66 and rotate into the trigger points at the site or in the vicinity of pain. Accordingly, the patients get a
67 needle sensation or Dechi, often expressed as numbness, dullness, or tingling.

68 As reported in some studies,^{2,9,10-19} acupuncture therapy has a significant benefit in pain
69 relief in most participants. Despite the effectiveness of acupuncture in the treatment of
70 musculoskeletal pain, many physical therapists are unwilling to use it in pregnant women, as they
71 believe that some points might trigger uterine contractions, inducing preterm labor, associated
72 with the risk of litigation.² A recent systematic review²⁰ involving 10 studies with 1040 women with
73 LBP and/or PGP during pregnancy showed that compared with standard care (SC), acupuncture
74 was associated with pain relief, functional status, and quality of life (QOL) improvement.
75 Moreover, no severe adverse effects were observed in the newborns. However, it did not include
76 a comparison with sham acupuncture (SAcu; inserting needles at non-acupuncture points). As we
77 know, pain is subjective; SAcu may ensure participants are blind, the potential bias that could
78 affect the outcomes were reduced, and the possible mechanisms of acupuncture effects could be
79 better known. It is necessary to reassess the existing evidence, which prompted us to conduct a

80 network meta-analysis to compare the effectiveness of acupuncture, SAcu, and SC on pain relief
81 and treatment of LBP.

82 **Methods**

83 ***Data sources and searches***

84 Following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
85 guidelines, this network meta-analysis with systematic review was registered at the International
86 Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) with registration number
87 CRD42022364064. English-language studies were searched mainly through five databases
88 (PubMed, Embase, Medline, Springer, and Google Scholar) from inception to September 30,
89 2022. Various combinations, keywords, and MeSH terms were used, using 'low-back pain,' 'pelvic
90 pain,' 'pelvic girdle pain,' 'acupuncture,' 'sham acupuncture,' 'standard care,' 'ear acupuncture,'
91 'pregnancy,' 'pregnancy-related,' 'lumbar back pain,' 'posterior pelvic pain,' 'standard treatment,'
92 'auricular acupuncture,' or 'anesthesia, general.'

93 ***Study selection and quality assessment***

94 We included randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of pregnant women with LBP with or without
95 PGP who were treated with acupuncture, SAcu, or SC, regardless of different acupuncture points
96 or needle materials. Cohort studies, case reports, animal studies, letters, and other complications
97 during pregnancy such as eclampsia, inflammation, impaired nerve function, or LBP before
98 pregnancy were excluded. All studies were imported into Endnote X9 (Clarivate, London, UK) by
99 two researchers (ML and ZYX), and duplicate studies were removed. For the references that
100 seemed to meet the inclusion criteria, the full text was reviewed to determine the final selection.

101 The Cochrane risk of bias (ROB) assessment tool was used to assess article quality by
102 two researchers (ML and ZYX), which included random sequence generation, allocation
103 concealment, blinding, integrity of outcome data, selective reporting of results, and other biases.

104 Each aspect was classified into three levels (low, unclear, or high risk). If there was any dispute, a
105 third investigator (DQC) provided consultation until a consensus was reached.

106 ***Outcome measures and data extraction***

107 Two investigators (ML and ZYX) independently extracted the data. If data were reported as
108 median (interquartile range), software ([https://www.math.hkbu.edu.hk/~tongt/
109 papers/median2mean.html](https://www.math.hkbu.edu.hk/~tongt/papers/median2mean.html)) was used to obtain the mean and standard deviation. If the data were
110 represented only in a graphical format, they were numerically extrapolated by plot digitization
111 using Plot Digitizer 2.6.8, (Free Software Foundation). The extracted data included authors,
112 publication time, sample size, gestational age, intervention point, and outcome measures (Table
113 1). The primary outcome was the pain intensity after the intervention. The visual analog scale
114 (VAS) was used to evaluate changes in pain intensity (using a scale from 0 to 10 cm, where 0 is
115 no pain and 10 is the worst pain). The secondary outcomes were the overall effects of treatment
116 and QOL (participants with a VAS score lower than 30% after intervention). The QOL was
117 expressed by the Short Form-36 Health Survey Questionnaire (SF-36).

