Title: An Adaptive Pragmatic Randomized Controlled Trial of Emergency Department Acupuncture for Acute Musculoskeletal Pain Management

Authors
Stephanie A. Eucker, MD, PhD[1,2,*], stephanie.eucker@duke.edu
Oliver Glass, PhD[3], oliver.glass@duke.edu
Mitchell R. Knisely, PhD, RN[5], mitchell.knisely@duke.edu https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2938-6125
Amy O'Regan, MPH[6], amy.oregan@duke.edu, orchid ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6788-5673
Alexander Gordee, MA[8,9], alexander.gordee@duke.edu
Cindy Li, BS [1], cindy.li1@duke.edu
Christopher L. Klasson, BA[11], clklasson@uiowa.edu
Olivia TumSuden, BS[12], otumsuden@unc.edu
Alena Pauley [1], alena.pauley@duke.edu
Harrison Chen[1], harrison.chen@duke.edu
Catherine A. Staton, MD, MSc[1,4], catherine.staton@duke.edu
Maggie Kuchibhatla, PhD[8,10], maggiek@dm.duke.edu
Shein-Chung Chow, PhD[8], sheinchung.chow@duke.edu
On behalf of the Duke Emergency Department Acupuncture Research team

Author affiliations
[1]Duke University, Department of Emergency Medicine
[2]Duke University, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery
[3]Duke University, Department of Medicine, Division of General Internal Medicine
[4]Duke University, Duke Global Health Institute
[5]Duke University School of Nursing
[6]Duke University, Department of Population Health Sciences
[7]Durham Veterans Affairs Health Care System
[8]Duke University, Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics
[9]Duke University Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Research Design Methods Core
[10]Duke University Center for Aging
[11]University of Iowa, Carver College of Medicine
[12]University of North Carolina, Adams School of Dentistry

*Corresponding author:
Stephanie A. Eucker
stephanie.eucker@duke.edu
Duke University Hospital
Department of Emergency Medicine
2301 Erwin Rd
DUMC 3096
Durham, NC 27710
919-681-0196

Key words:
Acupuncture therapy
Pain management
Emergency medicine
Emergency service, hospital
Musculoskeletal pain

Word count: 3000 words

Key Points

Question

- What is the effectiveness of acupuncture for reducing acute musculoskeletal pain in an emergency department (ED) population?

Findings

- In this pragmatic randomized clinical trial of 236 adults, ED patients receiving auricular acupuncture had a mean (± SD) pain score reduction of 2.1 ± 2.9 points, those receiving peripheral acupuncture had a reduction of 1.6 ± 2.0 points, while those who did not receive acupuncture had no change in pain (0.4 ± 1.9), which was a significant difference between no acupuncture and both acupuncture groups.

Meaning

- Acupuncture can be added to usual care to effectively improve acute musculoskeletal pain in the ED.

Abstract

Importance: Acute musculoskeletal pain is challenging to treat in the Emergency Department (ED), a novel setting to incorporate nonpharmacologic interventions, such as acupuncture, to reduce chronic pain.

Objective: Determine effectiveness of ED acupuncture for treating acute musculoskeletal pain.

Design: Pragmatic two-stage adaptive randomized clinical trial over one year. Stage 1 identified whether auricular acupuncture (AA) or peripheral acupuncture (PA) was more feasible and efficacious in the ED. Stage 2 assessed effectiveness of selected ED acupuncture intervention(s) on 1-hour pain reduction compared to no acupuncture (NA).

Setting: Academic tertiary-care ED.

Participants: Adults with acute (≤7 days) musculoskeletal pain in neck, back and/or extremities. Of 911 patients screened, 491 met inclusion criteria, 247 enrolled, 11 withdrew, and 236 were randomized (68 NA, 84 AA, 84 PA).

Interventions: AA places ear needles based on battlefield acupuncture. PA places needles in head, neck, and extremity sites distal to pain. Acupuncture was delivered by licensed acupuncturists. All three arms received usual care from blinded ED providers.

Main Outcomes: Primary outcome: 11-point Numeric pain rating scale at 1-hour. Secondary outcomes: Satisfaction with treatment; ED opioids given.

Results: Interim analysis at end of Stage 1 found both acupuncture styles similarly feasible and efficacious, so Stage 2 continued all three arms with unequal allocation (from 1:1:1 to 1:2:2 NA:AA:PA). All three arms had similar demographics (mean age 46.1 years ±16.5 SD, 56.2% female, and 53.6% Black), ED baseline pain scores (AA 7.0 ± 2.3, PA 7.2 ± 2.3, NA 6.9 ± 2.2) and pre-baseline ED administration of opioid and non-opioid analgesics. Both AA (2.1 ± 2.9) and PA (1.6 ± 2.0) produced significantly greater 1-hour pain reductions than NA (0.4 ± 1.9).

Conclusions and Relevance: Two different styles of ED acupuncture effectively reduce acute musculoskeletal pain better than usual care alone. Acupuncture is feasible, acceptable, and effective for treating pain in historically underserved populations in the emergency department setting.

