

1 **Has the design quality of randomized controlled trials of Acupotomy improved over the past**  
2 **18 years? -- CONSORT statement-based literature study from 2006 to 2024**

3

4 Junjie Li<sup>1</sup>, Yantong Zhou<sup>1</sup>, Xinzhu Lu<sup>1</sup>, Ying Bian<sup>1\*</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> Institute of Chinese Medical Sciences, State Key Laboratory of Quality Research in Chinese  
6 Medicine, University of Macau, Taipa, Macao

7

8 \*Corresponding author

9 E-mail: [bianyingumac@126.com](mailto:bianyingumac@126.com)

10

11 These authors contributed equally to this work.

## 12 **Abstract**

13 Acupotomy, originally named ‘Nine Needles’ in *Ling Shu*, was invented as a new type of TCM  
14 instrument in 1976, an innovative combination of acupuncture and surgical treatment. Its forward  
15 development is related to the Clinical effectiveness and safety. RCTs are gold standards in clinical  
16 practice and were welcomed in Acupotomy recently. The CONSORT Statement is set to guide the  
17 designing, analysis and interpretation of trials. But there haven’t been many Acupotomy RCTs until  
18 now, with few on quality evaluation, therefore design quality of Acupotomy RCTs is still weakness.  
19 This study aims to assess design quality of acupotomy RCTs by CONSORT statement, to analyze  
20 the overall quality status and influencing factors.

21 PubMed database was used to search keywords like ‘Acupotomy’ and ‘Randomized Controlled  
22 Trial’. All 48 Acupotomy RCTs published from January 2006 to January 2024 were included. The  
23 CONSORT(2010) was used for quality assessment.

24 48 studies were included for analysis, with 39 articles from Grade 3A hospitals and 9 from  
25 non-Grade 3A hospitals. Scores of RCTs ranged from 33 to 82, the mean score of 53.1 and median  
26 of 49. Grade 3A and non-Grade 3A hospitals differed significantly only in item 8, no studies  
27 reported item 18, and items 11, 14, and 23 had the highest frequency of reporting as failed.

28 Based on 48 Acupotomy RCTs included, the publication time associated with the quality of  
29 reports. The number of authors and possession of funding were the most important factors affecting  
30 the total score. Number of beds, hospitals’ grade, sample sizes, and region GDP/PP did not relate to  
31 the total score. Among 25 items, Ancillary analyses, Blinding, Recruitment were the worst-  
32 performing items. Therefore, updating and standardizing the use of CONSORT can help to improve

33 quality of RCTs, and cross-team communication and cooperation could promote the use of  
34 CONSORT.

35

## 36 **Introduction**

### 37 **Acupotomy**

38 A new-style bladed needle that has a flat head and a cylindrical body is named Acupotomy,  
39 which is a particular type of acupuncture, using a blade-needle combined with a flat surgical scalpel  
40 at the tip of the needle(1, 2). Through stripping adhesions and releasing contractures of deep soft  
41 tissues through the flat knife at the tip of the needle(3), it has been widely used for the treatment of  
42 musculoskeletal pain, soft tissue injuries, and bone hyperplasia(4), such as knee osteoarthritis(3, 5).

43 The Acupotomy was originally derived from ‘The Nine Needles’ recorded in the *Lingshu*(6),  
44 then was improved and reinvented by Prof. Zhu Hanzhang in China in 1976(7, 8), and it also been  
45 described with similar terminologies such as Acupotomology, Acupotome, needle knife, needle  
46 scalpel, miniscalpel, stiletto needle, sword-like needle, mini needle knife and xiaozhendao(9).  
47 Acupuncture is one of the most widely recognized Complementary and Alternative Medicine(CAM)  
48 therapies(10), and clinical studies have shown that Acupotomy is more effective in improving  
49 pressure-pain thresholds(11), and also has the effect of reducing inflammatory factors(12).

50 As an innovative and organic combination of traditional acupuncture therapy in Traditional  
51 Chinese Medicine(TCM) and surgical therapy in Western medicine today(13), Acupotomy shows  
52 promise as a new alternative to non-pharmacologic interventions(14), while the clinical  
53 effectiveness and safety are the key factors affecting its continued development(15, 16).

## 54 **Randomized control trials**

55 Randomized control trials (RCTs) are the gold standards in evaluating and efficiently  
56 translating research data into clinical practice(17). Owing to requiring large amounts of patient data  
57 to identify modest differences between treatments, a well-designed and rigorously conducted RCT  
58 can produce the most valid and precise scientific evidence to a certain extent(18). Thus, considering  
59 it could adequately assess the efficacy of an intervention (ie, what can work)(19), RCTs have been  
60 welcomed in Acupotomy clinical trials recently, especially represented by the analysis of the  
61 specific pain or disease, such as Lumbar Spinal Stenosis(20) and Cervical Spondylosis(21).

62 However, completing all included trials and results analysis does not equate to finishing a RCT  
63 trial at a high level, the quality of its completion is one of the determinative factors in evaluating  
64 the trails' value(22). For instance, Lin has pointed out that partial trials were of low quality and  
65 adverse effects were not recorded in s systematic review of the effects of small needle-knife therapy  
66 (23).

## 67 **The CONSORT statement**

68 To help increase trial utility, replicability and transparency(24), a team of professional editors  
69 and scientists developed the CONSORT (Consolidated Standards for Reporting of Trials)  
70 statement(17), which has been supported by more than 400 journals and multiple editorial  
71 groups(e.g., International Committee of Medical Journal Editors) since its publication in 1996(25,  
72 26), and was widely recognized internationally(27, 28).

73 However, CONSORT has been adopted relatively late in China (29, 30). Only a few Chinese  
74 medical journals recommended using CONSORT in the part of Author Instructions or Guidelines

75 previously(31). In recent years, it has gradually received more attention(32-34).

76 The CONSORT statement is set to regulate the standards for the trial’s design, analysis and  
 77 interpretation of the results(35). It’s made up of a 25-item checklist that provides authors with a  
 78 solid backbone around which to construct and present an RCT(36).

79 While most Acupotomy clinical researches focus on the systematic review and meta-analysis  
 80 of RCTs, taking the risk of bias as the indicator for evaluating quality on the whole, there is little  
 81 study that concentrates on the perspective of CONSORT assessment(37). So, this study aims to  
 82 assess the design quality of acupotomy RCTs from 2006 to 2024 by using the CONSORT 2010  
 83 statement as the evaluation criterion, revealing whether there have been changes in the design  
 84 quality of acupotomy RCTs over the past 18 years.

85

## 86 **Materials and Methods**

### 87 **Literature selection**

88 Using the PubMed database, all randomized controlled trials published by January 2024  
 89 assessing the efficacy of Acupotomy were included. The search strategy is shown in Table 1.

90 **Table 1. The search strategy**

<b>Concept1</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Concept2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Limits</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>Article Type</b>
<b>Acupotomology</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>RCTs</b>	<b>O</b>		<b>N</b>	
	<b>D</b>		<b>T</b>		<b>D</b>	
"Acupotomology"[Title/Abstract] OR	"randomized controlled trial"[Publication Type] OR			"Animals" [MeSH Terms]		Clinical trial [Filter]
"acupotomy"[Title/Abstract] OR	"controlled clinical trial"[Publication Type] OR					Randomized controlled trial [Filter]

"Acupotome"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"needle knife"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"needle scalpel"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"miniscalpel"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"stiletto needle"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"sword like needle"[Title/Abstract] OR  
("mini"[All Fields] AND "needle  
knife"[Title/Abstract]) OR  
"xiaozhendao"[Title/Abstract]

"randomized"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"placebo"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"drug therapy"[MeSH Subheading] OR  
"randomly"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"trial"[Title/Abstract] OR  
"groups"[Title/Abstract]

---

91 To confirm study eligibility, searches were followed by a manual review in which study titles  
92 were examined first, then abstracts, and finally the full text.