118 ***Statistical analyses***

119 The data were analyzed using R version 4.0 (R Foundation, Vienna, Austria). The consistency of
120 the model was also assessed, with $P > 0.05$ indicating good consistency between the direct and
121 indirect results. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) served as the effect indicators for
122 dichotomous outcomes, whereas the mean difference and 95% CIs were used for continuous
123 outcomes. A network plot and ranking diagram were drawn for each intervention. Surfaces under
124 the cumulative ranking curves (SUCRAs) were used to rank intervention results. The SUCRA
125 reflects the merits and defects of interventions. When it is close to one, the intervention is more
126 effective. Finally, the results were shown using forest maps. Statistical significance was set at $P <$
127 0.05. Publication bias was examined using comparison-adjusted funnel plots.

128 **Results**

129 ***Study selection***

130 A total of 646 articles were obtained through the preliminary screening. After removing 38
131 duplicate articles, 608 trials remained. After reading the title and abstract, 518 articles were
132 excluded because there was no control or placebo group or because it belonged to a case report,
133 meeting abstract, or review. Ninety full-text articles were assessed for eligibility. Finally, 8 articles
134 were included in the qualitative and quantitative analyses. A flowchart is shown in Fig. 1. VAS
135 after intervention was reported in six of these RCTs, while seven RCTs reported overall effects of
136 treatment and four RCTs reported SF-36 results.

137 Three studies compared the difference between acupuncture, SAcu, and SC
138 directly,^{15,17,18} four studies only compared the difference between acupuncture and SC,^{2,9,14,16} and
139 one study compared acupuncture and SAcu¹⁹ (Fig. 2). The basic features of the included studies
140 are presented in Table 1.

141 ***Risk of bias assessment***

142 Six studies had a low risk of bias^{9,14-18} and two studies had a high risk of bias.^{2,19} This bias mainly
143 came from allocation concealment and blinding. Seven studies randomly assigned groups using
144 computer software or drawing lots,^{9,14-19} and one study used the admission time to assign
145 participants to groups.² The allocation of six trials was concealed,^{9,14,15,17,18} while that of two trials
146 was unclear.^{2,19} All outcome data were complete (Fig. 3).

147 ***VAS scores after intervention***

148 VAS scores after intervention were reported in 731 participants in six RCTs.^{9,15-19} Compared with
149 the SC group, the VAS scores of the acupuncture and SAcu groups were significantly lower ($P <$
150 0.05). Meanwhile, the VAS score of the acupuncture group was lower than that of the SAcu group
151 by 0.75, but the difference between them was not significant ($P > 0.05$) (Fig. 4A). The suggested

152 rank order probability for better analgesia after the intervention was acupuncture > SAcu > SC
153 (Fig. 5A).

154 **Overall effects of treatment**

155 The overall effects of treatment after intervention were reported in 824 participants in seven
156 RCTs.^{2,9,14,15-18} The overall effects of the acupuncture and SAcu groups were greater than those
157 of the SC group ($P < 0.05$). The effect of the acupuncture group was significantly higher than that
158 of the SAcu group ($P < 0.05$) (Fig. 4B). The suggested rank order probability for better analgesia
159 after the intervention was acupuncture > SAcu > SC (Fig. 5B).

160 **Quality of life**

161 QOL was reported in 486 participants in four RCTs.^{15,17-19} The QOL of the acupuncture and SAcu
162 groups improved after the intervention compared to the SC group (Fig. 4C). The QOL of the
163 acupuncture group was significantly better than that of the SAcu group ($P < 0.05$). The suggested
164 rank order probability for better analgesia after the intervention was acupuncture > SAcu > SC
165 (Fig. 5C).

