Medicine

Acupuncture and weight loss in Asians: A PRISMA-compliant systematic review and meta-analysis: Erratum

After a reader inquiry, there are multiple corrections being made to the Medicine article, "Acupuncture and weight loss in Asians, a PRISMA-compliant systematic review and meta-analysis,"^[1] published in Volume 98, Issue 33 of *Medicine*. The authors of the paper apologize for the mistakes.

- 1) There was an error in the Abstract Results section. The Results should read:
- Twelve RCTs involving 1151 subjects were included. Compared with the control groups, the acupuncture groups exhibited significantly greater reductions of body mass index (BMI) (WMD -1.20 kg/m²; 95% CI -1.91, -0.48) and waist circumference (WMD -1.85 cm; 95% CI -3.20, -0.49) In the subgroup analyses, significant differences in the reduction of BMI was observed between the acupuncture and sham acupuncture groups, the acupuncture plus diet and exercise, and the diet and exercise groups, and the acupuncture and no intervention groups, but not between the acupuncture plus exercise and exercise groups.
- 2) There was an error and missing reference in section 2.6 Data synthesis and analysis. The line should read "where *r* is the correlation coefficient and the value is 0.4."[12] [43].

References [43] Abrams KR, Gillies CL, Lambert PC. Meta-analysis of heterogeneously reported trials assessing change from baseline. Stat Med 2005; 24:3823-44.

3) There was an error in Figure 1. The "not RCT: n=1" was missing from the figure.

4) There was an error in section 3.3 Effect of acupuncture on BMI.

The overall efficacy of acupuncture relative to control treatment was evident from a significant difference in the reduction of BMI (WMD -1.20 kg/m²; 95% CI -1.91, -0.48) (Fig. 4). In the subgroup analyses, significant differences in the reduction of BMI were noted between acupuncture and sham acupuncture (WMD -0.79 kg/m²; 95% CI -0.99, -0.59), acupuncture plus diet and exercise and diet and exercise (WMD:-2.27 kg/m²; 95% CI: -4.26, -0.29) and acupuncture and no intervention(WMD:-1.70 kg/m²;95% CI: -2.59, -0.81). No significant differences were observed in the comparisons of acupuncture with placebo acupuncture (WMD:-0.98 kg/m²;95% CI: -2.26, 0.30), acupuncture plus laser acupuncture with laser acupuncture (WMD:-0.04 kg/m²;95% CI: -1.21, 1.13) and acupuncture plus exercise (WMD:-0.50 kg/m²;95% CI: -2.20, 1.20).

Figure 4 has been updated.

5) There was an error in section 3.4 Effect of acupuncture on waist circumference.

The overall efficacy of acupuncture relative to control treatment was evident from the significant difference in the reduction of waist circumference (WMD -1.85 cm; 95% CI -3.20, -0.49) (Fig. 5). In the subgroup analyses, there were significant differences in the reduction of waist circumference between acupuncture plus diet and exercise, and diet and exercise (WMD -4.35 cm; 95% CI -6.16, -2.54), and acupuncture and no intervention (WMD -0.29 cm; 95% CI -0.54, -0.05). There was no significant difference between acupuncture and sham acupuncture (WMD -1.28 cm; 95% CI -3.96, 1.41), acupuncture plus exercise and exercise (WMD -1.07 cm; 95% CI -4.29, 2.16).

Figure 5 has been updated.

6) There was an error in section 4, the Discussion.

"Our results demonstrated that relative to sham treatment, acupuncture was effective for the reduction of BMI and waist circumference." should be revised to "Our results demonstrated that relative to sham treatment, acupuncture was effective for the reduction of BMI"

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000018400

Copyright © 2019 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc.

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CCBY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Yao J, He Z, Chen Y. Acupuncture and weight loss in Asians: A PRISMA-compliant systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine 2019;98:49 (e18400).



Figure 1. Flow diagram of study selection process.