Clinicaltrials.gov registration:
Emergency Department Acupuncture for Acute Musculoskeletal Pain Management
ID#: NCT04290741; URL: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04290741

INTRODUCTION

Musculoskeletal disorders are the leading cause of pain and disability, affecting over 1.7 billion people worldwide.[1] Chronic musculoskeletal pain impairs health, function and well-being, and is associated with chronic opioid use.[2,3] As chronic pain begins as acute pain and is frequently marked by acute severe exacerbations, mitigating chronic pain requires effective acute pain management. Treatment is particularly challenging in emergency department (ED) settings, where acute pain is typically severe and associated with emotional and psychological stressors and diagnostic uncertainty.[4,5] Medications alone provide only a limited degree and duration of pain relief, have potential side effects, and are limited in reducing severity and rates of chronic pain.[6–9] Thus, more innovative and multi-modal approaches to ED musculoskeletal pain management are needed.

International organizations are increasingly calling for nonpharmacologic strategies, including acupuncture, to treat pain.[10] Acupuncture is safe and effective for chronic pain conditions such as cancer pain, neck and low back pain, knee osteoarthritis, and headache.[11,12] Its analgesic effects are postulated to be mediated through inflammatory and endogenous opioid pathways.[13] Side effects are typically mild, transient needle site pain or bruising, and serious events are extremely rare.[14,15] However, traditional private hour-long acupuncture sessions are less feasible in space- and time-limited ED environments. More efficient treatment styles have been developed for community clinic and military settings. These include auricular acupuncture (AA) with ear needles placed based on the battlefield acupuncture protocol,[16,17] and peripheral acupuncture (PA) where needles are limited to head, neck, and extremities distal to the painful site to treat pain.[18,19] However, there is limited data on the efficacy of ED acupuncture for acute pain, and the acupuncture style best-suited to the ED environment remains unclear.[20]

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to (1) identify which style of acupuncture is feasible, acceptable, and effective for treating acute musculoskeletal pain in the ED, and (2) determine effectiveness of that acupuncture style compared to control (no acupuncture) on pain reduction in the ED.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS:

Study design and ethics

This pragmatic, two-stage adaptive randomized clinical trial was approved by the Institutional Review Board (Protocol # Pro00104140), registered on 2/7/2020 with clinicaltrials.gov (registration # NCT04290741) and released to the public on 2/28/2020. The detailed study methods were previously published.[21] In brief, the first stage objective was to identify the more effective style of ED-based acupuncture, AA or PA, and the second stage was to assess effectiveness of the selected acupuncture style on pain reduction. A planned interim analysis at the end of Stage 1, based on the FDA-recommended criterion of probability of being the best treatment,[22,23] was reviewed by an independent data-safety monitoring committee (DSMC) to identify the acupuncture style and study adaptations for Stage 2. The only change from Stage 1 to Stage 2 was unequal allocation to treatment arms, described below. In addition, there were

two phases to the study: Phase 1 focused on 1 hour ED acupuncture outcomes, followed by Phase 2 enrolling a larger number of patients and focused on the outpatient acupuncture clinic outcomes. This report is for Phase 1 ED outcomes only, as Phase 2 is ongoing. We used the SPIRIT and CONSORT checklists.[24,25]

Study setting and recruitment

Trial participants were enrolled between February 10, 2020 and May 3, 2021 in a U.S. academic tertiary-care ED with 80,000 visits per year. Trained clinical research coordinators (CRCs) performed all patient screening, recruitment, informed e-consent, and enrollment procedures. Study acupuncturists explained and delivered acupuncture treatments[21].

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

English-speaking adult ED patients with acute (≤7 days) new onset or exacerbations of chronic pain in the neck, back, arms and/or legs, deemed musculoskeletal by ED clinicians, were included.[23] Exclusion criteria included: (1) no pain at triage; (2) contraindication to needles at acupuncture sites (e.g. skin infection); (3) unable to attend clinic; or (4) serious medical condition (e.g., active COVID-19 infection).

Randomization and Blinding

Subjects were randomized 1:1:1 in Stage 1 and 2:2:1 in Stage 2 to AA, PA or no acupuncture (NA) using a computer-generated unstratified block randomization sequence stored in a secure electronic file, with sequence electronically hidden and visible only at randomization by the acupuncturists. While participants and acupuncturists were not blinded, reasonable attempts were made to blind all other research and clinical personnel, described in detail elsewhere.[21]

Interventions

Two different acupuncture interventions were performed by licensed acupuncturists to treat pain in the ED, described in detail elsewhere.[21] (1) <u>Auricular acupuncture (AA)</u> places press needles in up to 5 bilateral ear sites corresponding to the battlefield acupuncture protocol.[16,17] (2) <u>Peripheral acupuncture (PA)</u> places needles in select head, neck, and extremity sites distal to the pain based on acupuncturist clinical discretion.[26,27] Acupuncture was delivered in the ED, then offered free in an outpatient clinic twice a week for one month after ED visit. During clinic, participants could receive PA, AA or both based on acupuncturist discretion and/or participant request. (3) The no acupuncture (NA) control group did not receive acupuncture in the ED and were asked to refrain from receiving acupuncture for one month after ED visit. As an attention control, all control group participants had the same initial evaluation and pre-treatment interaction with study acupuncturists prior to randomization as the two acupuncture groups. All study participants in all three groups also received usual care (e.g., pain medications) at the discretion of their blinded ED clinical team.

