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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The authors present a clear rationale for this review. The inclusion of the Chinese literature to this topic is welcomed.

Major comments.

Referencing.

Statements have been supported to secondary data supporting the statements made. Suggest the authors need to go back and include primary sources when citing statements to the following

Line 56 ref 4 is a meta-analysis suggest source study that demonstrates the effect of N&V on qol.

Line 54 ref 3.

Line 57 ref 5

Line 67 ref 8 would the latest Cochrane review be a more appropriate reference?

Line 72 ref 10.

Line 77 ref 5.

Line 178 and 180 ref 14 is not the most appropriate reference to include here. Please include other appropriate sources

Other comments on references

Line 59 ref 6, line 69 ref 9 why do these statements need a reference?

Types of studies

Line 28: The rationale for including trials with at least 20 participants per arm needs to be stated, and why include only normal pregnancy, and how was this defined.

Type of control

Line 181 The distinction between sham and placebo acupuncture is not well and supported by appropriate references.

Outcomes

Primary and secondary outcomes are not well stated and defined. Why is the analysis limited to an unspecified primary outcome?
Statistical analysis
What were the pre-specified sub group analyse?

Line 236: What heterogeneity test was performed and how was this interpreted.

Results

Discussion
Line 239: exclusion of data from studies with multiple arms results is a potential bias, please reflect on this in the discussion. The control groups are controlling for different aspects; ie regression to the mean and for specific aspects of the intervention.

What did you do with the blinded studies with multiple treatment groups, which data was entered?

Minor points

Results
Figure 1 can you please clarify the reasons for exclusion for the 50 trials described as not an inclusion criteria. 6 duplicate studies are they not part of 311 identical citations. 9 studies not included for pooling was this insufficient data or insufficient information or both?

Please include a summary of studies by country setting.

Table 2 studies may need cross checking for accuracy.

Lines 334-340 suggest these definitions are moved to the methods under the outcomes.

Discussion
Line 399 suggest this data on sensitivity analysis is reported in results.

Line 415 statistical heterogeneity can be reduced by combining trials with different controls, agree, so why do it?

Line 440 I think it is worth highlighting other differences between your review and the Cochrane review ie inclusion of Chinese literature and reflecting the strength of this

There are some limitations associated with this review would the authors like to reflect on this and include for completeness?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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