166 **Discussion**

167 With respect to pain reduction, the overall results indicated that acupuncture therapy was similar
168 to SAcu therapy and more efficient than SC; acupuncture therapy was superior to the other two
169 groups in terms of the effectiveness of treatment and QOL.

170 LBP is a common syndrome during pregnancy, and the underlying mechanisms of its
171 etiology remain unknown. On the one hand, due to the imbalance between the pelvis and the
172 lumbar spine segments,¹ excessive lordosis is caused by increased uterine volume.² Relaxin (a
173 peptide hormone found in the placenta, corpus luteum, and decidua of pregnant women) can
174 relax the pubic symphysis and sacroiliac ligaments.³ The compression of the lumbosacral nerve
175 roots by the fetus and the reduction of blood flow caused by the compression of large vessels by
176 the pregnant uterus also plays an important role in the occurrence of LBP.² LBP subsides shortly

177 after delivery in most women.²¹ Nevertheless, approximately 43% of mothers continue to
178 experience constant pain 6 months after delivery, including 7% with recurrent pain and 36% with
179 persistent pain.²² Moreover, 20% of pregnant women with LBP reported persistent complaints
180 three years after delivery.²³

181 Exercise, pharmacological therapy, and acupuncture are the most common interventions
182 used in clinical practice. Acetaminophen^{24,25} is considered safe and is the first choice of
183 pharmacotherapy to relieve pain during pregnancy. However, because the maternal-fetal
184 circulation is unique and the drugs may have potential effects on the fetus, drug therapy during
185 pregnancy remains challenging.²⁶ In previous meta-analyses,⁷ the effect of physiotherapeutic
186 interventions on pregnancy-related lumbopelvic pain has been discussed, and there was strong
187 evidence for the positive effects of acupuncture compared with exercise in general and for
188 specific stabilizing exercises like water gymnastics. The underlying mechanism of action of
189 acupuncture is not completely understood. Existing research suggests the following theories.
190 First, peripheral and central pain control systems were activated by acupuncture through the
191 release of different endogenous opioid or non-opioid compounds, such as β -endorphin,
192 enkephalin, γ -aminobutyric acid, deilorphine, serotonin, norepinephrine or ATP, to exert
193 analgesic effects.⁹⁻¹² Secondly, the gate control theory of pain was considered to be how
194 acupuncture works, in which the sensory input to the central nervous system was inhibited by the
195 inserted needle. Third, the vascular and immunomodulatory factors, such as inflammatory
196 mediators, was stimulated by the presence of the needle as a foreign substance within the body
197 tissue to reduce pain.¹³ However, because the appropriate position and manipulation of the
198 needles are considered essential in achieving successful outcomes, acupuncture applications are
199 restricted and need specialized personnel.^{7,27,28}

200 Yao et al²⁹ and Yang et al²⁰ showed that acupuncture was superior to the treatment
201 provided to the control group. However, they focused on evaluating the efficacy of acupuncture
202 and SC; SAcu was not involved and there was no appropriate blinding. The acupoints in SAcu
203 may not be in the appropriate or specific place for treatment, and SAcu is generally designed to
204 achieve good credibility and blinding and to minimize the potential physiological effects. In our

