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Reviewer’s report:

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.
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