### 93 **Inclusion criteria**

94 Reports were included only if they involved human subjects. There were no language  
95 restrictions on the reports. Acupotomy can be used alone or in combination with drugs or other  
96 therapeutic measures. There is no restriction on the technique or type of acupotomy, including  
97 traditional acupotomy, point acupotomy and other new types of acupotomy.

### 98 **Exclusion criteria**

99 Studies related to Needle-knife Fistulotomy(NK-F), draft study protocols, case-control studies,  
100 studies that have not been finalized, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and follow-up studies of  
101 previously published trials.

102

### 103 **Report evaluation criteria**

104 All evaluators assessed articles using the revised CONSORT2010 checklist (Table 2), the  
105 CONSORT Interpretation Guidance document, and the examples cited within it. Since the  
106 CONSORT list does not assign weights to the 25 items(38, 39), in this study, 25 items were assigned

107 an average of 4 points for a total of 100 points based on the experience of the relevant research  
108 literature.

109 **Table 2. CONSORT 2010 Checklist**

	<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Checklist item</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Title and abstract</b>			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	2
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	2
<b>Methods</b>			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	2
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	2
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	2
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	2
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	4
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	2
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	2
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	2
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	2
<b>Randomisation</b>			
Sequence generation	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	2
	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	2
Allocation concealment mechanism	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	4
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	4

Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	2
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	2
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	2
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses	2
<b>Results</b>			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome	2
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	2
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	2
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	2
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	4
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was by original assigned groups	4
Outcomes and estimation	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	2
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	2
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	4
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	4
<b>Other information</b>			
Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	4
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	4
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	4
Total			100

110 The 2010 revised CONSORT statement has 25 items, 12 of which are divided into two sub-  
 111 items (37 items in total). 13 individual items without sub-items are awarded 4 points for adequate  
 112 reporting, 2 points for inadequate reporting or mentioning only, and 0 points for missing items,  
 113 while 12 items with sub-items are awarded 2 points for each sub-item of adequate reporting, 1 point



114 for inadequate reporting or mentioning only, and 0 points for missing items, and the sum of the two  
115 sub-items is the score for this item(40).

116 A report is considered adequate only if it is detailed explicit and written in the required  
117 structural subdivisions. If the content is sufficient but appears in a structure not the CONSORT  
118 required, the report is considered insufficient or only mentioned. Additionally, the location of the  
119 setting where the data were collected in item4b was judged to be adequate only if the content  
120 included, but was not limited to, the hospital, department, time of collection, and time of treatment.  
121 Item 15 required a table of baseline data for subjects in the Result, but if the study included a table  
122 of baseline data for the population in the section of Method and did not state it in the section of  
123 Result, the report was deemed inadequate.

124

## 125 **Data extraction and evaluator training**

126 48 studies were evaluated independently by three evaluators. In addition to the evaluated scores,  
127 the extracted data also included descriptive information such as year of publication, sample size,  
128 number of authors, level of hospital to which the study belonged and number of established beds,  
129 foundation support for the study, and GDP per capita value for 2023 at the municipal level in the  
130 region of publication (the region of publication was determined based on the address of the first  
131 author's institution).

132 The three assessors, all professionals from the University of Macau with a background in  
133 medical administration, were trained in assessing RCTs using the CONSORT checklist, and the  
134 definition of each checklist item was discussed and agreed upon before the data extraction. The full

135 text of each RCT was then assessed independently by each evaluator. If the inter-assessor  
136 concordance was low, a fourth professional assessor was introduced to further assess the full text,  
137 and the final agreed score would be confirmed after the consultation in all four.

138

## 139 **Statistical analysis**

140 All data were typed into the extraction form and descriptive statistical data analysis was  
141 performed using Microsoft Excel 2007 and SPSS 29. The level of significance was set at  $P < 0.05$ .

142 Cohen's kappa was determined to assess inter-assessor agreement for each CONSORT item.  
143 Kappa values between 0.6 and 0.8 were considered to indicate substantial agreement, while values  
144 above 0.8 were considered to indicate almost perfect agreement.

145 The univariate analyses as well as multifactorial impact analyses of possible determinants were  
146 performed. The date of study publication and the 2023 GDP per capita (CNY) of the hospital's city  
147 were used as independent variables and the total score as the dependent variable for linear regression  
148 analysis. The chi-square test was utilized to study the impact of Grade 3A hospitals versus non-  
149 Grade 3A hospitals on the extent of each item. The correlation analysis was used to study the  
150 relationship between the number of beds, the number of authors, the sample size and the 25 items.  
151 The Pearson analysis was performed to analyze the factors affecting the scores.

152

## 153 **Results**

154 An initial literature search identified 93 studies from October 1994 through January 2024. After

155 the screening of titles and abstracts, 32 studies were excluded as they were irrelevant, including 9  
156 articles from between 1994-2005, all of which were excluded for related cutting techniques such as  
157 needle-knife fistulotomy(NK-F). The remaining 61 articles from the beginning of 2006 were  
158 evaluated for full text, of which 6 articles were not available to read and 7 were considered not  
159 eligible, resulting in the inclusion of 48 studies for analysis. Of the 48 eligible articles, 6 were  
160 published before 2010, 42 were published later, 46 published were from China, and 2 were from  
161 South Korea; the literature screening process and results are shown in Fig 1.

162 **Figure 1. Literature selection flowchart**

163

## 164 **Overall compliance with the CONSORT statement**

165 As shown in Fig 2, the lowest score out of 48 studies from 2006 to 2024 was 33, the highest  
166 score was 82, the mean score was 53.1, the median score was 49, and the quality of reporting  
167 improved over time. Using the year of publication as the independent variable (X) and the total  
168 score as the dependent variable (Y), it was found that there is a correlation between the year of  
169 publication and the total score of the report ( $R^2=0.455$ ,  $F=38.350$ ,  $P<0.001$ ).

170 **Figure 2. The bar chart with scatter of publication year versus score of report quality**

171

## 172 **Compliance with the CONSORT statement in different** 173 **grades of hospitals**

174 Of the 48 articles, 39 were sourced from Grade 3A hospitals and 9 from non-Grade 3A  
175 hospitals. To compare whether the two hospitals responded differently to items, the mean scores of

176 the RCTs of Grade 3A hospitals and non-Grade 3A hospitals for each of the 25 items were calculated  
177 separately in Table 3, as well as the frequency of obtaining excellent, good, and failed, where a  
178 score of 0 is considered as failed, 0-2 is considered as accepted, and 3-4 is considered as excellent.

