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Answer for reviewers

Thanks for your helps and suggestions. The point to point responses to the comments of the reviewer(s) are listed below. We checked the changed sentence in red color.

Reviewers' comments:
Reviewer #1:

Please add one paragraph to elaborate the shortcoming of this study, thus make sure the reader can know about that.
-> We have added the shortcoming of this study in discussion (page 14).

Reviewer #2

The authors have revised the paper according to my recommendations. I have only one comment. I wrote:
“Please give the results (the differences between the groups) with 95% confidence intervals (CI).”
Probably due to misunderstandings, the authors have not given the results, only the 95% CI. This applies throughout the paper. For example on page 10 –
“Primary outcome variable” they write:
“There was no significant difference in the change in defecation frequency between the moxibustion and sham group (95%CI: -2.08, 1.58, p=0.78).”
The result is missing. I recommend for instance:
“There was no significant difference in the change in defecation frequency between the moxibustion and sham group. The difference was x.x (95%CI: -2.08, 1.58, p=0.78)”.
Or: "The difference in the change in defecation frequency between the moxibustion and sham group was x.x (95%CI: -2.08, 1.58, p=0.78)."
X.X is the result.
The Editor decides if these changes should be made throughout the paper.
-> We reported the difference between two groups in abstract and results as recommended (page 2, 10-11).

Thank you for all valuable comments.