205 review, both acupuncture and SAcu exerted non-specific effects on pain relief compared with SC,
206 which is consistent with previous studies.³⁰ To the best of our knowledge, there are several
207 possible reasons for this phenomenon. First, the needle touching the skin can possibly be
208 considered as a type of sensory stimulation, which could activate mechanoreceptors coupled to
209 slow-conducting unmyelinated (C) nerve fibers and consequently expresses physiological
210 responses. Therefore, any specific acupuncture intervention may cause physiological responses
211 and pain relief.^{31,32} Second, patients' expectations and therapeutic effects could be regulated by
212 the underlying psychobiological mechanisms, which could trigger complex neurobiological
213 changes in the central and peripheral nervous systems, as well as the end-organs, and elicit non-
214 specific effects contributing to the overall therapeutic effect.^{30,33-34} In addition, pain relief may also
215 be associated with long consultations during pregnancy that are in themselves prone to be
216 psychologically therapeutic.³⁴⁻³⁶ Overall, results from SAcu suggest that the therapy is not
217 completely inert. For this reason, acupuncture therapy may be applied by non-specialists and
218 primary care professionals in a clinical context, thus bringing it closer and more convenient to
219 patients. Meanwhile, it is not necessary for a patient to experience Dechi on each occasion,
220 reduce the difficulty of acupuncture stimulation, and avoid unnecessary pain and complications.
221 Experiencing pain involves a range of suffering for the individual, which may influence daily life.
222 As we can see in the review, there are tendencies of improvements in the QOL for pregnant
223 women with pain relief. Although small bruises and subcutaneous hematomas, transient ear
224 tenderness that resolved spontaneously, and paresthesia in the arm have been reported in some
225 trials,^{2,15-17} no serious consequences persisted. According to relevant studies,^{20,37-38} no significant
226 side effects were observed in either the mother or the fetus, including obstetrical and neonatal
227 morbidity, mean birthweight, and caesarean delivery rate.

228 This study had several limitations. First, there was heterogeneity in our review. We
229 supposed that the methodological bias and differences could have resulted in this heterogeneity:
230 two ear acupuncture RCTs and five acupuncture RCTs were included in the review, and the
231 points of puncture, depth of puncture, duration of puncture, and gestational age at which the
232 treatment was performed differed. Third, the measurement tools may not be the best choice; the

233 VAS or the numeric rating scale play an important role in assessing the clinical pain intensity, but
234 pain disorders are usually complex, multi-factorial, and have an incompletely understood
235 pathophysiology. In future studies, using multi-dimensional pain assessment tools to address
236 different aspects of pain could be taken into consideration, such as the Brief Pain Inventory³⁹ or
237 McGill Pain Scale.⁴⁰ Considering the above limitations, evaluating the efficacy of acupuncture for
238 LBP requires larger-scale, higher-quality evidence, and rigorously designed RCTs.

239 **Conclusion**

240 Current evidence suggests that acupuncture therapy performs similarly to SAcu therapy in pain
241 relief and is more efficient than SC. Acupuncture therapy is superior to SAcu and SC in terms of
242 effectiveness of treatment and QOL.

243 **List of abbreviations**

244 CI = confidence interval

245 LBP = low back pain

246 PGP = pelvic girdle pain

247 QOL = quality of life

248 RCT = randomized controlled trial

249 SAcu = sham acupuncture

250 SC = standard care

251 SF-36 = Short Form-36 Health Survey Questionnaire

252 SUCRA = surface under the cumulative ranking curve

253 VAS = visual analog scale

254 **Declarations**

255 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

256 Not applicable.

257 **Consent for publication**

258 Not applicable.

259 **Availability of data and materials**

260 All data are included in this article

261 **Competing Interests**

262 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

263

264 **Funding**

265 This work was supported by Chongqing Medical Scientific Research Project (Joint Project of

266 Chongqing Health Commission and Science and Technology Bureau 2023MSXM125) and

267 Scientific and Technological Research Program of Chongqing Municipal Education

268 Commission(KJQN202300117).

269

270 **Authors' contributions**

271 Study concept and design: D.Z, D.T. Acquisition of data: M.L, Z.X, D.Z. Manuscript drafting: M.L,

272 Z.X, D.T. methodology and software: Q.C, D.Z. Study supervision: D.Z, Q.C. All authors read and

273 approved the final manuscript.