179 **Table 3. Mean scores of 25 items and their frequency of excellent, accepted and failed**

Items	Mean (Grade 3A)	Mean (Non- Grade 3A)	Grade 3A			Non-Grade 3A			X <sup>2</sup>	P
			excell ent	accep ted	failed	excell ent	accep ted	failed		
1	2.90	2.67	18	21	0	3	6	0	0.488	0.485
2	3.74	3.67	39	0	0	9	0	0	-	-
3	1.97	2.00	0	39	0	0	9	0	-	-
4	3.69	3.78	37	2	0	9	0	0	0.482	0.488
5	3.90	3.78	37	2	0	8	1	0	0.447	0.504
6	1.90	1.89	1	38	0	0	9	0	0.236	0.627
7	1.13	0.78	5	13	21	0	4	5	1.413	0.493
8	3.49	4.00	34	3	2	0	8	1	29.302	0.001*
9	1.38	0.89	11	5	23	2	0	7	1.664	0.435
10	1.13	0.67	6	11	22	1	1	7	1.499	0.473
11	0.38	0.44	0	10	29	0	3	6	0.219	0.640
12	2.05	2.00	1	38	0	0	9	0	0.236	0.627
13	1.97	1.56	14	11	14	3	2	4	0.253	0.881
14	0.46	0.44	3	5	31	0	3	6	2.694	0.260
15	2.62	2.22	18	14	7	3	5	1	1.194	0.551
16	4.00	4.00	39	0	0	9	0	0	-	-
17	2.00	2.00	0	39	0	0	9	0	-	-
18	0.00	0.00	0	0	39	0	0	9	-	-
19	1.18	0.67	8	5	26	2	0	7	1.295	0.523
20	1.74	1.33	18	0	21	2	0	7	1.723	0.189
21	3.95	4.00	38	1	0	9	0	0	0.236	0.627
22	3.95	4.00	38	1	0	9	0	0	0.236	0.627
23	0.82	0.44	8	0	31	1	0	8	0.424	0.515
24	1.28	1.33	10	4	25	3	1	5	0.250	0.882
25	2.26	3.11	22	0	17	7	0	2	1.396	0.237

180 It is observed that there is a difference between Grade 3A hospitals and non-Grade 3A hospitals  
181 only in Sequence generation and related details (item 8), as detailed in Table 3.

182 In addition, among the 25 items, Ancillary analyses (item 18) had no studies reported, and  
183 items 11, 14, and 23 had the highest frequency of being reported as failed.

184

185 **Impact of different sizes of hospitals (number of beds),**  
 186 **number of authors, sample size, and availability of funding on**  
 187 **evaluation quality**

188 The size of the hospital is indicated by the number of established beds in the hospital to which  
 189 it belongs. Funding support showed whether there was a source of funding for the trial, and authors  
 190 were asked to report any sources of support for the study, such as project fund sponsored, supply of  
 191 drugs or equipment, etc. The correlations between the 25 items and the number of beds, number of  
 192 authors, and sample size are shown in Table 4.

193 **Table 4. Correlations between number of beds, authors, sample size, funding and 25 items,**  
 194 **total score**

Item	Number of beds	Number of authors	Sample size	Funding
1	0.154	0.292*	-0.300*	0.035*
2	0.178	0.454**	0.037	0.003**
3	0.06	-0.097	-0.07	0.398
4	-0.139	0.207	0.094	0.506
5	-0.337*	0.173	-0.157	0.036*
6	-0.028	0.328*	-0.311*	0.272
7	0.153	0.304*	-0.261	0.22
8	-0.042	0.324*	-0.003	0.331
9	0.271	0.452**	-0.222	0.025*
10	0.344*	0.468**	-0.272	0.040*
11	0.129	0.396**	-0.246	0.016*
12	0.191	0.244	0.05	0.398
13	0.276	0.312*	0.108	0.415
14	0.11	0.118	0.057	0.221
15	0.126	0.315*	-0.127	0.079
16	0	0	0	2
17	0	0	0	2
18	0	0	0	2

19	0.212	0.239	-0.321*	0.303
20	0.23	0.311*	-0.22	0.433
21	-0.085	-0.146	0.065	0.398
22	0.06	0.049	0.015	0.398
23	0.271	0.642**	-0.26	0.005**
24	0.176	0.508**	-0.128	0.025*
25	0.012	0.527**	-0.154	0.000**
Total	0.254	0.598**	-0.254	0.000**
* p<0.05		** p<0.01		

195 The number of authors showed a significant correlation with Item1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15,  
196 20, 23, 24, 25, 14 items and the total score; the sample size had a certain negative correlation with  
197 Item1, 6, 19, 3 items; the number of beds established in the affiliated hospitals had a certain negative  
198 correlation with Item5, and a certain positive correlation with Item10; the presence of funding  
199 showed a certain significant difference for Item1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 23, 24, 25, 9 items and the total  
200 score. Scatter plots were drawn with the independent variable as the number of beds and the  
201 dependent variable as the total evaluation score, and the total score was not correlated with the size  
202 of the hospital to which it belongs as seen in Fig 3 ( $P>0.05$ ).

203 **Figure 3. Scatterplot of the number of beds established in affiliated hospitals versus the total**  
204 **score**

205

## 206 **The effect of economic level in different regions on the quality** 207 **of reports**

208 In Fig 4, The GDP per capita in 2023 of the cities where the hospital the study belongs to is  
209 the independent variable, and the total score of the report quality is the dependent variable, inferring  
210 from the scatter plot that there is no significant correlation between the total score of the report

211 quality and the level of the economy of the region( $P=>0.05$ ).

212 **Figure 4. Scatterplot of GDP per capita in 2023 and scores of report quality**

213

## 214 **Multi-factor impact analysis**

215 The Pearson test is shown in Table 5 for a total of six impact factors, including the number of  
216 beds established in the hospitals, the grade of the hospitals, the number of authors, the sample size,  
217 the presence of funding and the per capita GDP of the affiliated region.

218 **Table 5. Pearson test for six impact factors**

<b>Impact factors</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>P</b>
The number of beds	0.254	0.082
The grades of the hospitals	-0.062	0.676
The number of authors	0.598	<0.001*
The sample size	-0.254	0.081
The presence of funding	-0.438	0.002
The per capita GDP	0.228	0.119*

219 The number of authors and the existence of foundation funding were the most important factors  
220 affecting the report score, and the number of beds prepared by the hospitals, the grade of the  
221 hospitals, the sample size, and the per capita GDP of the affiliated regions were not related to the  
222 total report score of the evaluation.

223

## 224 **Discussion**

225        This article was the first attempt to evaluate the design quality of acupotomy RCTs according  
226 to the CONSORT statement (2010). 48 acupotomy RCTs published in PubMed from January 2006  
227 to January 2024 were evaluated based on the 25 items that were evenly scored. The previous studies  
228 focusing on acupotomy mostly were systematic reviews and Meta-analyses, with risk of bias as the  
229 principle for evaluating overall quality(41-45), lack of studies using the CONSORT checklist to  
230 assess the quality of acupotomy RCTs, which was met by this study.

231        This article used the international RCT standard CONSORT guidelines, which are more  
232 authoritative for quality evaluation(46, 47). In addition, in studies using CONSORT for evaluating  
233 the quality of RCTs, most only selected part of 25 items(48-50). But in this article, the 25 items of  
234 CONSORT were averaged scored, with the same weighting between the items, which emphasized  
235 more on the completeness and standardization of the article's structure and content. Therefore, the  
236 standardization and comprehensiveness of data is better.

237

## 238 **Overall quality to be improved**

239        In studies of acupotomy RCTs from 2006 to 2024, the overall quality needs to be improved.  
240 Among the 48 studies, the lowest score was 33 points, the highest score was 82 points, the average  
241 score was 53.1 points, and the median score was 49 points. This condition is not uncommon, and a  
242 2021 Korean study similarly showed that the reports' quality of acupotomy therapy is currently  
243 low(51).

244        As shown by some studies, there is still no significant improvement in the quality of RCT



245 reports in fields such as dentistry, psychiatry, psychology, cardiothoracic surgery, etc., since the  
246 release of the updated CONSORT list in 2010(52-56), Qi Cui MM et al. also argued that the quality  
247 of current RCTs is not as great as expected(57), and the mere publication of the CONSORT  
248 guidelines did not appear to have a significant impact on the quality of RCTs, whereas the authors'  
249 awareness of the CONSORT items was relevant to the improvement of the RCTs quality(52, 58,  
250 59).

