Adverse event reporting in studies of penetrating acupuncture during pregnancy: a systematic review
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Abstract

Background. Acupuncture within pregnancy has frequently been investigated, often finding this to be more effective than standard care. However, the adverse event severity, types and occurrence are unclear. Objective. To investigate the quality of reporting adverse events and to attempt to identify occurrence, type and severity of adverse events in acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups. Data sources. MEDLINE, CINAHL, Allied and Complementary Medicine Database, and Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) were searched for relevant studies between 2000 and 2014. Study selection. Seventeen studies using penetrating acupuncture and making comment on adverse events experienced were included. Quality appraisal of the selected publications was performed using either the PEDro scale or the Downs and Black checklist. Quality of reporting was evaluated against STRICTA and CONSORT guidelines, with data on adverse events extracted in accordance with CONSORT and Good Clinical Practice adverse event guidelines. Results. Overall quality of reporting of adverse events was poor, with information describing the adverse events often lacking in detail. A number of trends were noted: adverse events occurring within a treatment session was 3–17% in the acupuncture groups and 4–25% in the non-acupuncture groups. The percentage of women affected by an adverse event was between 14 and 17% in the acupuncture groups and between 15 and 19% in non-acupuncture groups. Conclusions. Adverse event reporting within acupuncture trials is generally poor. The trends noted were that adverse events do occur, but would appear to be largely minor and comparable to non-acupuncture-related interventions.

Introduction

The effectiveness of acupuncture for pregnancy-related ailments is an area of growing interest, with conditions such as pelvic girdle pain the subject of an increasing body of randomized controlled trial (RCT) evidence. A
recent Cochrane review (1) reported moderate quality evidence in support of acupuncture for pelvic girdle pain and European guidelines recommend its use (2). Favorable outcomes have been reported when acupuncture has been used for other pregnancy-related disorders such as low back pain (3), nausea and vomiting (4), dyspepsia (5), depression (6) and insomnia (7).

Best evidence on the types, severity and occurrence of adverse events as a result of receiving acupuncture during pregnancy is central to shared decision-making and informed consent. The range of adverse events that may be associated with acupuncture and moxibustion during pregnancy has recently been reviewed (8); however, the definition of acupuncture was unclear, and no comparison was made between adverse events in acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups. Despite this recent review (8), the quality of reporting has yet to be established. In addition, the types, severity and occurrence of adverse events associated with a skin-penetrating needle compared with non-skin-penetrating interventions remains unclear.

Good Clinical Practice guidelines (9) suggest that authors should record any adverse event, categorize its severity and postulate if it is attributable to the intervention. An extension to the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) statement (10) addressed the poor quality of reporting of adverse events in healthcare research, suggesting the use of the term “harms” and providing a series of recommendations on reporting. The Standards for Reporting Interventions in Clinical Trials of Acupuncture (STRICTA) guidelines (11), another extension of the CONSORT 2001 statement (12), were designed to improve the overall quality of reporting of acupuncture research trials. However, there has been little change in standards of reporting since their introduction (13). This systematic review will examine the quality of reporting of adverse events in studies of acupuncture in pregnancy, using the CONSORT extension of harms (10) and STRICTA guidelines (11). The types, severity and occurrence in women and fetuses/infants in both skin-penetrating needling and non-skin-penetrating treatment groups will also be assessed.

Material and methods

The following databases were searched between the years 2000 and 2014: MEDLINE; CINAHL; Allied and Complementary Medicine Database (AMED); and Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro). English language restrictions were imposed. The keywords and truncations used in a combined search of MEDLINE, CINAHL and AMED using EBSCOhost Online Research Databases were (“acupuncture” OR “acupunct*” OR “acupuncture therap*” OR “segmental acupuncture” OR “Japanese acupuncture” OR “trigger point acupuncture” OR “auricular acupuncture” OR “ear acupuncture” OR “auricular acupuncture” OR “electroacupuncture” OR “electro-acupuncture” OR “electro acupuncture” AND “pregnant” OR “pregnan*” OR “pre-natal” OR “pre-natal” NOT “fertility” OR “infertility”). The search strategy was modified for PEDro. Hand searching of reference lists of retrieved articles was also carried out to identify further studies.