274 Acknowledgments

275 Not applicable.

276 References

- 277 1. Wu WH, Meijer OG, Uegaki K, Mens JM, van Dieën JH, Wuisman PI, et.al. Pregnancy-
278 related pelvic girdle pain (PPP), I: Terminology, clinical presentation, and prevalence. Eur
279 Spine J. 2004; 13(7): 575-589.
- 280 2. Guerreiro da Silva JB, Nakamura MU, Cordeiro JA, Kulay L Jr. Acupuncture for low back
281 pain in pregnancy - a prospective, quasi- randomised, controlled study. Acupunct
282 Med. 2004;22(2):60-67.
- 283 3. Kovacs FM, Garcia E, Royuela A, González L, Abraira V. Prevalence and factors associated
284 with low back pain and pelvic girdle pain during pregnancy: a multicenter study conducted in
285 the Spanish National Health Service. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2012;37(17):1516-1533.
- 286 4. Pennick VE, Liddle SD. Interventions for preventing and treating pelvic and back pain in
287 pregnancy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2007;(2):CD001139.
- 288 5. Robinson HS, Eskild A, Heiberg E, Eberhard-Gran M. Pelvic girdle pain in pregnancy: the
289 impact on function. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2006;85(2):160-164.
- 290 6. Olsson C, Nilsson-Wikmar L. Health-related quality of life and physical ability among
291 pregnant women with and without back pain in late pregnancy. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.
292 2004;83(4):351-357.
- 293 7. Gutke A, Betten C, Degerskär K, Pousette S, Olsén MF. Treatments for pregnancy-related
294 lumbopelvic pain: a systematic review of physiotherapy modalities. Acta Obstet Gynecol
295 Scand. 2015;94(11):1156-1167.
- 296 8. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 650: Physical activity and exercise during pregnancy and the
297 postpartum period. Obstet Gynecol. 2015;126(6):e135-e142.
- 298 9. Wedenberg K, Moen B, Norling A. A prospective randomized study comparing acupuncture
299 with physiotherapy for low-back and pelvic pain in pregnancy. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.

- 300 2000;79(5):331-335.
- 301 10. Coutaux A. Non-pharmacological treatments for pain relief: TENS and acupuncture. *Joint*
302 *Bone Spine*. 2017;84(6):657-661.
- 303 11. Ondrejovicova A, Petrovics G, Svitkova K, Bajtekova B, Bangha O. Why acupuncture in
304 pain treatment? *Neuro Endocrinol Lett*. 2016;37(3):163-168.
- 305 12. Tang Y, Yin HY, Rubini P, Illes P. Acupuncture-Induced analgesia: a neurobiological basis in
306 purinergic signaling. *Neuroscientist*. 2016;22(6):563-578.
- 307 13. Ammendolia C, Furlan AD, Imamura M, Irvin E, van Tulder M. Evidence-informed
308 management of chronic low back pain with needle acupuncture. *Spine J*. 2008;8(1):160-172.
- 309 14. Kvorning N, Holmberg C, Grennert L, Aberg A, Akesson J. Acupuncture relieves pelvic and
310 low-back pain in late pregnancy. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2004;83(3):246-250.
- 311 15. Wang SM, Dezinno P, Lin EC, Lin H, Yue JJ, Berman MR, et. al. Auricular acupuncture as a
312 treatment for pregnant women who have low back and posterior pelvic pain: a pilot study.
313 *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2009;201(3):271.e1-271.e9.
- 314 16. Nicolian S, Butel T, Gambotti L, Durand M, Filipovic-Pierucci A, Mallet A, et. al. Cost
315 effectiveness of acupuncture versus standard care for pelvic and low back pain in
316 pregnancy: a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(4):e0214195.
- 317 17. Vas J, Cintado MC, Aranda-Regules JM, Aguilar I, Rivas Ruiz F. Effect of ear acupuncture
318 on pregnancy-related pain in the lower back and posterior pelvic girdle: a multicenter
319 randomized clinical trial. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2019;98(10):1307-1317.
- 320 18. Foster NE, Bishop A, Bartlam B, Ogollah R, Barlas P, Holden M, et. al. Evaluating
321 acupuncture and standard care for pregnant women with back pain (EASE Back): a
322 feasibility study and pilot randomised trial. *Health Technol Assess*. 2016;20(33):1-236.
- 323 19. Ekdahl L, Petersson K. Acupuncture treatment of pregnant women with low back and pelvic
324 pain—an intervention study. *Scand J Caring Sci*. 2010;24(1):175-182.
- 325 20. Yang J, Wang Y, Xu J, Ou Z, Yue T, Mao Z, et al. Acupuncture for low back and/or pelvic
326 pain during pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled
327 trials. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(12):e056878.