251 Since factors such as the training background of the researchers, the original design of the trial,  
252 and the requirements of the journals are closely related to the quality of the final report, improving  
253 the design, implementation, and reporting of RCTs is a systematic and multifaceted task that  
254 demands a very close understanding of and rigorous compliance with the CONSORT checklist to  
255 ensure RCTs' completeness and standardization, systematically accomplishing the entire  
256 experimental procedure(57, 60).

257

## 258 **Different quality levels among different items**

259 There were large differences in quality levels between 25 items, and some items were still  
260 irregularly reported. The Ancillary analyses were not mentioned in any of the articles, and Blinding,  
261 Recruitment, and Registration were the three items with the lowest quality of reporting, which  
262 probably was due to the lack of rigor in blinding methods, poor recruitment methods, and omission  
263 of key information(61, 62).

264 It is one of the key features of RCTs that lack of blinding may lead to a risk of bias in treatment  
265 effects(63). Although there was previously some controversy over the method of blinding(64), the

266 researchers suggest that the integrity of blinding must still be maintained by devoting sufficient  
267 resources, consideration, and programming to it(65).

268 Recruitment of physicians and patients has always been one of the difficulties in clinical  
269 trials(66), most trials fail to complete recruitment on time, resulting in longer recruitment time, less  
270 reliable results, and even additional costs (67). Therefore, some scholars evaluated the potential  
271 factors affecting the effectiveness of recruitment, which revealed that better recruitment methods,  
272 as well as monitoring and managing poor recruitment, can contribute to the success of  
273 recruitment(68).

274 Similar to the International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for  
275 Pharmaceuticals for Human Use(ICH), whether or not a study is registered is an important factor in  
276 study reliability(69).

277 A previous study also found fewer reports of methodological quality in the areas of  
278 randomization methods, allocation concealment, and blinding details(70-73), probably because  
279 methodological content has been analyzed separately from other CONSORT projects previously(74,  
280 75).

281 Therefore, based on the updated CONSORT guidelines, researchers should focus on the overall  
282 structural integrity of the design quality of RCTs.

283

## 284 **Higher potential for use of CONSORT in Grade 3A hospitals**

285 This study showed that over 80% of the 48 studies were from Grade 3A hospitals, which shows  
286 that in studying the efficacy of Acupotomy, a larger percentage of hospitals with higher grades are

287 among those that follow the CONSORT statement. Such hospitals have more stringent requirements  
288 for the process of randomized controlled trials, which may be due to the more advanced equipment  
289 in higher-grade hospitals, and a better-quality clinical trial environment provides hospitals with  
290 more accurate data sources and results, which is consistent with the findings of Xuan Zhang and  
291 other scholars(76).

292 Nisha Berthon-Jones et al. proposed that multicenter randomized clinical trials facilitate  
293 meeting required timelines and increasing cost-effectiveness by initiating, recruiting, and collecting  
294 data and samples in different areas(77), so that, high-quality multicenter RCTs can strengthen the  
295 external validity of findings in practice(78).

296 But among 25 items, the parts of Sample size ( item7 ) , Allocation concealment mechanism  
297 ( item9 ) , Implementation ( item10 ) , Blinding ( item11 ) , Recruitment ( item14 ) , Ancillary  
298 analyses ( item18 ) , Harms ( item19 ) are poorly reported by these articles, which means that the  
299 hospitals should pay more attention to the details.

300 We found that in the Ancillary analyses (item18) section, the compliance of both Grade 3A  
301 hospitals and non-Grade 3A hospitals was not enough. The investigators should state the results of  
302 the study completely in the report so as not to affect the results of the trial or lead to duplication and  
303 waste of future research, and how to improve the quality of the report further was all mentioned in  
304 these reports. This view was echoed by Mercieca-Bebber R et al.(79).

305 In addition, as hierarchical medical system continues to advance in China, the relevant  
306 authorities can introduce policies to encourage cooperation and exchanges between hospitals in  
307 different grades, clarify the roles and priorities of their respective clinical fields, and realize the  
308 rational allocation of high-quality medical resources, thereby taking advantage of each hospital's

309 strengths, promoting the conduct of high-quality clinical trials, improving the quality of research,  
310 and strengthening the scientific research capacity of the hospitals(80, 81).

311

## 312 **Trend of increasing scores over time**

313 In the 18 years since the first small-needle RCT was published in 2006(82), the quality of  
314 articles has gradually improved over time. This is consistent with the study by Fay Karpouzis et al.  
315 suggesting that the report quality of the medical literature has significantly improved with the  
316 adoption of the CONSORT guidelines(83-85). The CONSORT statement was first published in  
317 1996(86), and officially translated and endorsed by the CONSORT panel in 2007. Scholars such as  
318 Tian-Jiao Song have shown that although CONSORT has been neglected during this period, the  
319 evidence suggests that the overall quality of RCTs published in Chinese journals has improved from  
320 2005 to 2015(31, 60, 87).

321 On the one hand, with the development of science and technology, the medical equipment and  
322 technology in clinical experiments have been improving, and a favorable medical experimental  
323 environment is a necessary prerequisite for research results; on the other hand, with the constant  
324 refinement of the preliminary experiments, it also provides abundant theoretical and practical  
325 experience for the later experiments, therefore the quality of the experimental reports has been  
326 improving with the time.

327 According to Leticia Maria Wambie, the increase in scores on the CONSORT assessment  
328 reflects the growing familiarity of researchers with the rules of CONSORT, which in turn improves  
329 their research reporting skills(88), and the CONSORT checklist is constantly updated, with

330 statements becoming clearer and more accurate, which will also contribute to the quality of  
331 reporting(12, 89), to some extent reflecting the mutually reinforcing relationship between the two.  
332

### 333 **Factors affecting the design quality of RCTs**

334 Among the factors affecting the report quality, the number of authors and the presence of fund  
335 support had a certain impact on most of the evaluation indicators, while the sample size and the  
336 number of established beds in the affiliated hospitals had an impact on only a few of the indicators,  
337 and whether it was a Grade 3A hospitals, the economic level of the region and the quality of the  
338 report had no correlation with each other. Sabapathy P. Balasubramanian et al. similarly found high  
339 number of authors, multicenter studies, and statement of funding sources to be factors significantly  
340 associated with better quality of reporting in a general surgery RCT quality assessment(90, 91).

341 This suggests that the size of the research team and financial support are important for  
342 improving the quality of reporting, but simply increasing sample size and hospital size does not  
343 completely address the issue of reporting quality(92). Furthermore, even if it is a large hospital or a  
344 more economically developed region, it does not mean that all of its studies are of high quality. This  
345 finding is partially consistent with the findings of Ioannis Liampas et al. who concluded that the  
346 number of authors had a meaningful impact on the study, whereas sample size and commercial  
347 funding reports had a less impact on the study(93). A study by Parish AJ et al. concluded that  
348 scientific collaboration (number of authors) is associated with higher citation impact(94). Although  
349 the primary responsibility for improvement rests with the investigators(95), reviewers and editors  
350 of surgical journals can promote this process by endorsing CONSORT guidelines(96, 97), such as

351 requiring authors to follow the guidelines as a condition of publication, and assessing the reliability  
352 of RCTs to be published(98).

353 Therefore, advocating more efficient cooperation and resource sharing, such as cross-region,  
354 cross-hospital, and multi-team cooperation, is conducive to integrating the resources of all parties,  
355 and sharing the experience of trial design, data collection, and statistical analysis, to improve the  
356 feasibility and efficiency of the trial, which will establish a more regularized standard of research  
357 based on consensus(99, 100).