All types of research design using penetrating acupuncture in the treatment of pregnant women were considered for inclusion in this review. Studies focusing on women in labor were excluded. For the purpose of this review “acupuncture” was considered as any intervention that inserted needles into the skin, and is referred to as acupuncture throughout this article. If the authors used a skin-penetrating placebo acupuncture approach, this was termed, for reporting purposes of this study, as acupuncture. Studies that used non-penetrating sham acupuncture, and/or another non-acupuncture-related intervention were termed non-acupuncture and will be referred to as such throughout this article. No restrictions were placed on the dosage of the intervention administered.

The primary outcome of this review was to analyze the quality of reporting of adverse events in the included studies. The secondary outcomes were to report upon trends in: the occurrence of adverse events that were experienced following acupuncture and non-acupuncture; the severity and type of adverse events experienced; and the number of pregnant women affected by adverse events in acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups.

Titles and abstracts of studies identified by both electronic and hand searches were collated and reviewed. Full texts of studies meeting the inclusion criteria were screened and publications were included if there was mention of adverse events in mother or fetus/infant in the text or tables. Due to the inclusion of a wide variety of study design, more than one quality assessment tool was required. Included RCTs were assessed for methodological quality using the PEDro checklist (14), to assess the internal validity and statistical interpretability. The Downs and Black checklist (15) was used to assess the quality of included cohort and case studies. Quality of reporting was evaluated against the STRICTA guidelines (11) and CONSORT extension on harms guidelines (10). The term “harms” has not been used in this review as not all adverse events extracted would be deemed harmful and therefore its use could be misleading. In accordance with Good Clinical Practice guidelines (9), the severity and description of events that were considered as adverse were extracted in line with the study authors’ interpretation, not the interpretation of the authors of this review.
Methodological quality scores were calculated for each included study for the PEDro (14) and Downs and Black (15) checklists with higher scores indicating greater internal validity and statistical interpretability. Each study's quality of reporting against CONSORT (10) and STRICTA (11) guidelines was collated in tabular format.

For each included study the number of adverse events that occurred in both the acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups (if applicable), and the percentage in relation to the number of treatment sessions administered, were calculated. A range was calculated if the number of treatments received was variable, if the exact amount of adverse events was unclear or if the number of treatments received by drop outs (included in this analysis) was unclear. The number and percentage of women in acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups who experienced an adverse event was also calculated. An aggregate figure was calculated for percentage of adverse events experienced and percentage of women experiencing an adverse event.

Data on the severity of adverse events were analyzed in relation to an adverse event tree (9) where the judgment of the chief investigator in the primary study determined the event as serious or not; attributable to the study or not; and if attributable to the study, whether it was a serious adverse event, a serious related event or a serious adverse reaction. Data were not separated into ailments treated, as the acupuncture intervention would be very similar and there were too few studies to enable appropriate subgroup analysis.

**Results**

**Study description**

After removing duplicates, a total of 252 studies were identified, which were screened by title and abstract to determine their eligibility; 227 articles were excluded because they did not meet the selection criteria. Of the remaining 25 studies, eight (16–23) were excluded because they did not mention whether adverse events were found or not. A Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) diagram (24) (Figure 1) identifies the different stages of the selection process. Seventeen studies (3–7,25–36) were included (Table 1) and systematically reviewed.

![Flow chart of articles identified through the review process (PRISMA).](image-url)
Ten studies investigated acupuncture’s effect on pain (3,26,27,29–33,35,36); three studies investigated nausea and/or vomiting (4,25,34); one investigated depression (6); one emotional complaints (28) one dyspepsia (5) and another insomnia (7). Thirteen studies used an RCT design (3–7,27–30,32,34,36); three employed a case study design (26,31,33), and another used a retrospective cohort design (35). Five studies included women within the first trimester (4,6,25,26,34). One author (da Silva) was the first named on four studies (5,7,27,28), and two authors were first named on two articles, Elden (29,30) and Ternov, who was also cited as Kvorning (32,35).

Nine included studies were published in acupuncture-related journals (5,7,26–28,30,31,33,34) and six in journals directly related to women’s health (3,4,6,29,32,36). Twelve studies compared acupuncture to a non-acupuncture group (Table 2 (3–7,27–30,32,34,36).