- 328 21. Albert H, Godskesen M, Westergaard J. Prognosis in four syndromes of pregnancy-related
329 pelvic pain. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 2001;80(6):505-510.
- 330 22. Mogren IM. BMI, pain and hyper-mobility are determinants of long-term outcome for women
331 with low back pain and pelvic pain during pregnancy. *Eur Spine J.* 2006;15(7):1093-1102.
- 332 23. Norén L, Ostgaard S, Johansson G, Ostgaard HC. Lumbar back and posterior pelvic pain
333 during pregnancy: a 3-year follow-up. *Eur Spine J.* 2002;11(3):267-271.
- 334 24. Albert H, Godskesen M, Westergaard J. Evaluation of clinical tests used in classification
335 procedures in pregnancy-related pelvic joint pain. *Eur Spine J.* 2000;9(2):161-166.
- 336 25. Vermani E, Mittal R, Weeks A. Pelvic girdle pain and low back pain in pregnancy: a review.
337 *Pain Pract.* 2010;10(1):60-71.
- 338 26. Rathmell JP, Viscomi CM, Ashburn MA. Management of non-obstetric pain during pregnancy
339 and lactation. *Anesth Analg.* 1997;85:1074-1087.
- 340 27. Liddle SD, Pennick V. Interventions for preventing and treating low-back and pelvic pain
341 during pregnancy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015;2015(9):CD001139.
- 342 28. Close C, Sinclair M, Liddle SD, Madden E, McCullough JE, Hughes C. A systematic review
343 investigating the effectiveness of complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) for the
344 management of low back and/or pelvic pain (LBPP) in pregnancy. *J Adv Nurs.*
345 2014;70(8):1702-1716.
- 346 29. Yao X, Li C, Ge X, Wei J, Luo J, Li F, et al. Effect of acupuncture on pregnancy related low
347 back pain and pelvic pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Clin Exp Med.*
348 2017;9(8):5903-5912.
- 349 30. Cherkin DC, Sherman KJ, Avins AL, Erro JH, Ichikawa L, Barlow WE, et al. A randomized
350 trial comparing acupuncture, simulated acupuncture, and usual care for chronic low back
351 pain. *Arch Intern Med.* 2009;169(9):858-866.
- 352 31. Lund I, Lundeberg T. Are minimal, superficial or sham acupuncture procedures acceptable
353 as inert placebo controls? *Acupunct Med.* 2006;24(1):13-15.
- 354 32. Birch S, Hammerschlag R, Trinh K, Zaslowski C. The non-specific effects of acupuncture
355 treatment: when and how to control for them. *Clinical Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine.*

- 356 2002;3:20-25.
- 357 33. Finniss DG, Kaptchuk TJ, Miller F, Benedetti F. Biological, clinical, and ethical advances of
358 placebo effects. *Lancet*. 2010;375(9715):686-695.
- 359 34. Schedlowski M, Enck P, Rief W, Bingel U. Neuro-bio-behavioral mechanisms of placebo and
360 nocebo responses: implications for clinical trials and clinical practice. *Pharmacol Rev*.
361 2015;67(3):697-730.
- 362 35. Kong JT, Puetz C, Tian L, Haynes I, Lee E, Stafford RS, et. al. Effect of electroacupuncture
363 vs sham treatment on change in pain severity among adults with chronic low back pain: a
364 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(10):e2022787.
- 365 36. Elden H, Fagevik-Olsen M, Ostgaard HC, Stener-Victorin E, Hagberg H. Acupuncture as an
366 adjunct to standard treatment for pelvic girdle pain in pregnant women: randomised double-
367 blinded controlled trial comparing acupuncture with non-penetrating sham acupuncture.
368 *BJOG*. 2008;115(13):1655-1668.
- 369 37. Park J, Sohn Y, White AR, Lee H. The safety of acupuncture during pregnancy: a systematic
370 review. *Acupunct Med*. 2014;32(3):257-266.
- 371 38. Clarkson CE, O'Mahony D, Jones DE. Adverse event reporting in studies of penetrating
372 acupuncture during pregnancy: a systematic review. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*.
373 2015;94(5):453-464.
- 374 39. Song CY, Lin SF, Huang CY, Wu HC, Chen CH, Hsieh CL. Validation of the brief pain
375 inventory in patients with low back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2016;41(15):E937-E942.
- 376 40. Melzack R. The short-form McGill pain questionnaire. *Pain*. 1987;30(2):191-197.