358 In further study, the number of included articles, the weight allocation of items in CONSORT  
359 and the analysis of CONSORT should be improved. The number of included articles needs to be  
360 raised, for one is due to the international terminology of acupotomy is not clear, and the words used  
361 in previous studies are confusing, this study has tried to check the whole, but there may still be  
362 omitted articles, the second is that this study lacks the articles of 2010, 2015, which may affect the  
363 analysis. The weights of 25 items need to be clarified, there were sub-items for different items, with  
364 different content and length, which were of different significance for the article, affecting the  
365 different value evaluation of the RCTs from different perspectives. The instructions of CONSORT  
366 need to be refined, the CONSORT instructions only have short statements currently, which are  
367 understood differently by people with different research backgrounds and experiences, it is  
368 recommended that examples or detailed instructions be introduced(101). Due to the limited sample,  
369 there are limited statistical analyses available, and it is hoped that with the inclusion of more relevant  
370 literature and more standardized evaluation, a more in-depth analysis of influencing factors can be  
371 carried out.

372

## 373 **Conclusion**

374 This study showed that of the 48 Acupotomy RCT studies published during 2006-2024, based  
375 on the CONSORT statement, the highest score was 82, the lowest score was 33, the mean score was  
376 53.1, and the median score was 49, and there was a positive correlation between the report quality  
377 and the time of publication.

378 Among the many factors affecting the quality of the report, the number of authors and the  
379 possession of foundation support were the most important factors affecting the total score, while the  
380 number of beds in the affiliated hospital, the hospital grade, the number of samples, and the per  
381 capita GDP of the affiliated region did not correlate with the total score of the report assessment.  
382 Among the 25 items, Ancillary analyses were not reported by any study, as well as Blinding and  
383 Recruitment were reported as failed with the highest frequency.

384 Therefore, updating and standardizing the use of the CONSORT checklist can help to improve  
385 the quality of RCT reports, and cross-team communication, cooperation and resource sharing can  
386 help to integrate resources and establish a more standardized research standard.

387

## 388 **Acknowledgements**

389 We would like to thank three research funds for their support.

390

## 391 **References**

392 1. Zhu J, Zheng Z, Liu Y, Lawrie S, Esser P, Izadi H, et al. The effects of small-needle-knife therapy  
393 on pain and mobility from knee osteoarthritis: a pilot randomized-controlled study. Clin Rehabil.  
394 2020;34(12):1497-505. Epub 20200630. doi: 10.1177/0269215520938852. PubMed PMID:

- 395 32602373; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7649921.
- 396 2. Shen Y, Cai T, Li T, Zhong J, Guo J, Shen H. A comparison between acupotomy vs the local steroid  
397 injection for the management of soft tissue disorder: A systematic review protocol. *Medicine*  
398 (Baltimore). 2019;98(45):e17926. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000017926. PubMed PMID:  
399 31702675; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6855588.
- 400 3. Yuk DI, Kim KM, Jeon JH, Kim YI, Kim JH. A review of trends for acupotomy. 2014.
- 401 4. Ding Y, Wang Y, Shi X, Luo Y, Gao Y, Pan J. Effect of ultrasound-guided acupotomy vs electro-  
402 acupuncture on knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled study. *Journal of Traditional Chinese*  
403 *medicine= Chung i tsa chih ying wen pan*. 2016;36(4):450-5.
- 404 5. Jiao L, Xiao Y, Chi Z, Zhu D, Ouyang X, Xu W, et al. Acupotomy for third lumbar vertebrae  
405 transverse process syndrome: A protocol for systematic review. *Medicine (Baltimore)*.  
406 2020;99(29):e21072. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000021072. PubMed PMID: 32702850; PubMed  
407 Central PMCID: PMC7373551.
- 408 6. Guo CQ, Liu NG, Li XH, Sun HM, Hu B, Lu J, et al. Effect of acupotomy on nitric oxide synthase  
409 and beta-endorphin in third lumbar vertebrae transverse process syndrome model rats. *J Tradit Chin*  
410 *Med*. 2014;34(2):194-8. doi: Doi 10.1016/S0254-6272(14)60078-9. PubMed PMID:  
411 WOS:000334563800013.
- 412 7. Zhu H. Summarization of acupotomy system. *Engineering Science*. 2006;8(7):1-15.
- 413 8. Wei W, Peng X, Su X. Effectiveness and Safety of Acupotomy on Lumbar Spinal Stenosis: A  
414 Pragmatic, Pilot, Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of Pain Research*. 2023:1057-8.
- 415 9. Kwon C-Y, Yoon S-H, Lee B. Clinical effectiveness and safety of acupotomy: an overview of  
416 systematic reviews. *Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice*. 2019;36:142-52.



- 417 10. Lee MS, Ernst E. Acupuncture for pain: an overview of Cochrane reviews. *Chinese Journal of*  
418 *Integrative Medicine*. 2011;17:187-9.
- 419 11. Li X, Wang R, Xing X, Shi X, Tian J, Zhang J, et al. Acupuncture for myofascial pain syndrome: a  
420 network meta-analysis of 33 randomized controlled trials. *Pain Physician*. 2017;20(6):E883.
- 421 12. Lin M, Li X, Liang W, Liu J, Guo J, Zheng J, et al. Needle-knife therapy improves the clinical  
422 symptoms of knee osteoarthritis by inhibiting the expression of inflammatory cytokines.  
423 *Experimental and therapeutic medicine*. 2014;7(4):835-42.
- 424 13. Pang J, Wang X, Yang L, Tang H. Meta-analysis of a randomised controlled study of small-needle  
425 knife treatment of myofascial pain syndromes. *Lishizhen Medicine and Materia Medica Research*.  
426 2017;28(9):2282-4.
- 427 14. White PF, Lazo OLE, Galeas L, Cao X. Use of electroanalgesia and laser therapies as alternatives  
428 to opioids for acute and chronic pain management. *F1000Research*. 2017;6.
- 429 15. Xie R, You J, Liu L, Huang C, Liang Y. Acupotomy therapy for cervical vertigo: a protocol for a  
430 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*. 2020;99(29):e20662.
- 431 16. Yoon S-H, Kwon C-Y, Leem J. Adverse events of miniscalpel-needle treatment in Korea: A  
432 systematic review. *European Journal of Integrative Medicine*. 2019;27:7-17.
- 433 17. Cuschieri S. The CONSORT statement. *Saudi journal of anaesthesia*. 2019;13(Suppl 1):S27-S30.
- 434 18. Patel N, Sil A. Dermatology and randomized control trials. *Indian Dermatology Online Journal*.  
435 2021;12(3):400-7.
- 436 19. Li D, Wang X, Fang T, Chen Y, Xiang S, Qi J, et al. Acupotomy in the treatment of tenosynovitis  
437 of hand flexor tendons: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*. 2022;101(45):e31504.
- 438 20. Liu F-s, Jin D-z, Wu X. Acupotomy versus acupuncture for knee osteoarthritis: a Meta-analysis of

- 439 randomized controlled trials. Chinese Journal of Tissue Engineering Research. 2012;16(44):8235.
- 440 21. Xiu Z, Liu H, Jiang J, Zeng W, Zhang L, Liu J, et al. A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial  
441 of Effective Levels of Ultrasound-guided Acupotomy for Cervical Spondylosis. Journal of Liaoning  
442 University of Traditional Chinese Medicine. 2023;25(06):1-4.
- 443 22. Liang Y-s, Chen L-y, Cui Y-y, Du C-x, Xu Y-x, Yin L-h. Ultrasound-guided acupotomy for trigger  
444 finger: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research.  
445 2023;18(1):678.
- 446 23. Lin X, Huang K, Zhu G, Huang Z, Qin A, Fan S. The effects of acupuncture on chronic knee pain  
447 due to osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis. JBJS. 2016;98(18):1578-85.
- 448 24. Butcher NJ, Monsour A, Mew EJ, Chan A-W, Moher D, Mayo-Wilson E, et al. Guidelines for  
449 reporting outcomes in trial reports: the CONSORT-outcomes 2022 extension. Jama.  
450 2022;328(22):2252-64.
- 451 25. Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gøtzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010  
452 explanation and elaboration: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. Bmj.  
453 2010;340.
- 454 26. Davidoff F. News from the international committee of medical journal editors. Annals of internal  
455 medicine. 2000;133(3):229-31.
- 456 27. Egger M, Jüni P, Bartlett C, Grp C. Value of flow diagrams in reports of randomized controlled  
457 trials. Jama-J Am Med Assoc. 2001;285(15):1996-9. doi: DOI 10.1001/jama.285.15.1996. PubMed  
458 PMID: WOS:000167995900029.
- 459 28. Piggott M, McGee H, Feuer D. Has CONSORT improved the reporting of randomized controlled  
460 trials in the palliative care literature? A systematic review. Palliative Medicine. 2004;18(1):32-8.