Data Collection and Management

Data was collected from participants in all arms at ED baseline, 1 hour post-treatment, and at 2 weeks and 1 month post-ED visit in a secure REDCap database, by iPad in ED and by email,

text, or phone after the ED visit.[28] Acupuncture treatment details based on STRICTA recommendations,[29] ED medications, and AEs were recorded by study personnel in REDCap.

Outcome Measures

The primary endpoints for Stage 1 were feasibility, acceptability, and safety. Feasibility was assessed by patient recruitment and retention rates. Acceptability was assessed by patient-reported satisfaction. Safety was evaluated by adverse events (AEs), most commonly bleeding, bruising, or pain at needle sites.[26,30] The primary endpoint for Stage 2 was change in current pain score (0-10 numeric rating scale, NRS) from ED baseline to 1-hour post-treatment.

Secondary measures included satisfaction with treatment (1-5 Likert scale) and medication use, including opioid and non-opioid medications, assessed by patient report and electronic medical record (EMR) data. Additional patient self-reported data included demographics, pain characteristics, non-medical opioid use using ASSIST,[31] the simplified graded chronic pain scale,[18,19] as well as pain interference, sleep disturbance, and physical function using the validated PROMIS-29 instruments.[14] The question timeframe was modified from “over the past 7 days” to “over the past 24 hours (1 day)” for ED baseline assessments due to the acute duration (≤7 days) of pain.

Sample size

Sample size of 220 total subjects for Phase 1 was calculated using 90% power and $\alpha = 5\%$, based on a 2-stage adaptive design with 90 subjects allocated 1:1:1 to three arms (AA, PA, NA) in Stage 1, and the remaining 130 subjects to two arms assuming 1:2 control:treatment allocation for Stage 2,[23,32,33] adjusted for one planned interim analysis using O’Brien-Fleming type of alpha spending function[22] and a 10% drop rate, described in detail elsewhere.[21]

Data Analysis and Statistical Methods

Primary analysis was performed based on intention-to-treat (ITT) including all randomized subjects combined from both stages with at least one follow-up evaluation. Descriptive statistics for continuous variables included number of subjects, means and standard deviations, medians and interquartile ranges, and minima and maxima. Descriptive statistics for discrete (categorical) variables included number and percentage of subjects in each category.

Because usual care for pain in this ED site starts immediately after triage, an exploratory analysis to assess within-group differences in response to usual care vs acupuncture examined differences in pain scores over time from triage to study baseline to 1 hour post-treatment across treatment groups using ANOVA, with the outcome being the difference-of-differences [(one-hour – baseline) – (baseline – triage)]. All subjects with pain scores at one or more pre- and post-treatment timepoints were included; missing pain scores were not imputed.

All analyses were performed using SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). Unless otherwise noted, tests of hypotheses were two-sided with 5% level of significance.

Handling of Missing Data: For the primary analysis, 10 patients were missing change in 1-hour pain score, due to 1 missing baseline (**Table 2**) and 9 missing 1-hour pain scores (**Table 3**). A multiple linear regression model using baseline pain, sex, race, age, and duration of pain as predictor variables was fit to impute these missing change in pain scores. A quadratic linear regression model was fit using triage pain score to predict the single missing baseline pain score for use in the imputation model. Percentage change in pain at 1-hour also used these 10 imputed values. Additionally, two patients indicated a baseline 'current pain' score of 0 despite reporting pain at triage (**Table 2**), so a baseline pain score of 1 was used in the percentage change analysis. For secondary outcomes and repeated measures analysis, missing values were not imputed.

Analyses: As there were no significant differences in baseline characteristics between groups, the primary outcome was compared using unadjusted ANOVA. Secondary outcomes were compared using separate unadjusted ANOVAs for continuous variables, Kruskal-Wallis for ranked (Likert-scale) variables, and chi-squared for categorical variables. AEs were tabulated, ordered by frequency, and summarized by seriousness, severity, and possible association with acupuncture. Incidence rates of AEs were compared by Fisher's Exact Test.

Interim Analysis: One interim analysis was planned at the end of Stage 1 to assess feasibility based on patient recruitment and retention rates, safety based on AEs, and probability of being the more effective treatment arm analyzed from the 1-hour change in pain scores.[23] An independent DSMC (biostatistician, emergency physician-researcher and medical acupuncturist) monitored trial safety and performance and recommended adaptations based on interim analysis.

RESULTS

At interim analysis, ED acupuncture was deemed feasible and safe by the DSMC. One acupuncture arm was not clearly superior, and both trended toward superior to control. Therefore, all three study arms were continued in Stage 2 with new allocation ratio 2:2:1 AA:PA:NA to determine effectiveness of AA and PA compared to NA. The study ended when the target sample size was achieved.

From February 10, 2020 to May 3, 2021, 911 patients were screened, 491 met inclusion criteria and were approached, 247 were enrolled, 11 withdrew prior to randomization, and 236 patients were randomized to one of three arms (68 NA, 84 AA, 84 PA, **Figure 1**). All subjects in the ITT population completed the study, and there were no protocol violations. The study population consisted of broad demographic characteristics representative of the typical ED population seeking care for musculoskeletal pain,[4] and were similar across the AA, PA and control arms (**Table 1**). Enrolled subjects had a mean age of 46.1 years (±16.5 SD, range: 19 – 85). The most common self-identified race was Black (53.6%), and 7.2% identified as Hispanic or Latino. In addition, 56.6% of subjects were employed either full-time or part-time, whereas 21.7% reported being unemployed or unable to work.