	acu	punctu	re	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 acupuncture v	s sham a	acupur	icture						
Hsu2009	-0.1	5.6	23	-0.3	0.9	22	5.0%	0.20 [-2.12, 2.52]	
Tseng2016	-0.7	0.6	26	0.07	0.33	26	10.6%	-0.77 [-1.03, -0.51]	-
Xie2011	-3.1	11.6	100	-2.8	13	100	3.1%	-0.30 [-3.71, 3.11]	
Yeo2014	-1.65	0.76	61	-0.8	0.7	30	10.5%	-0.85 [-1.16, -0.54]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			210			178	29.2%	-0.79 [-0.99, -0.59]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² :	= 0.00; C	hi² = 0.	94, df=	= 3 (P =	0.82);	² = 0%	N .		
Test for overall effect	Z=7.75	5 (P < 0	0.00001)					
1.1.2 acupuncture v	s placeb	o acup	unctur	е					
Tong2010	-1.04	3.21	76	-0.06	3.5	42	8.0%	-0.98 [-2.26, 0.30]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			76			42	8.0%	-0.98 [-2.26, 0.30]	•
Heterogeneity: Not a	pplicable								
Test for overall effect	Z= 1.50) (P = 0	0.13)						
1.1.3 electro-acupu	ncture+la	aser a	cupunc	ture vs	laser	acupu	ncture		
Wang2015	-2 02	3.21	65	-7.89	36	65	8 3%	-0.04 -1 21 1 1 3	
Subtotal (95% CI)	2.02	0.21	65	2.00	0.0	65	8.3%	-0.04 [-1.21, 1.13]	•
Heterogeneity Not a	nnlicable								
Test for overall effect	Z = 0.07	7 (P = 0	0.95)						
1.1.4 acupuncture+	diet and	exerci	se vs d	iet and	exerc	ise			
Yang2010	-3.32	0.89	31	-2.3	0.65	30	10.4%	-1.02 [-1.41, -0.63]	-
Zhang2016	-6.88	1.87	120	-3	1.64	120	10.3%	-3.88 [-4.33, -3.43]	÷
Zhao2010	-3.16	2.11	30	-1.25	0.9	30	9.4%	-1.91 [-2.73, -1.09]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.000		181			180	30.0%	-2.27 [-4.26, -0.29]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 2.99; C	hi ² = 9	0.33, df	= 2 (P	< 0.000	001); P	= 98%		
Test for overall effect	Z= 2.24	4 (P = 0).02)						
1.1.5 acupuncture+	exercise	VS ex	ercise						
Hsu2005(a)	-0.7	3.61	24	-0.2	4 49	22	4 9%	-0.501-2.87 1.871	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Hsu2005(b)	-0.7	3.78	22	-0.2	4 27	20	4 8%	-0.50 [-2.95 1.95]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.1	0.10	46	0.2	7.61	42	9.7%	-0.50 [-2.20, 1.20]	-
Heterogeneity Tau ²	= 0.00° C	$hi^2 = 0$	00 df=	1 (P =	1.000	P = 0.0%	0.000		
Test for overall effect	Z = 0.58	B (P = 0	0.56)		1.00/1	0			
1.1.6 acupuncture v	s no inte	rventio	on						
Hsu2005(b)	-0.7	3.78	22	-0.1	3.78	21	5.2%	-0.60 [-2.86, 1.66]	
Xu2015	-2.25	1.33	30	-0.36	1.16	15	9.6%	-1.89 [-2.65, -1.13]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			52	11010	10.11.20	36	14.8%	-1.70 [-2.59, -0.81]	•
Suprotariosition	= 0.09; C	$hi^2 = 1$	13, df=	= 1 (P =	0.29);	² = 119	%		
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	1 - 5 / 1	1 (P=1	.0002)						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect	2-5.75								
Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Total (95% CI)			630			543	100.0%	-1.20 [-1.91, -0.48]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² :	= 1.25; C	hi² = 1	630 66.72, 0	df = 12 ((P < 0.0	543 00001)	100.0%	-1.20 [-1.91, -0.48]	4 -2 0 2 4

Figure 4. Body mass index (BMI): acupuncture vs control.

	acupuncture			control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Random, 95% CI
1.2.1 acupuncture vs	sham a	cupunc	ture						
Hsu2009	-0.2	5.1	23	-2.3	4.8	22	10.0%	2.10 [-0.79, 4.99	1 +
Tseng2016	-3.2	3.4	26	0.8	1.8	26	15.1%	-4.00 [-5.48, -2.52	1
Yeo2014	-3.36	2.17	61	-2.2	2.1	30	17.0%	-1.16 [-2.09, -0.23	1 <u> </u>
Subtotal (95% CI)			110			78	42.1%	-1.28 [-3.96, 1.41	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	4.75; Ch Z = 0.93	$i^2 = 17.3$ (P = 0.3	22, df = (5)	2 (P = 1	0.0002);	² = 88	%		
1.2.2 acupuncture+d	iet and e	vercise	vs die	t and e	rercise				
7hang2016	-13 32	11 00	120	-8.03	11 59	120	0 7%	-5 20 1.9 27 -2 31	1
Zhang2010 Zhan2010	-73	5.25	30	-3.5	3.6	30	121%	-3 80 1-6 08 -1 52	
Subtotal (95% CI)	1.0	0.20	150	0.0	0.0	150	21.8%	-4.35 [-6.16, -2.54	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	i ² = 0.6	1, df = 1	1 (P = 0)	44); 12=	0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z= 4.71	(P < 0.0	0001)						
1.2.3 acupuncture+e	xercise	s exer	cise						
Hsu2005(a)	-2.2	7.29	24	-0.5	7.68	24	6.6%	-1.70 [-5.94, 2.54]
Hsu2005(b) Subtotal (95% CI)	-2.2	8.06	22 46	-2	8.34	20 44	5.3% 11.8%	-0.20 [-5.17, 4.77 -1.07 [-4.29, 2.16	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	i ² = 0.20	0, df = 1	1 (P = 0.)	65); I ² =	0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.65	(P = 0.5	(2)						
1.2.4 acupuncture vs	no inter	vention							
Hsu2005(b)	-2.2	8.06	22	-0.4	7.34	21	5.9%	-1.80 [-6.40, 2.80	1
Wang2015 Subtotal (95% CI)	-1.46	0.69	65 87	-1.17	0.72	65 86	18.3% 24.2%	-0.29 [-0.53, -0.05 -0.29 [-0.54, -0.05	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	i ² = 0.4	1, df = 1	1 (P = 0.)	52); I ² =	0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.38	(P = 0.0	12)						
Total (95% CI)			393			358	100.0%	-1.85 [-3.20, -0.49	1 •
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2.58; Ch	i ² = 48.1	04, df =	8 (P < 1	0.00001); I ² = 8	3%		-4 -2 0 2 4
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.68	(P = 0.0)	107)						Favours acupuncture Favours control
Test for subgroup diff	erences:	Chi ² = 1	19.55,	df = 3 (P	= 0.000	02), I ² =	84.7%		
			Fig	ure 5.	Waist c	ircumfe	rence: ac	cupuncture vs contro	ol.

Reference

[1] Yao J, He Z, Chen Y. Acupuncture and weight loss in Asians: A PRISMA-compliant systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine. 98;33:e16815.