- 461 29. Bian Z, Liu B, Moher D, Wu T, Li Y, Shang H, et al. Consolidated standards of reporting trials  
462 (CONSORT) for traditional Chinese medicine: current situation and future development. *Frontiers*  
463 *of medicine*. 2011;5:171-7.
- 464 30. Lu L, Liao M, Zeng J, He J. Quality of reporting and its correlates among randomized controlled  
465 trials on acupuncture for cancer pain: application of the CONSORT 2010 Statement and STRICTA.  
466 *Expert review of anticancer therapy*. 2013;13(4):489-98.
- 467 31. Xu L, Li J, Zhang M, Ai C, Wang L. Chinese authors do need CONSORT: reporting quality  
468 assessment for five leading Chinese medical journals. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2008;29(5):727-31.  
469 Epub 20080518. doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2008.05.003. PubMed PMID: 18579449.
- 470 32. Lu L-m, He J, Zeng J-c, Liao M-x, Jia C, Pan H-h. Impact evaluation of CONSORT and STRICTA  
471 guidelines on reporting quality for randomized controlled trials of acupuncture conducted in China.  
472 *Chinese journal of integrative medicine*. 2017;23:10-7.
- 473 33. Ma B, Chen Z-m, Xu J-k, Wang Y-n, Chen K-y, Ke F-y, et al. Do the CONSORT and STRICTA  
474 checklists improve the reporting quality of acupuncture and moxibustion randomized controlled  
475 trials published in Chinese journals? A systematic review and analysis of trends. *PloS one*.  
476 2016;11(1):e0147244.
- 477 34. Xiu W-C, Meng X, Hu X-Y, Shi L-J, Gang W-J, Jing X-H. Evaluation of the report quality of  
478 Chinese and English randomized controlled trials of acupuncture based on CONSORT statement  
479 and STRICTA checklist. *Zhongguo Zhen jiu= Chinese Acupuncture & Moxibustion*.  
480 2023;43(3):355-61.
- 481 35. Suppre JS, Patel A, Keshwara SM, Krishna ST, Gillespie CS, Richardson GE, et al. Assessing the  
482 reporting quality of adult neuro-oncology protocols, abstracts, and trials: Adherence to the SPIRIT

- 483 and CONSORT statements. *Neuro-Oncology Practice*. 2023;10(4):391-401.
- 484 36. Gupta AK, Maity C. Efficacy and safety of *Bacillus coagulans* LBSC in irritable bowel syndrome:  
485 A prospective, interventional, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical study  
486 [CONSORT Compliant]. *Medicine*. 2021;100(3):e23641.
- 487 37. Lee J, Guo S, Dinalo J, DeLeo VA, Adler BL. Consort Allergic Contact Dermatitis: A Systematic  
488 Review. *Dermatitis*. 2022;33(3):181-6.
- 489 38. Halpern S, Darani R, Douglas M, Wight W, Yee J. Compliance with the CONSORT checklist in  
490 obstetric anaesthesia randomised controlled trials. *International journal of obstetric anaesthesia*.  
491 2004;13(4):207-14.
- 492 39. Kodounis M, Liampas IN, Constantinidis TS, Siokas V, Mentis A-FA, Aloizou A-M, et al.  
493 Assessment of the reporting quality of double-blind RCTs for ischemic stroke based on the  
494 CONSORT statement. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*. 2020;415:116938.
- 495 40. McCormick F, Cvetanovich GL, Kim JM, Harris JD, Gupta AK, Abrams GD, et al. An assessment  
496 of the quality of rotator cuff randomized controlled trials: utilizing the Jadad score and CONSORT  
497 criteria. *Journal of shoulder and elbow surgery*. 2013;22(9):1180-5.
- 498 41. Kwon C-Y, Yoon S-h, Lee B, Leem J. Acupotomy for the treatment of lumbar spinal stenosis: a  
499 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine*. 2019;98(32):e16662.
- 500 42. Liu F, Zhou F, Zhao M, Fang T, Chen M, Yan X. Acupotomy Therapy for Chronic Nonspecific  
501 Neck Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Evidence-Based Complementary and*  
502 *Alternative Medicine*. 2017;2017(1):6197308.
- 503 43. Sun J, Zhao Y, Zhu R, Chen Q, Song M, Xue Z, et al. Acupotomy Therapy for Knee Osteoarthritis  
504 Pain: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative*

- 505 Medicine. 2020;2020(1):2168283.
- 506 44. Ting F, Qi L, Fanyuan Z, Fushui L, Zhongyong L, Meimei Z, et al. Effect and safety of acupotomy  
507 in treatment of knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and Meta-analysis. *J Tradit Chin Med.*  
508 2020;40(3).
- 509 45. You J, Yang F, Liu N, Tang N, Fang T, Liu F, et al. Acupotomy therapy for shoulder adhesive  
510 capsulitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Evidence-Based*  
511 *Complementary and Alternative Medicine.* 2019;2019(1):2010816.
- 512 46. Hodkinson A, Kirkham JJ, Tudur-Smith C, Gamble C. Reporting of harms data in RCTs: a  
513 systematic review of empirical assessments against the CONSORT harms extension. *BMJ open.*  
514 2013;3(9):e003436.
- 515 47. Kane RL, Wang J, Garrard J. Reporting in randomized clinical trials improved after adoption of the  
516 CONSORT statement. *Journal of clinical epidemiology.* 2007;60(3):241-9.
- 517 48. Ghimire S, Kyung E, Lee H, Kim E. Oncology trial abstracts showed suboptimal improvement in  
518 reporting: a comparative before-and-after evaluation using CONSORT for Abstract guidelines.  
519 *Journal of clinical epidemiology.* 2014;67(6):658-66.
- 520 49. Smith BA, Lee H-J, Lee JH, Choi M, Jones DE, Bausell RB, et al. Quality of reporting randomized  
521 controlled trials (RCTs) in the nursing literature: application of the consolidated standards of  
522 reporting trials (CONSORT). *Nursing outlook.* 2008;56(1):31-7. e3.
- 523 50. Turner L, Shamseer L, Altman DG, Schulz KF, Moher D. Does use of the CONSORT Statement  
524 impact the completeness of reporting of randomised controlled trials published in medical journals?  
525 *A Cochrane review a. Systematic reviews.* 2012;1:1-7.
- 526 51. Jun H, Yoon S-H, Roh M, Kim S-h, Lee J, Lee J, et al. Quality assessment and implications for