Baseline pain and clinical characteristics were comparable across AA, PA, and control groups (**Table 2**). Overall, the most common primary pain locations were lower back (36.9%), legs (26.7%), and neck (14.4%). Most subjects (66.9%) reported having pain in more than one location, and 56.0% reported that their current painful condition was due to trauma or injury. The majority of subjects reported having at least some pain in the past 3 months (79.3%), and that pain had limited their life or work activities (66.5%). All three arms had similar ED baseline pain scores (AA 7.0 ± 2.3, PA 7.2 ± 2.3, NA 6.9 ± 2.2). Only 18% of study participants had ever tried acupuncture before. There were no differences in pre-baseline ED administration of opioid and non-opioid analgesics between the groups (**Table 2**).

As shown in **Table 3**, greater pain reductions at 1-hour post-treatment in the ED were observed with both AA (2.1 ± 2.9) and PA (1.6 ± 2.0) compared to NA (0.4 ± 1.9). Although not significant, there were fewer opioids ordered in the ED or prescribed on ED discharge among the acupuncture groups compared to control at ED discharge (**Table 3**). Participants in both the AA and PA groups reported comparably high satisfaction with their overall acupuncture experience at 1-hr with a mean score of 4.4 (±0.9) on a 1-5 Likert scale (**Table 3**).

Table 3 shows the mean pain score at triage, baseline and 1-hr post-treatment. Changes in pain score from triage to baseline were comparable across groups (-0.8 ± 1.9), indicating a similar effect of any usual care triage medications given. The AA and PA groups had significant decreases in pain at 1-hour post-treatment while the NA group did not, and the AA and PA pain scores were both significantly different from NA at 1 hour. For the exploratory analysis, the AA group showed significantly better within-group improvements after acupuncture than after usual care alone, while the PA group showed a similar trend that was not significant. Participants in both acupuncture groups also received fewer opioid and non-opioid analgesics post-baseline and at discharge than control, although these findings were not statistically significant.

Overall, there were few adverse events (AEs) and no serious adverse events (SAEs) reported (**eTable**). There was no significant difference in the number of subjects who reported AEs in the control (n=2, 2.9%), AA (n=3, 3.6%), and PA (n=0, 0.0%) groups in the ED. The most common AEs were transient pain, bleeding or bruising at needle sites, self-limited headache or brief episodes of anxiety.

DISCUSSION

Improved acute musculoskeletal pain management:

Acute musculoskeletal pain is a common complaint in the ED and challenging to treat, in part due to its severity.[34] The high baseline pain scores in our study population support that observation. Effective management of acute pain is critically important to mitigate associated morbidity and disability; however, the current reliance on opioid medications presents substantial risks.[9,35] Previous studies of acupuncture in the ED have shown greater improvements than sham acupuncture and similar benefits as medications for treating acute pain,[12,20,36] but have been limited by small sample sizes.[37] Our study builds upon prior work with a uniquely large and diverse population of ED patients in a randomized controlled trial design.

Our study shows greater and clinically significant improvements in pain scores 1-hour after acupuncture compared to usual care alone. We found that two different acupuncture interventions were similarly effective, allowing for increased flexibility in terms of both patient preference and clinical implementation.

While not significant, there were fewer ED opioid administrations and discharge prescriptions after acupuncture. In addition, within-group changes in pain score were significantly better after auricular acupuncture + usual care than after usual care medications alone. Previous work in ED and cancer patients has shown that acupuncture can outperform opioids in treating pain and may reduce opioid prescriptions.[38–40] One study, comparing acupuncture and intravenous morphine for acute pain in an ED setting, found that acupuncture was more likely to cause significant reduction in pain (≥50%), and faster, than morphine alone.[39] Another study comparing acupuncture patients with those using non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and physical therapy found that acupuncture patients were prescribed fewer opioids and had fewer ED visits.[40] Thus, acupuncture may be an important treatment option for reducing opioid prescribing and subsequent use.

Delivery of acupuncture to a broad population in the ED environment:

Ours is one of the first randomized controlled trials of acupuncture to intentionally and successfully enroll a large number of underserved and minoritized groups in the U.S.[41–43] By minimizing the number of exclusion criteria that have historically excluded these populations,[44] and systematically approaching all potentially qualifying patients for the study, our study population is reflective of our general ED population.[45] More than 50% of participants self-identified as Black and 7% as Latino, more than half reported low income, and over half had public or no health insurance. These rates are higher than U.S. national averages reporting 36.1% with income under $50,000[46] and 8.3% with no health insurance.[47] Furthermore, we successfully adapted acupuncture to a fast-paced, relatively chaotic ED environment by keeping treatments to 20 to 30 minutes and focusing on pain relief and needling of sites distal to the pain.[48,49] Our ability to recruit and perform acupuncture on 236 ED patients over a one-year period demonstrates feasibility. Participants in both acupuncture intervention arms reported high patient satisfaction and minimal side effects, demonstrating broad acceptability across diverse populations. Our findings underscore those from recent work developing community acupuncture clinics for underserved populations reporting high participant interest in and satisfaction with acupuncture treatments,[17,42,50,51] supporting implementation of acupuncture more broadly to a wide range of patients.