**Methodological quality and quality of acupuncture-specific reporting**

Table 2 relates key STRICTA guideline (11) domains to each included study. Table 2 also includes the PEDro scale (14) score for each RCT and the Downs and Black checklist (15) overall score for study quality for other study designs. Two-thirds of the included RCTs (n = 8)
scored 5/10 or lower (5,7,25,27–29,32,36) on the PEDro scale (14). Higher methodological quality scores did not necessarily mean that the quality of acupuncture-specific reporting related to the STRICTA guidelines (11) was of a similarly higher standard. For example, of the five RCTs (3,4,6,30,34) scoring 6/10 or higher on the PEDro scale (14) only one study (6) reported on all criteria as for the STRICTA guidelines. Likewise, a lower methodological score did not necessarily indicate poorer compliance to STRICTA guidelines (11). Seven studies specified details of the practitioner’s background (5–7,25,27,28,33). Twelve studies described the type of acupuncture used, categorized into TCM or Western acupuncture (3–7,25,27,28,31,33,34,36).

The reporting of needling approach (depth, number of needles and retention time) varied. Five studies did not give any description of the depth of needling (3,31,32,35,36). The 12 studies that described the depth of needling used differing levels of detail. Five studies gave vague depths: “classical acupuncture depth” (5,28), “traditional depth” (7,27) and “standard depth” (6). Six studies described the depth needled in either centimeters or millimeters and gave it as a range (4,25,26,29,30,34).

Eight studies gave an incomplete description of the number and dimensions of the needles used (3,25,26,29,30,32,33,35), and only one study did not report information on needle retention time (32).

Table 2. Quality of reporting of included studies in relation to STRICTA (11) checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodology quality score</th>
<th>Practitioner background specified?</th>
<th>Style of acupuncture stated?</th>
<th>Non-acupuncture group intervention reported?</th>
<th>Frequency of acupuncture reported fully?</th>
<th>Depth of needling reported?</th>
<th>Number of points needled and needle dimensions reported fully?</th>
<th>Needle retention time stated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsson et al. (25)</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings (26)</td>
<td>10/15, 67%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (27)</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (7)</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva (28)</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (5)</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder et al. (29)</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder et al. (30)</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrester (31)</td>
<td>9/15, 60%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight et al. (4)</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvorning et al. (32)</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manber et al. (6)</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouse (33)</td>
<td>9/15, 60%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al. (34)</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternov et al. (35)</td>
<td>17/26, 65%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. (3)</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedenberg et al. (36)</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA, not applicable; STRICTA, Standards for Reporting Interventions in Clinical Trials of Acupuncture; TCM, traditional Chinese medicine; U, unclear; Western, Western style acupuncture.
Quality of adverse event reporting

Table 3 details the supporting information provided by included studies in relation to adverse events’ recording as recommended by the CONSORT extension on reporting of harms in RCTs (10). Only five studies mentioned harms either within their title or abstract (29,32,34–36). Eleven studies included infant health as part of their results (3,5,7,27–29,31,32,34–36), all of which stated that there were no adverse events attributable to acupuncture or non-acupuncture interventions. Three studies did not explain clearly whether adverse events were attributable to the intervention (4,27,35), and seven studies indicated that at least one adverse event experienced was attributable to the intervention (5–7,26,28,29,36). The two studies that had adverse event reporting as a primary aim included the most supporting information (29,34). Eight studies (3–7,30,34,36) failed to provide detailed information for all drop outs. The most common form of reporting of adverse event method appears to be patient self-reporting (n = 7), though the method of reporting was unclear in seven studies (3,25,31–34,36). Four studies indicated measurement of adverse events to the medium term (3,29,31,34), with no studies finding lasting health impacts to either mother of fetus/child.

Table 3. Quality of reporting of included studies in relation to CONSORT Better Reporting of Harms in Randomized Trials (10) checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsson et al. (25)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings (26)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (27)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (7)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva (28)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elden et al. (29)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elden et al. (30)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrester (31)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight et al. (4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvorning et al. (32)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manber et al. (6)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouse (33)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al. (34)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternov et al. (35)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. (3)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedenberg et al. (36)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AE, adverse event; IQ, investigator questioning; NA, not applicable; PSR, participant self-reporting; U, unclear.