- 527 further study of acupotomy: case reports using the case report guidelines and the Joanna Briggs  
528 Institute critical appraisal checklist. 2021.
- 529 52. Savithra P, Nagesh LS. Have CONSORT guidelines improved the quality of reporting of  
530 randomised controlled trials published in public health dentistry journals? Oral health & preventive  
531 dentistry. 2013;11(2).
- 532 53. AL-NAMANKANY AA, Ashley P, Moles DR, Parekh S. Assessment of the quality of reporting of  
533 randomized clinical trials in paediatric dentistry journals. International Journal of Paediatric  
534 Dentistry. 2009;19(5):318-24.
- 535 54. Gerber AJ, Kocsis JH, Milrod BL, Roose SP, Barber JP, Thase ME, et al. A quality-based review  
536 of randomized controlled trials of psychodynamic psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychiatry.  
537 2011;168(1):19-28.
- 538 55. Song SY, Kim B, Kim I, Kim S, Kwon M, Han C, et al. Assessing reporting quality of randomized  
539 controlled trial abstracts in psychiatry: adherence to CONSORT for abstracts: a systematic review.  
540 PLoS One. 2017;12(11):e0187807.
- 541 56. Tiruvoipati R, Balasubramanian SP, Atturu G, Peek GJ, Elbourne D. Improving the quality of  
542 reporting randomized controlled trials in cardiothoracic surgery: the way forward. J Thorac  
543 Cardiovasc Surg. 2006;132(2):233-40. doi: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2005.10.056. PubMed PMID: 16872940.
- 544 57. Plint AC, Moher D, Morrison A, Schulz K, Altman DG, Hill C, et al. Does the CONSORT checklist  
545 improve the quality of reports of randomised controlled trials? A systematic review. Medical journal  
546 of Australia. 2006;185(5):263-7.
- 547 58. Lucena C, Souza E, Voinea G, Pulgar R, Valderrama M, De-Deus G. A quality assessment of  
548 randomized controlled trial reports in endodontics. International Endodontic Journal.

- 549 2017;50(3):237-50.
- 550 59. Moher D, Jones A, Lepage L, Group C, Group C. Use of the CONSORT statement and quality of  
551 reports of randomized trials: a comparative before-and-after evaluation. *Jama*. 2001;285(15):1992-  
552 5.
- 553 60. Song T-J, Leng H-F, Zhong LL, Wu T-X, Bian Z-X. CONSORT in China: past development and  
554 future direction. *Trials*. 2015;16:1-11.
- 555 61. Altman DG, Moher D, Schulz KF. Improving the reporting of randomised trials: the CONSORT  
556 Statement and beyond. *Statistics in medicine*. 2012;31(25):2985-97.
- 557 62. Augestad KM, Berntsen G, Lassen K, Bellika JG, Wootton R, Lindsetmo RO, et al. Standards for  
558 reporting randomized controlled trials in medical informatics: a systematic review of CONSORT  
559 adherence in RCTs on clinical decision support. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics  
560 Association*. 2011;19(1):13-21. doi: 10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000411.
- 561 63. Kolahi J, Bang H, Park J, Desbiens N. CONSORT 2010 and controversies regarding assessment of  
562 blindness in RCTs. *Dent Hypotheses*. 2010;1:99-105.
- 563 64. Moher D, Schulz KF, Altman DG. The CONSORT statement: revised recommendations for  
564 improving the quality of reports of parallel-group randomised trials. *The lancet*.  
565 2001;357(9263):1191-4.
- 566 65. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, Fergusson D. CONSORT 2010 changes and testing blindness in  
567 RCTs. *The Lancet*. 2010;375(9721):1144-6.
- 568 66. Treweek S, Lockhart P, Pitkethly M, Cook JA, Kjeldstrøm M, Johansen M, et al. Methods to  
569 improve recruitment to randomised controlled trials: Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis.  
570 *BMJ open*. 2013;3(2):e002360.

- 571 67. Madurasinghe VW, Group SEoboMS, Group GFobotSEC. Guidelines for reporting embedded  
572 recruitment trials. *Trials*. 2016;17:1-25.
- 573 68. Sully BG, Julious SA, Nicholl J. A reinvestigation of recruitment to randomised, controlled,  
574 multicenter trials: a review of trials funded by two UK funding agencies. *Trials*. 2013;14:1-9.
- 575 69. Shikata S, Nakayama T, Yamagishi H. Quality of surgical randomized controlled trials for acute  
576 cholecystitis: assessment based on CONSORT and additional check items. *Journal of*  
577 *Hepato-Biliary-Pancreatic Surgery*. 2008;15(3):297-303.
- 578 70. Berwanger O, Ribeiro RA, Finkelsztejn A, Watanabe M, Suzumura EA, Duncan BB, et al. The  
579 quality of reporting of trial abstracts is suboptimal: survey of major general medical journals.  
580 *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2009;62(4):387-92.
- 581 71. Ghimire S, Kyung E, Kang W, Kim E. Assessment of adherence to the CONSORT statement for  
582 quality of reports on randomized controlled trial abstracts from four high-impact general medical  
583 journals. *Trials*. 2012;13:1-7.
- 584 72. Peron J, Pond GR, Gan HK, Chen EX, Almufti R, Maillet D, et al. Quality of reporting of modern  
585 randomized controlled trials in medical oncology: a systematic review. *Journal of the National*  
586 *Cancer Institute*. 2012;104(13):982-9.
- 587 73. Ziogas DC, Zintzaras E. Analysis of the quality of reporting of randomized controlled trials in acute  
588 and chronic myeloid leukemia, and myelodysplastic syndromes as governed by the CONSORT  
589 statement. *Annals of epidemiology*. 2009;19(7):494-500.
- 590 74. Rios LP, Oduyungbo A, Moitri MO, Rahman MO, Thabane L. Quality of reporting of randomized  
591 controlled trials in general endocrinology literature. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology &*  
592 *Metabolism*. 2008;93(10):3810-6.



- 593 75. Toulmonde M, Bellera C, Mathoulin-Pelissier S, Debled M, Bui B, Italiano A. Quality of  
594 randomized controlled trials reporting in the treatment of sarcomas. *Journal of clinical oncology*.  
595 2011;29(9):1204-9.
- 596 76. Zhang X, Dong C, Wang N, Chan C, Lau CT, Wang J, et al. Protocol of the CONSORT and SPIRIT  
597 Extension for multicenter clinical trials. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2023;11:1241152.
- 598 77. Berthon-Jones N, Courtney-Vega K, Donaldson A, Haskelberg H, Emery S, Puls R. Assessing site  
599 performance in the Altair study, a multinational clinical trial. *Trials*. 2015;16. doi: ARTN 138  
600 10.1186/s13063-015-0653-x. PubMed PMID: WOS:000353541500001.
- 601 78. Aitken LM, Pelter MM, Carlson B, Marshall AP, Cross R, McKinley S, et al. Effective strategies  
602 for implementing a multicenter international clinical trial. *J Nurs Scholarsh*. 2008;40(2):101-8. doi:  
603 10.1111/j.1547-5069.2008.00213.x. PubMed PMID: 18507563.
- 604 79. Mercieca-Bebber R, Aiyegbusi OL, King MT, Brundage M, Snyder C, Calvert M. Knowledge  
605 translation concerns for the CONSORT-PRO extension reporting guidance: a review of reviews.  
606 *Quality of Life Research*. 2022;31(10):2939-57.
- 607 80. Wang Y, Chen H. The impact of the implementation of hierarchical medical system on population  
608 health: evidence from China. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2024;12:1402832.
- 609 81. Hu H, Wang R, Li H, Han S, Shen P, Lin H, et al. Effectiveness of hierarchical medical system  
610 policy: an interrupted time series analysis of a pilot scheme in China. *Health Policy and Planning*.  
611 2023;38(5):609-19.
- 612 82. Zhu HZ, Quan WC, Zhang XF, Qiao JL, Liu ZJ, Fu P, et al. [Evaluation on clinical therapeutic  
613 effect of needle-knife therapy on cervical spondylosis]. *Zhongguo Zhen Jiu*. 2006;26(5):316-8.  
614 PubMed PMID: 16739840.