Limitations

Limitations of this study include a single urban U.S. ED which may limit generalizability to other environments, such as rural ED's and other nations. However, studies from other countries have shown similar efficacy of ED acupuncture for treating pain, and ours adds to this body of literature as one of the largest U.S.-based studies. Second, treatment delivery by licensed acupuncturists may limit comparison to other ED-based trial protocols that trained other providers, like physicians, or environments with no available acupuncturists. Third, we did not include an active comparator or placebo group. However, all control group participants received

the same initial contact and evaluation by study acupuncturists as the acupuncture groups to account for extra attention and service time effects. While every attempt was made to blind ED providers and outcomes assessors, patients could not be blinded to treatment assignment. Future research should include multi-site RCT's with varied ED settings to further evaluate acupuncture's efficacy across patient groups and practice environments.

Conclusions

These results indicate that both auricular and peripheral acupuncture are effective, feasible, and acceptable within the emergency department for musculoskeletal pain and should be further explored for more widespread implementation to improve ED pain management.

Author contributions
SAE is principal investigator of the study, drafted the manuscript, and is responsible for the overall design and final decisions on the trial design and manuscript. SCC, OG, CAS, and MRK participated in the design of the study and revising the manuscript. MK and AG were responsible for the statistical design and analysis of the study and revising the manuscript. AO, CL, CLK, OT, AP, and HC were involved as clinical research coordinators in revising the protocol and manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Protocol version: 1.41, Date 09/02/2022

Funding & Acknowledgements
This project is supported by The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Emergency Department Alternatives to Opioids Demonstration Program (ED-ALT) Grant number H79TI083109.

This project is included as part of the Duke School of Medicine Opioid Collaboratory which is administered through the Duke Department of Population Health Sciences and supported by grant funding from the Duke Endowment. The Collaboratory's mission is to save lives and reduce the harmful impact of opioids in North Carolina through the development, implementation, and/or evaluation of system-level interventions.

Duke Integrative Medicine provided integral partnership for this project giving us the infrastructure and space needed to conduct our group acupuncture clinic.

The study funders had no role in the study design, collection or analysis of data.
SAE, AO, and MK had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Competing interests
None declared.

Patient consent
Obtained.

Ethics approval
The Duke University Health System Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved this study on January 29, 2020 (Protocol No: Pro00104140).

Data sharing statement
Data sharing is not currently available due to ongoing additional analyses. Data available in the future on request.

REFERENCES

1. Cieza A, Causey K, Kamenov K, Hanson SW, Chatterji S, Vos T. Global estimates of the need for rehabilitation based on the Global Burden of Disease study 2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*. 2021;396(10267):2006-2017. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32340-0

2. Williams A, Kamper SJ, Wiggers JH, et al. Musculoskeletal conditions may increase the risk of chronic disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *BMC Med*. 2018;16(1):167. doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1151-2

3. GBD 2016 Disease and Injury Incidence and Prevalence Collaborators. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet*. 2017;390(10100):1211-1259. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32154-2

4. Flynn SB, Gordee A, Kuchibhatla M, George SZ, Eucker SA. Moving toward patient-centered care in the emergency department: Patient-reported expectations, definitions of success, and importance of improvement in pain-related outcomes. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2021;28(11):1286-1298. doi:10.1111/acem.14328

5. Garbez R, Puntillo K. Acute musculoskeletal pain in the emergency department: a review of the literature and implications for the advanced practice nurse. *AACN Clin Issues*. 2005;16(3):310-319.

6. Busse JW, Sadeghirad B, Oparin Y, et al. Management of Acute Pain From Non-Low Back, Musculoskeletal Injuries□: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-analysis of Randomized Trials. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;173(9):730-738. doi:10.7326/M19-3601

7. Chou R, Deyo R, Friedly J, et al. Systemic pharmacologic therapies for low back pain: A systematic review for an american college of physicians clinical practice guideline. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;166(7):480-492. doi:10.7326/M16-2458

8. Moore RA, Derry S, Aldington D, Wiffen PJ. Single dose oral analgesics for acute postoperative pain in adults - an overview of Cochrane reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015;2015(9):CD008659. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008659.pub3

9. Chang H-Y, Daubresse M, Kruszewski SP, Alexander GC. Prevalence and treatment of pain in EDs in the United States, 2000 to 2010. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2014;32(5):421-431. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2014.01.015

10. Tick H, Nielsen A, Pelletier KR, et al. Evidence-Based Nonpharmacologic Strategies for Comprehensive Pain Care: The Consortium Pain Task Force White Paper. *Explore (NY)*. 2018;14(3):177-211. doi:10.1016/j.explore.2018.02.001

11. Skelly AC, Chou R, Dettori JR, et al. *Noninvasive Nonpharmacological Treatment for Chronic Pain: A Systematic Review Update*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2020. doi:10.23970/AHRQEPCCER227

12. Vickers AJ, Vertosick EA, Lewith G, et al. Acupuncture for Chronic Pain: Update of an Individual Patient Data Meta-Analysis. *J Pain*. 2018;19(5):455-474. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2017.11.005

13. McDonald JL, Cripps AW, Smith PK. Mediators, Receptors, and Signalling Pathways in the Anti-Inflammatory and Antihyperalgesic Effects of Acupuncture. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med*. 2015;2015:975632. doi:10.1155/2015/975632