*aHow many drop outs from each group and whether the drop out was as a result of the intervention received.
Of the four publications that reported zero adverse events (Table 4) (25,31,33,34), three (25,31,33) provided minimal information in relation to CONSORT guidelines on reporting harms (11).

**Categories and types of adverse events**

A number of trends were noted. Thirty-one non-serious adverse events were categorized as being potentially attributable to receiving acupuncture (Figure 2). One serious adverse event, premature labor, was attributed to being potentially acupuncture related and categorized as an unexpected serious related event. The investigators discontinued acupuncture from this point, and reported that the event ceased and had no lasting impact on mother/infant, delivering uneventfully at 42 weeks (35). In the non-acupuncture groups, 19 non-serious adverse events were reported, all potentially attributable to the intervention (Figure 3). No serious adverse events were recorded as being potentially attributable to the intervention.

Altered taste, tiredness, treatment discomfort, uterine contractions, being placed on bed rest, treatment discomfort (noted as needle pain in acupuncture group) were all

### Table 4. Percentage adverse event occurrence and percentage affected in acupuncture vs non-acupuncture groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Total sample size (women who received acupuncture)</th>
<th>Number of sessions: acupuncture/ nonacupuncture</th>
<th>% of times that adverse events occurred: acupuncture/ nonacupuncture</th>
<th>% of women who experienced an adverse event: acupuncture/ nonacupuncture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsson et al. (25)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>416/NA</td>
<td>0/NA</td>
<td>0/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings (26)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20/NA</td>
<td>10/NA</td>
<td>100/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (27)</td>
<td>61 (27)</td>
<td>216–324/NA</td>
<td>2–28/U</td>
<td>22/U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (7)</td>
<td>22 (12)</td>
<td>96–144/NA</td>
<td>1–13/U</td>
<td>8/U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al. (5)</td>
<td>36 (20)</td>
<td>160–240/NA</td>
<td>1–8/U</td>
<td>5/U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elden et al. (29)</td>
<td>108 (56)</td>
<td>672/624</td>
<td>8–100/5–100</td>
<td>96–100/65–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elden et al. (30)</td>
<td>386 (124)</td>
<td>1414/261</td>
<td>5/11</td>
<td>35/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrester (31)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/NA</td>
<td>0/NA</td>
<td>0/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight et al. (4)</td>
<td>55 (28)</td>
<td>103/100</td>
<td>11/8</td>
<td>4-39/4-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvorning et al. (32)</td>
<td>72 (37)</td>
<td>222/105</td>
<td>3–38/U</td>
<td>38/U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manber et al. (6)</td>
<td>150 (101)</td>
<td>863–1093/466–566</td>
<td>2–31/1–11</td>
<td>2–22/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouse (33)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/NA</td>
<td>0/NA</td>
<td>0/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al. (34)</td>
<td>552 (414)</td>
<td>2070/138</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternov et al. (35)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4955/NA</td>
<td>6/NA</td>
<td>17–22/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. (3)</td>
<td>159 (112)</td>
<td>112/47</td>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>4–5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedenberg et al. (36)</td>
<td>60 (30)</td>
<td>300/270</td>
<td>1–7/2</td>
<td>7/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA, not applicable; U, unclear.

*A range was calculated if the number of treatments received, occurrence or amount of women effected by adverse events were open to interpretation, variable or if the number of treatments received by drop outs was unclear.

*Upper limit unable to be calculated.

*Aggregate average percentage, rounded up if 0.5 or above.
reported in both acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups. The details of the need for bed rest occurring in the acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups were not disclosed (3). The serious events that were not attributable to acupuncture or non-acupuncture interventions were all noted in two studies (6,34).
Occurrence of adverse events and numbers of women experiencing adverse events

Although all studies reported the total number of women, details on where dropouts occurred were not always clear. It was assumed for this review that if dropouts had suffered an adverse event, this would have been included in the overall reporting. In six studies the precise number of treatment sessions administered was difficult to ascertain (5–7,27,28,35). Of the 12 studies that included a non-acupuncture group (3–7,27–30,32,34,36), four did not articulate how many sessions the non-acupuncture groups received (5,7,27,28), and one did not provide specific detail (6). Where data were available, the acupuncture groups all received more sessions than the non-acupuncture groups.