- 615 83. Xu L, Li J, Zhang M, Ai C, Wang L. Chinese authors do need CONSORT: reporting quality  
616 assessment for five leading Chinese medical journals. *Contemporary clinical trials*. 2008;29(5):727-  
617 31.
- 618 84. Wang L, Li Y, Li J, Zhang M, Xu L, Yuan W, et al. Quality of reporting of trial abstracts needs to  
619 be improved: using the CONSORT for abstracts to assess the four leading Chinese medical journals  
620 of traditional Chinese medicine. *Trials*. 2010;11:1-6.
- 621 85. Karpouzis F, Bonello R, Pribicevic M, Kalamir A, Brown BT. Quality of reporting of randomised  
622 controlled trials in chiropractic using the CONSORT checklist. *Chiropr Man Therap*. 2016;24:19.  
623 Epub 20160609. doi: 10.1186/s12998-016-0099-6. PubMed PMID: 27284400; PubMed Central  
624 PMCID: PMC4899907.
- 625 86. Begg C, Cho M, Eastwood S, Horton R, Moher D, Olkin I, et al. Improving the quality of reporting  
626 of randomized controlled trials. The CONSORT statement. *JAMA*. 1996;276(8):637-9. doi:  
627 10.1001/jama.276.8.637. PubMed PMID: 8773637.
- 628 87. Zhang D, Yin P, Freemantle N, Jordan R, Zhong N, Cheng KK. An assessment of the quality of  
629 randomised controlled trials conducted in China. *Trials*. 2008;9:22. Epub 20080424. doi:  
630 10.1186/1745-6215-9-22. PubMed PMID: 18435861; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2373774.
- 631 88. Wambier LM, Gonçalves AdR, Wambier DS, Reis A, Chibinski ACR. Adherence to the CONSORT  
632 statement of randomized clinical trials on ART restorations in children: current status and reporting  
633 characteristics. *Brazilian Oral Research*. 2022;36:e017.
- 634 89. Chen W, Li X, Chen Z, Hao W, Yao P, Li M, et al. A comprehensive quality analysis of randomized  
635 controlled clinical trials of Asian ginseng and American ginseng based on the CONSORT guideline.  
636 *Journal of Ginseng Research*. 2022;46(1):71-8.

- 637 90. Balasubramanian SP, Wiener M, Alshameeri Z, Tiruvoipati R, Elbourne D, Reed MW. Standards  
638 of reporting of randomized controlled trials in general surgery: can we do better? *Ann Surg.*  
639 2006;244(5):663-7. doi: 10.1097/01.sla.0000217640.11224.05. PubMed PMID: 17060756;  
640 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1856614.
- 641 91. Chen J, Li Z, Liu B, Gan X, Li C, Yu H. Quality improvement in randomized controlled trial  
642 abstracts in prosthodontics since the publication of CONSORT guideline for abstracts: a systematic  
643 review. *J Dent.* 2018;23-9. Epub 20180506. doi: 10.1016/j.jdent.2018.04.025. PubMed PMID:  
644 29742449.
- 645 92. He Y, Zhang R, Shan W, Yin Y, Zhang X, Zhang Y, et al. Evaluating the completeness of the  
646 reporting of abstracts since the publication of the CONSORT extension for abstracts: an evaluation  
647 of randomized controlled trial in ten nursing journals. *Trials.* 2023;24(1):423. Epub 20230622. doi:  
648 10.1186/s13063-023-07419-5. PubMed PMID: 37349754; PubMed Central PMCID:  
649 PMC10286410.
- 650 93. Liampas I, Chlinos A, Siokas V, Brotis A, Dardiotis E. Assessment of the reporting quality of RCTs  
651 for novel oral anticoagulants in venous thromboembolic disease based on the CONSORT statement.  
652 *Journal of Thrombosis and Thrombolysis.* 2019;48(4):542-53.
- 653 94. Parish AJ, Boyack KW, Ioannidis JP. Dynamics of co-authorship and productivity across different  
654 fields of scientific research. *PloS one.* 2018;13(1):e0189742.
- 655 95. Kuriyama A, Takahashi N, Nakayama T. Reporting of critical care trial abstracts: a comparison  
656 before and after the announcement of CONSORT guideline for abstracts. *Trials.* 2017;18(1):32.  
657 Epub 20170121. doi: 10.1186/s13063-017-1786-x. PubMed PMID: 28109324; PubMed Central  
658 PMCID: PMC5251322.


- 659 96. Kassirer JP, Champion EW. Peer review. Crude and understudied, but indispensable. *JAMA*.  
660 1994;272(2):96-7. doi: 10.1001/jama.272.2.96. PubMed PMID: 8015140.
- 661 97. Turner L, Shamseer L, Altman DG, Weeks L, Peters J, Kober T, et al. Consolidated standards of  
662 reporting trials (CONSORT) and the completeness of reporting of randomised controlled trials  
663 (RCTs) published in medical journals. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;11(11):MR000030. Epub  
664 20121114. doi: 10.1002/14651858.MR000030.pub2. PubMed PMID: 23152285; PubMed Central  
665 PMCID: PMC7386818.
- 666 98. Dasí F, Navarro-García MM, Jiménez-Heredia M, Magraner J, Viña JR, Pallardó FV, et al.  
667 Evaluation of the quality of publications on randomized clinical trials using the Consolidated  
668 Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) statement guidelines in a Spanish tertiary hospital. *The*  
669 *Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*. 2012;52(7):1106-14.
- 670 99. Moores CJ, Miller J, Perry RA, Chan LLH, Daniels LA, Vidgen HA, et al. CONSORT to  
671 community: translation of an RCT to a large-scale community intervention and learnings from  
672 evaluation of the upscaled program. *BMC Public Health*. 2017;17(1):918. Epub 20171129. doi:  
673 10.1186/s12889-017-4907-2. PubMed PMID: 29187157; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5708099.
- 674 100. Sarkis-Onofre R, Poletto-Neto V, Cenci MS, Pereira-Cenci T, Moher D. Impact of the CONSORT  
675 Statement endorsement in the completeness of reporting of randomized clinical trials in restorative  
676 dentistry. *J Dent*. 2017;58:54-9. Epub 20170131. doi: 10.1016/j.jdent.2017.01.009. PubMed PMID:  
677 28159507.
- 678 101. Speich B, Schroter S, Briel M, Moher D, Puebla I, Clark A, et al. Impact of a short version of the  
679 CONSORT checklist for peer reviewers to improve the reporting of randomised controlled trials  
680 published in biomedical journals: study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ open*.

681 2020;10(3):e035114.

682


## 683 Supporting information

684 S1 Fig. Literature selection flowchart




685

686 S2 Fig. The bar chart with scatter of publication year versus score of report quality




687

688 **S3 Fig. Scatterplot of the number of beds established in affiliated hospitals versus the total score**



689

690 **S4 Fig. Scatterplot of GDP per capita in 2023 and scores of report quality**



691

692

## 693 List of abbreviations

694 **RCTs:** Randomised controlled trials

695 **CONSORT:** Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials

696 **TCM:** Traditional Chinese Medicine

697 **GDP:** Gross Domestic Product

698 **CAM:** Complementary and Alternative Medicine

699 **NK-F:** Needle-knife fistulotomy