http://dx.doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.15.00620

Fig. E-1

Comparisons of acupuncture and sham treatment on the basis of short-term WOMAC pain scores (**Fig. E-1A**), short-term WOMAC physical function scores (**Fig. E-1B**), long-term WOMAC pain scores (**Fig. E-1C**), and long-term WOMAC physical function scores (**Fig. E-1D**). WMD = weighted mean difference.

Fig. E-2

Comparisons of acupuncture and usual care on the basis of short-term WOMAC pain (**Fig. E-2A**) and physical function (**Fig. E-2B**) scores. WMD = weighted mean difference.

Fig. E-3

Comparisons of acupuncture and no intervention on the basis of short-term WOMAC pain scores (**Fig. E-3A**), short-term WOMAC physical function scores (**Fig. E-3B**), long-term WOMAC pain scores (**Fig. E-3C**), and long-term WOMAC physical function scores (**Fig. E-3D**). WMD = weighted mean difference.

Fig. E-4

Funnel plots of pain relief (**Fig. E-4A**) and functional improvement (**Fig. E-4B**). SE = standard error, and WMD = weighted mean difference.

Fig. E-5

Funnel plots of short-term pain relief (**Fig. E-5A**), short-term function improvement (**Fig. E-5B**), long-term pain relief (**Fig. E-5C**), and long-term function improvement (**Fig. E-5D**). SE = standard error, and MD = weighted mean difference.

http://dx.doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.15.00620

TABLE E-1 PRISMA Checklist*

Section/Topic	#	Checklist Item
Title		
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both
Abstract		
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number
Introduction		
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS)
Methods		
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis)
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means)
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies)
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified
Results		
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations
Risk of bias within	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12)

studies		
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group and (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see item 15)
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see item 16])
Discussion		
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers)
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias)
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research
Funding		
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review

*Reproduced from: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097. Epub 2009 Jul 21. For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.

TABLE E-2 Publication Bias According to the Egger and Begg Tests

	Egger Test						Begg Test			
	Std. Efficiency	Coeff.	Std. Error	T	P > |T|	95% CI	Kendall Score	Std. Dev.	Pr > |Z|	Pr > |Z| (Continuity Corrected)
Pain										
	Slope	−3.49	0.80	−4.34	0.00	−5.22 – −1.75	−29	20.21	0.15	0.17
	Bias	0.55	3.67	0.15	0.88	−7.38 – 8.48				
Function										
	Slope	−1.45	0.21	−6.87	0.00	−1.91 – −1.00	−40	22.21	0.07	0.08
	Bias	1.09	2.69	0.41	0.69	−4.68 – 6.86				