Eight studies gave enough detail to calculate the precise number of treatment sessions that produced an adverse event (3,4,25,26,30,31,33,34), four of them being zero (25,31,33,34). Two of the studies including women within the first trimester reported that zero adverse events occurred (25,34). For the nine remaining studies that did not give precise data (5–7,27–29,32,35,36), a range was calculated. Out of the 12 studies that compared penetrating acupuncture to a non-penetrating treatment, five studies (5,7,27,28,32) did not state whether adverse events were noted in the non-acupuncture groups, two studies suggested more adverse events occurred in the acupuncture group compared with the non-acupuncture groups (3,4), one study suggested more adverse events in the non-acupuncture group (30), and in three studies it was unclear whether the acupuncture or non-acupuncture group experienced more adverse events (6,29,36). One study found no difference between the groups (34). The aggregate average percentage range of adverse events occurring within a treatment session was 3–17% in the acupuncture groups and 4–25% in the non-acupuncture groups.

An exact figure of how many women were affected by adverse events was clear in 12 studies (5,7,25–28,30–34,36). When acupuncture was compared with non-acupuncture, the number of women affected by an adverse event was reported as: more in the non-acupuncture group in one study (36); no difference in one study (34); more in the acupuncture group in two studies (3,30); five did not state how many women were affected in the non-acupuncture groups (5,7,27,28,32); and in three it was unclear (4,6,29).

The majority of types of adverse events experienced were transient and non-serious, with the one serious adverse event equating to 1 per 1193 women, or once per 7375–7941 sessions. On average, the percentage of women affected by an adverse event ranged between 14 and 17% in the acupuncture groups, and between 15 and 19% in the non-acupuncture groups. It was not possible to ascertain whether adverse events or the number of women affected by them, were more or less prevalent in the acupuncture compared with the non-acupuncture groups.

Discussion

This systematic review examined the quality of reporting of adverse events in studies of acupuncture in pregnancy, with trends noted in their type, occurrence and severity, in both acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups.

Overall the quality and clarity of reporting of adverse events was found to be poor. Only 17 studies out of a possible 25 reported on adverse events and of these 17 studies, only two studies provided adequate data (29,34). However, 11 studies did give some explanation as to whether at least one adverse event was attributable to the intervention received. This said, within these 11 studies the reporting of attribution was not provided for all adverse events and a lack of clarity prevented exact data reporting for either adverse event occurrence or women affected. As a result, we cannot say whether the adverse events reported upon were considered to be as a result of the intervention the person received every time they occurred.

The wide range of what might be considered to be an adverse event in itself affects the level of reporting. For example, one study (29) recorded deqi as an adverse event, despite it being sought when inserting needles. For most clinicians, deqi is a desired response from acupuncture (37). The CONSORT extension on harms statement (10) proposes the use of the term “side effect” for anything that may or may not be expected as a result of an intervention. An adverse event or harm should be reported separate from a side effect. Given the lack of consensus in the literature in relation to the reporting of adverse events, harms and side effects, the term “harm” was not adopted because it would have inadequately reflected the type of data that were extracted from included studies.

Explanations for the poor reporting could include researchers not collecting data on adverse events; authors being unaware or publishing before the creation of the CONSORT extension on harms statement in 2004 (10); translation into English; or word limits in journals. However, it is important to report upon the trends that were noted on data extraction to help aid clinicians and patients on informed consent. Transient and non-serious adverse events were the norm in the included studies, and no adverse events were recorded as having an effect on the fetus, which supports a previous review (8). The non-serious events were very similar in both acupuncture and non-acupuncture groups, which tentatively suggests that
their occurrence is neither more nor less when receiving a
skin-penetrating needle compared with another interven-
tion. The one serious adverse event had no longlasting
effect on mother or baby, and it was questionable as to
whether it was attributable to inserting a needle. The data
presented also suggest that some women experienced
more than one adverse event.

In this review we noted no trends between adverse
events and any of the following: the ailment being investi-
gated, the trimester acupuncture was initiated, the mean
age of participants, the type of acupuncture administered,
country of publication, or the detail provided within the
STRICTA (11) and CONSORT (10) guidelines.

