

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript is very novel and of High Quality. It is recommended for publication.

Reviewer #2:

Specific Comments to Authors: Through network meta-analysis, this paper explored the difference in efficacy of different acupuncture therapies in the treatment of liver cancer pain. The research topic has certain clinical practicability and innovation. However, the quality of this paper is poor, and there are problems in language writing and methodology, so it is difficult to draw a reliable conclusion. The specific problems are as follows: 1. The number of literatures in each database should be indicated in Fig.1Flow Chart. And the reasons for the preliminary screening of 369 papers should be noted. 2. In the abstract, shouldn't the purpose of the study be the difference in efficacy between different acupuncture treatments? What is the difference between acupuncture and other therapies? 3. Among the retrieved databases, PubMed includes Medline database. Web of Science database. should be added. 4. With too few included literatures, there is little significance in making network meta-analysis, and it is difficult to draw reliable conclusions. 5. PRISMA, which is proprietary to network meta-analysis, should be used instead of 2009 PRISMA, which is used in regular Meta-analysis. 6. It is necessary to provide the method of consistency check, specific results and pictures. 7. In the previous summary and results section of the text, it was mentioned that there were 8 RCTs in this study, but there were 14 RCTs in the discussion. 8. The theory of Traditional Chinese medicine that is not easy to understand should be deleted, and the international code should be added to the acupuncture points. 9. There were only 4 acupuncture treatments in the study. Are there any other acupuncture treatments for liver cancer pain? 10. In addition, this paper lacks direct comparison of acupuncture therapy and only has indirect comparison of network meta.

Answers:

1. The number of literatures in each database has already been indicated in Fig.1Flow Chart. And the reasons for the preliminary screening of 369 papers have been noted.

2. In the abstract, the purpose of the study is the difference in efficacy between different acupuncture treatments, we have already corrected it.

3. PubMed includes Medline database, but PubMed has a wider range. In order to get a higher recall ratio, we searched both database.

4. In order to get a higher recall ratio, we retrieved literatures about all cancers but focused on liver cancer, thus the included literatures is relatively few.

5. 2009 PRISMA checklist is requested by the magazine.

6. The method of consistency check, specific results and pictures are provided in the revised paper.

7. We are sorry for the mistake we have made in the discussion, there are only 8 RCTs.

8. The theory of Traditional Chinese medicine is important for the understanding of the difference between each acupuncture methods.

9. There are many other acupuncture treatments for liver cancer pain, but 4 acupuncture treatments are tested by RCT.
10. The direct comparison of acupuncture therapy for liver cancer pain is our purpose for next clinical study.

Reviewer #3:

Specific Comments to Authors: This network meta-analysis analyzed the function of different acupuncture methods in releasing the pain of liver cancer. The topic is fine, and the search strategies and analysis methods are good. However, there are some concerns about the manuscript. Firstly, the authors described that Tianying acupoint acupuncture may be the most effective measure in the Results; but in the Abstract, 'triple puncture and remaining needle acupuncture had a relatively high effective rate'; finally, a third different conclusion was made 'In this study we found that acupuncture with the three step analgesic ladder method had the highest effectiveness.' From abstract to results, then to conclusion, the authors concluded three different best conclusions. Secondly, although the initial number of finding studies (n= 5889) is very high, more than half of them are duplicated, only 8 randomized controlled clinical trials (RCTs) are selected. The number is relatively small. In the Results, 8 RCTs with a total of 734 patients, while in Discussion, 14 RCTs with a total of 1152 patients. A plagiarism check is needed. Such as the sentence of 'In serious cancer pain, morphine and other major analgesics have been commonly administrated for clinical treatments, and their effects were accurate, while with high incidence of side effects, such as nausea, vomiting, constipation, and other conditions.' and the sentences of 'Acupuncture may be useful in controlling the pain experienced by many cancer patients. It is a complementary and conservative therapy that balances the flow of vital energy, and in turn helps to relieve pain. It is an analgesic adjunctive method for cancer patients that is worthy of additional high quality studies'. Minors: 1. A space is required after punctuation (many similar issues), such as the article; Jing Chen; Corresponding author:Zuo-Yun Chen, Chief Doctor, Department ofTraditional; due to liver cancer; March31, 2021, etc. Please check across the manuscript. 2. Grammar checks: the three step analgesic ladder therapy > three-step; the quality of their life > lives; identify a best method of acupuncture > a better method or the best method; the early screening and treatment of liver cancer has > have; effects plays an important role > effects, and plays an important role; irrespective of ages and sex > age and sex or ages and sexes; the Cocharne hand book> Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions; in the review should met> meet; liver cancer.(Table2, Table3, Figure 3, Figure 4)> liver cancer (Table 2, Table 3, Figure 3, and Figure 4); RESULT>RESULTS; DISSCUSSION (wrong spelling)> DISCUSSION; 3. Full name for the abbreviation of RCT in the abstract; Similarly, on page 5, VAS score; In Table 3, SUCRA except in the abstract. 4. Cocharne hand book for systematic review of interventions (Version 5.1.0) [1q]: what is [1q]?

Answers:

1. We must apologize for mixing our former article with this. We have corrected it.

2. Plagiarism check is done, and all references are clearly marked.
3. We have sent the article to MedE for grammar check.

Re-reviewer:

The authors substantially revised the manuscript. The current version is acceptable unless the following minors should be revised. Minor changes: seriously affects the quality of their life > lives; March31, 2021 > March 31, 2021; and(Pain or Suffering or Ache)and(Acupuncture (space between the worlds); a third reviewerif necessary; should met the following; age and sex.(3); (Figure3, Figure4, Table2, Figure5, table3). similar issues checking across the manuscript; >three-step analgesic ladder therapy (14.1%); we found thattriple puncture; Wu hedge, etc.There is; Please check the close of each sentence and between words, a space is needed.

Authors have revised throughout.