377

378 **Figure legends**

379 Fig. 1: The screening flow chart.

380 Fig. 2: Evidence networks. Acu: Acupuncture, SAcu: Sham Acupuncture, SC: Standard care. A:
381 Pain scores after treatment; B: Overall effects of treatment; C: Quality of life. The lines represent
382 direct comparison of interventions, the line thickness represents the number of studies, and the
383 dot size represents the sample size.

384 Fig. 3: Risk of bias analysis. Green means low risk of bias, yellow means unclear, and red means
385 high risk of bias.

386 Fig. 4: Forest maps. Acu: Acupuncture, SAcu: Sham Acupuncture, SC: Standard care. A: Pain
387 scores after treatment; B: Overall effects of treatment; C: Quality of life.

388 Fig. 5: SUCRA for different interventions. Acu: Acupuncture, SAcu: Sham Acupuncture, SC:
389 Standard care. A: Pain scores after treatment; B: Overall effects of treatment; C: Quality of life.

390

391

392 Table 1. Characteristics

Study ID	Year	Sample size Acu/SAcu//SC	Gestation age	Intervention point	Outcome
Foster et.al	2016	42/42//41	more than 24 weeks	BL25, BL26, BL31, BL54	1, 2, 3
Vas et. al	2019	55/55//52	24-36 weeks	Shenmen and Kidney points	1, 2, 3
Wedenberg et. al	2000	28/0//18	no more than 32 weeks	Bl:26–30, Bl: 60, CW 2	1, 2
Silva et. al	2004	27/0//34	15 to 30 weeks,	K13, S13, BL62, BL40,TE5, GB30,GB41, huatojjaji points	2

Nicolianl et al	2019	96/0//103	16 and 34 weeks	Weizhong, AShi points	1, 2
Kvorning et. al	2004	37/0//35	24-37 weeks	BL60, SI3, BL22–26, GV20	2
Wang et. al	2009	58/54//47	25 to 38 weeks	CW8, SC7, TF2 points	1, 2, 3
Ekdahl et. al	2010	20/20//0	20-26 weeks	Known anatomical site as reference points	1, 3

393 Acu: Acupuncture, SC: Standard care. 1: Pain scores after treatment; 2: Overall effects of treatment, 3:

394 Quality of life (Short Form-36 Health Survey Questionnaire (SF-36))

395

591 of records identified through database searching

55 of additional records identified through other sources

646 of records after duplicates removed

608 of records screened

418 of records excluded

- Without placebo or control group
- Case report
- Meeting abstract
- Review


60 of full-text articles assessed for eligibility

82 of full-text articles excluded


- Data unusable (n=3)
- Types of intervention and control group did not meet inclusion criteria (n=60)
- Data duplication (n=6)
- Different treatment period (n=13)

6 of studies included in qualitative synthesis


6 of studies included in quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis)



A



B



C

	Random reports generated from (subject line) (pass)	Adverse comments (subject line)	Mixing of paragraphs and previous performance trail	Mixing of multiple comments in alternative trail	Incomplete sentences due to concatenation	Subject repeating opening line	Other fails
David 2000	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Robert 2000	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
John 2000	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
George 2001	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Michael 2000	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Steve 2001	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Frank 2000	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Wendell 2000	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

