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Reviewer's report:

The revision has addressed my concerns in general. There are a few minor editing I would suggest the authors to consider.

1) Please make sure the tense in the manuscript is correct. For instance, p4 line 9-10, "The recruitment will start from December, 2016 and end in October, 2019 synchronously in the three centers.", should it be "The recruitment would start from December, 2016 and will end in October, 2019 synchronously in the three centers."

2) P4, Line 15-16: A standard care is what the patient receives regarding less if he/she is in a study or in the real/sham acupuncture group, it is not a choice or ethical consideration. If the decongestive therapy is INDEED all the patients receive, I suggest reword the sentence as "all participants will receive the same standard care of decongestive therapy". If the decongestive therapy is NOT received by all patients, then try to use the term usual care. You study design actually is real acupuncture+usual care vs. sham acupuncture+usual care.

3) p8 Line 21-27, please consider moving this up to the section of "patient health monitoring" on p7, or following P8, Line 11 "Adverse Event", as the content is not related to QoL outcome. Please note safety is listed as your primary study aim P3 line 42, but AE is your secondary outcome, which is not really consistent.

4) P8, line 33-37, the sentence seems incomplete.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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