The authors of this review took the decision to define
acupuncture as a needle penetrating the skin, meaning
where a penetrating placebo approach was adopted it was
categorized as acupuncture, although it is acknowledged
that a penetrating placebo approach would not necessarily
be considered as acupuncture in clinical practice. Making
the distinction between penetrating and non-penetrating
interventions provides a clear comparison and can help
with identifying whether needle penetration leads to
greater or lesser risk of experiencing an adverse event.

This review used the best practice frameworks of
STRICTA (11), CONSORT extension on harms (10) and
Good Clinical Practice (9) adverse event reporting as the
structure within which to present findings. As recom-
manded, adverse event types have been reported upon
based on the included studies' authors' interpretation.
Given the generally poor reporting quality of the included
studies, the provision of a range percentage in this review
provides more insight into adverse event occurrence rate
than the more common single figure, but cannot be inter-
preted with a great deal of confidence because of the pau-
city of information provided within individual studies.
Although the clinical experience of author CEC, coupled
with safety acupuncture research within the general popu-
lation (38–40), would suggest that the real incidence lies
closer to the more conservative percentages, the poor
detail and clarity of reporting make this impossible to
confirm.

As this was a systematic review looking at adverse
events, it was necessary to use tools to assess study quality
as well as reporting quality. Using different assessment
tools for different studies hinders the uniformity of
assessment from the review. Although the CONSORT
extension of harms (10) is not a validated tool for assess-
ing quality of reporting of adverse events, it is a guideline
for authors to follow when publishing, and therefore its
use in this review as a benchmark highlights the poor
depth of reporting. Adverse events included did not nec-
essarily arise as a result of acupuncture treatment, as
demonstrated by the same types of adverse events being
recorded in both acupuncture and non-acupuncture
groups (Figures 2 and 3), and the reporting of adverse
events was more often than not open to interpretation or
had missing data. It is therefore beyond the scope of this
review to suggest whether these adverse events occurred
as a direct result of the intervention administered or was
due to other factors. Based on our findings, the trend
suggests that a penetrating needle appears to be as safe as
non-acupuncture interventions; however, the amount of
women included in the selected studies are unlikely to be
enough to be representative of the population of pregnant
women globally. Finally, studies that were not published
in English were excluded from this analysis, and so a
more accurate picture of types, severity and occurrence
could potentially be gained from including non-English
published studies.

The CONSORT statement (10) recommends that all
trials publishing data on effectiveness should also publish
any safety issues to help guide the reader in terms of the
safety risk–benefit of the intervention under study.
Authors should follow STRICTTA (11), the CONSORT
extension on harms (10) and Good Clinical Practice
guidelines (9) when reporting results of acupuncture
studies regardless of study design. They should clearly
state whether they thought the adverse events/side effects
observed were caused by the intervention, and if drop
outs were as a result of experiencing an adverse event.
We would also suggest that the CONSORT statement of
harms (10) is extended to include details on the exact
occurrence and amount of women affected. Due to edito-
rial constraints and accompanying word limits, publishers
could consider using adherence to the CONSORT state-
ment as part of their consideration when receiving a
manuscript. A uniform approach for the use of the terms
“harms” and “side effects” would ensure that differentia-
tion is made between desirable/undesirable effects and
highlight those effects that were deemed potentially harm-
ful. Enhanced reporting, including that of zero adverse
events and of adverse events in all groups under study,
would ensure that the severity, type and occurrence of
adverse events were made transparent. Future investiga-
tion into the safety aspects of acupuncture in pregnancy
should be extended into audit of adverse events in clinical
settings. In addition, the characteristics of the individual
women investigated could be researched to determine if
there are particular attributes that predispose a woman to
experience one or several adverse events.

Conclusion

This review has highlighted the poor quality of
adverse event reporting and trends in severity, types and
occurrence reported in the English language published
literature on acupuncture in pregnancy. Adverse events do occur in the pregnant population, but would appear to be largely minor and transient and comparable to other non-acupuncture-related interventions. In the context of shared decision-making, pregnant women should be made aware of the severity, occurrence and type of potential adverse events associated with acupuncture before consenting to acupuncture treatment.
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