14. Cella D, Riley W, Stone A, et al. The Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) developed and tested its first wave of adult self-reported health outcome item banks: 2005-2008. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2010;63(11):1179-1194. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.04.011

15. Cella D, Lai JS, Nowinski CJ, et al. Neuro-QOL: brief measures of health-related quality of life for clinical research in neurology. *Neurology*. 2012;78(23):1860-1867. doi:10.1212/WNL.0b013e318258f744

16. Niemtzow RC. Battlefield Acupuncture. *Med Acupunct*. 2007;19(4):225-228. doi:10.1089/acu.2007.0603

17. Federman DG, Zeliadt SB, Thomas ER, Carbone GF, Taylor SL. Battlefield acupuncture in the veterans health administration: effectiveness in individual and group settings for pain and pain comorbidities. *Med Acupunct*. 2018;30(5):273-278. doi:10.1089/acu.2018.1296

18. Krebs EE, Lorenz KA, Bair MJ, et al. Development and initial validation of the PEG, a three-item scale assessing pain intensity and interference. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2009;24(6):733-738. doi:10.1007/s11606-009-0981-1

19. Von Korff M, DeBar LL, Krebs EE, Kerns RD, Deyo RA, Keefe FJ. Graded chronic pain scale revised: mild, bothersome, and high-impact chronic pain. *Pain*. 2020;161(3):651-661. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001758

20. Jan AL, Aldridge ES, Rogers IR, Visser EJ, Bulsara MK, Niemtzow RC. Review article: Does acupuncture have a role in providing analgesia in the emergency setting? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Emerg Med Australas*. 2017;29(5):490-498. doi:10.1111/1742-6723.12832

21. Eucker SA, Glass O, Staton CA, et al. Acupuncture for acute musculoskeletal pain management in the emergency department and continuity clinic: a protocol for an adaptive pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(9):e061661. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-061661

22. O'Brien PC, Fleming TR. A multiple testing procedure for clinical trials. *Biometrics*. 1979;35(3):549-556. doi:10.2307/2530245

23. Zheng J, Chow S-C. Criteria for dose-finding in two-stage seamless adaptive design. *J Biopharm Stat*. 2019;29(5):908-919. doi:10.1080/10543406.2019.1657130

24. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, CONSORT Group. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c332. doi:10.1136/bmj.c332

25. Chan A-W, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, et al. SPIRIT 2013 statement: defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(3):200-207. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-3-201302050-00583

26. Hempel S, Taylor SL, Solloway MR, et al. *Evidence Map of Acupuncture*. Department of Veterans Affairs; 2014.

27. North Carolina Acupuncture Licensing Board. Fundamental Information About Acupuncture. General Information. Accessed March 30, 2021. https://www.ncalb.com/general-information/

28. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap): A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009;42(2):377-381. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010

29. MacPherson H, Altman DG, Hammerschlag R, et al. Revised STandards for Reporting Interventions in Clinical Trials of Acupuncture (STRICTA): Extending the CONSORT statement. *J Evid Based Med*. 2010;3(3):140-155. doi:10.1111/j.1756-5391.2010.01086.x

30. Melchart D, Weidenhammer W, Streng A, et al. Prospective investigation of adverse effects of acupuncture in 97 733 patients. *Arch Intern Med*. 2004;164(1):104-105. doi:10.1001/archinte.164.1.104

31. Humeniuk R, Henry-Edwards S, Ali R, Poznyak V, Monteiro M. The Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST). *Manual for use in primary care*. 2010.

32. Chow S-C, Chang M. *Adaptive Design Methods in Clinical Trials (Chapman & Hall/CRC Biostatistics Series)*. 2nd ed. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2011:375.

33. Chow S-C, Wang H, Shao J. *Sample Size Calculations in Clinical Research*. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2007. doi:10.1201/9781584889830

34. Pierik JGJ, IJzerman MJ, Gaakeer MI, et al. Pain management in the emergency chain: the use and effectiveness of pain management in patients with acute musculoskeletal pain. *Pain Med*. 2015;16(5):970-984. doi:10.1111/pme.12668

35. Bohnert ASB, Valenstein M, Bair MJ, et al. Association between opioid prescribing patterns and opioid overdose-related deaths. *JAMA*. 2011;305(13):1315-1321. doi:10.1001/jama.2011.370

36. Cohen MM, Smit DV, Andrianopoulos N, et al. Acupuncture for analgesia in the emergency department: a multicentre, randomised, equivalence and non-inferiority trial. *Med J Aust*. 2017;206(11):494-499. doi:10.5694/mja16.00771

37. Harkin C, Parker R. A prospective, randomised control trial of acupuncture for select common conditions within the Emergency Department. *The Journal of Chinese Medicine*. October 1, 2007.

38. Mao JJ, Liou KT, Baser RE, et al. Effectiveness of electroacupuncture or auricular acupuncture vs usual care for chronic musculoskeletal pain among cancer survivors: the PEACE randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Oncol*. 2021;7(5):720-727. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2021.0310

39. Grissa MH, Baccouche H, Boubaker H, et al. Acupuncture vs intravenous morphine in the management of acute pain in the ED. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2016;34(11):2112-2116. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2016.07.028

40. Pham T, Ma Q, Agiro A, Bukowiec J, Flannery T. Do Acupuncture Services Reduce Subsequent Utilization of Opioids and Surgical Interventions Compared to Noninvasive Therapies among Patients with Pain Conditions? *Pain Med*. 2021;22(11):2754-2762. doi:10.1093/pm/pnab187

41. Weidenhammer W, Streng A, Linde K, Hoppe A, Melchart D. Acupuncture for chronic pain within the research program of 10 German Health Insurance Funds--basic results from an observational study. *Complement Ther Med*. 2007;15(4):238-246. doi:10.1016/j.ctim.2006.09.005

42. Zeliadt SB, Thomas ER, Olson J, et al. Patient feedback on the effectiveness of auricular acupuncture on pain in routine clinical care: the experience of 11,406 veterans. *Med Care*. 2020;58 Suppl 2 9S:S101-S107. doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000001368

43. Goertz CMH, Niemtzow R, Burns SM, Fritts MJ, Crawford CC, Jonas WB. Auricular acupuncture in the treatment of acute pain syndromes: A pilot study. *Mil Med*. 2006;171(10):1010-1014. doi:10.7205/MILMED.171.10.1010

44. Baker K, McDonald J, Steel A. Tackling health inequity: a commentary on the potential of acupuncture to improve health outcomes of marginalised populations. *Acupunct Med*. 2021;39(5):533-537. doi:10.1177/0964528420961404

45. Eucker SA, Foley S, Peskoe S, et al. Willingness to use nonpharmacologic treatments for musculoskeletal pain in the emergency department: a cross-sectional study. *Pain Rep*. 2022;7(5):e1027. doi:10.1097/PR9.0000000000001027

46. Semega J, Kollar M. Income in the United States: 2021. *US Census Bureau, Current Population Reports*. January 9, 2022:P60-276.

47. Keisler-Starkey K, Bunch L. Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2021. *US Census Bureau, Current Population Reports*. January 9, 2022:P60-278.

48. Burns JR, Kram JJF, Xiong V, et al. Utilization of acupuncture services in the emergency department setting: A quality improvement study. *J Patient Cent Res Rev*. 2019;6(2):172-178. doi:10.17294/2330-0698.1688

49. Reinstein AS, Erickson LO, Griffin KH, et al. Acceptability, adaptation, and clinical outcomes of acupuncture provided in the emergency department: A retrospective pilot study. *Pain Med*. 2017;18(1):169-178. doi:10.1093/pm/pnv114

50. Taylor SL, Giannitrapani KF, Ackland PE, et al. The implementation and effectiveness of battlefield auricular acupuncture for pain. *Pain Med*. 2021;22(8):1721-1726. doi:10.1093/pm/pnaa474

51. Kligler B, Buonora M, Gabison J, Jacobs E, Karasz A, McKee MD. “I Felt Like It Was God’s Hands Putting the Needles In”: A Qualitative Analysis of the Experience of Acupuncture for Chronic Pain in a Low-Income, Ethnically Diverse, and Medically Underserved Patient Population. *J Altern Complement Med*. 2015;21(11):713-719. doi:10.1089/acm.2014.0376


Screened (n=911)
Chief complaint of acute pain in the neck, back, or extremities with potential musculoskeletal origin
Not eligible (n=349)
- Unable to follow up: 118
- Pain not musculoskeletal in origin: 64
- Serious medical condition (critical illness, deformity, COVID, requiring admission): 51
- Musculoskeletal pain > 7 days: 33
- Non-English speaking: 21
- ED provider declined: 20
- Hearing/speech/cognitive impairment; intoxicated: 19
- No pain at approach: 16
- Unable to receive acupuncture: 4
- Already receiving acupuncture elsewhere: 3
Fulfilled inclusion criteria (n=562)
Not approached (n=71)
- Patient left prior to approach: 45
- Too many interruptions: 11
- Pending further medical assessment: 9
- No treatment room available: 6
Approached (n=491)
Declined (n=244)
- Not interested in research: 56
- Fear of needles: 53
- Reason not specified: 53
- Not interested in acupuncture: 21
- Patient ready to leave: 19
- Unwilling to follow up: 13
- Other: 13
- Only wants to see provider: 9
- In too much pain: 7
Enrolled (n=247)
Excluded from analyses (n=11)
- Withdrew prior to randomization: 11
Randomized (n=236)
Allocation
Allocated to No Acupuncture (n=68)
- Received standard care: 68
Allocated to Auricular Acupuncture (n=84)
- Received intervention: 84
Allocated to Peripheral Acupuncture (n=84)
- Received intervention: 84
1 Hour Analysis
1 Hour Analysis (n=68)
- Missing Baseline: 0
- Missing 1 Hour: 4
(Missing data imputed)
1 Hour Analysis (n=84)
- Missing Baseline: 0
- Missing 1 Hour: 3
(Missing data imputed)
1 Hour Analysis (n=84)
- Missing Baseline: 1
- Missing 1 Hour: 2
(Missing data imputed)
1 Month Analysis
1 Month Analysis (n=47)
- Lost to follow-up: 21
1 Month Analysis (n=55)
- Lost to follow-up: 29
1 Month Analysis (n=61)
- Lost to follow-up: 23

Table 1: Patient Characteristics

	Control (N=68)	Auricular (N=84)	Peripheral (N=84)	Total (N=236)
Age (Years)				
Mean (SD)	46.5 (16.5)	47.4 (16.0)	44.6 (17.0)	46.1 (16.5)
Range	(19.0-83.0)	(19.0-80.0)	(19.0-85.0)	(19.0-85.0)
Age 65 years or older	11 (16.4%)	14 (16.7%)	13 (15.5%)	38 (16.2%)
Missing	1 (1.5%)	0	0	1 (0.4%)
Sex (Male or Female)				
Female	36 (53.7%)	52 (61.9%)	44 (52.4%)	132 (56.2%)
Male	31 (46.3%)	31 (36.9%)	40 (47.6%)	102 (43.4%)
Missing or prefer not to answer	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.2%)	0	2 (0.8%)
Race				
Black or African American	39 (58.2%)	46 (54.8%)	41 (48.8%)	126 (53.6%)
White or Caucasian	17 (25.4%)	30 (35.7%)	33 (39.3%)	80 (34.0%)
Asian	3 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.4%)	5 (2.1%)
Native American or Alaska Native	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	2 (0.9%)
More than one race	2 (3.0%)	2 (2.4%)	2 (2.4%)	6 (2.6%)
Other	3 (4.5%)	2 (2.4%)	4 (4.8%)	9 (3.8%)
Missing or prefer not to answer	4 (5.9%)	3 (3.6%)	1 (1.2%)	8 (3.4%)
Ethnicity				
Hispanic or Latino	5 (7.5%)	3 (3.6%)	9 (10.7%)	17 (7.2%)
Not Hispanic or Latino	59 (88.1%)	76 (90.5%)	72 (85.7%)	207 (88.1%)
Missing or prefer not to answer	4 (5.9%)	5 (6.0%)	3 (3.6%)	12 (5.1%)
Marital status				
Never married	29 (43.3%)	31 (36.9%)	36 (42.9%)	96 (40.9%)
Living together	6 (9.0%)	2 (2.4%)	4 (4.8%)	12 (5.1%)
Married	19 (28.4%)	21 (25.0%)	24 (28.6%)	64 (27.2%)
Separated or Divorced	11 (16.4%)	22 (26.2%)	15 (17.9%)	48 (20.4%)
Widowed/Widower	1 (1.5%)	5 (6.0%)	4 (4.8%)	10 (4.3%)
Missing or prefer not to answer	2 (2.9%)	3 (3.6%)	1 (1.2%)	6 (2.5%)
Level of education completed				
Less than High School	5 (7.5%)	6 (7.1%)	5 (6.0%)	16 (6.8%)
Graduated High school or GED	24 (35.8%)	19 (22.6%)	22 (26.2%)	65 (27.7%)
Some college	19 (28.4%)	27 (32.1%)	26 (31.0%)	72 (30.6%)
Graduated college	7 (10.4%)	20 (23.8%)	17 (20.2%)	44 (18.7%)
Some post-graduate coursework	6 (9.0%)	1 (1.2%)	6 (7.1%)	13 (5.5%)
Completed post-graduate degree	6 (9.0%)	10 (11.9%)	7 (8.3%)	23 (9.8%)
Missing or prefer not to answer	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	3 (1.3%)
Current employment status				

Employed Full-Time	34 (50.7%)	41 (48.8%)	34 (40.5%)	109 (46.4%)
Employed Part-Time	8 (11.9%)	9 (10.7%)	7 (8.3%)	24 (10.2%)
Retired	11 (16.4%)	8 (9.5%)	12 (14.3%)	31 (13.2%)
Homemaker	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	2 (2.4%)	3 (1.3%)
Student	3 (4.5%)	2 (2.4%)	3 (3.6%)	8 (3.4%)
Volunteer	1 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)
Unemployed or laid off	5 (7.5%)	8 (9.5%)	11 (13.1%)	24 (10.2%)
Unable to work	4 (6.0%)	10 (11.9%)	13 (15.5%)	27 (11.5%)
Missing or prefer not to answer	2 (2.9%)	5 (6.0%)	2 (2.4%)	9 (3.8%)
Approximate annual household income				
Less than $10,000	7 (10.4%)	12 (14.3%)	12 (14.3%)	31 (13.2%)
$10,000 to $20,000	12 (17.9%)	12 (14.3%)	11 (13.1%)	35 (14.9%)
$20,000 to $50,000	21 (31.3%)	19 (22.6%)	31 (36.9%)	71 (30.2%)
$50,000 to $90, 000	9 (13.4%)	14 (16.7%)	11 (13.1%)	34 (14.5%)
Greater than $90,000	8 (11.9%)	8 (9.5%)	4 (4.8%)	20 (8.5%)
Missing or prefer not to answer	11 (16.2%)	19 (22.6%)	15 (17.9%)	45 (19.1%)
Insurance status[1]				
Medicare	11 (16.2%)	17 (20.2%)	17 (20.2%)	45 (19.1%)
Medicaid	9 (13.2%)	14 (16.7%)	19 (22.6%)	42 (17.8%)
Private insurance	30 (44.1%)	36 (42.9%)	32 (38.1%)	98 (41.5%)
Worker's compensation	2 (2.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	3 (1.3%)
Disability	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.2%)	3 (3.6%)	5 (2.1%)
No health insurance or missing	19 (27.9%)	20 (23.8%)	20 (23.8%)	59 (25.0%)
Prefer not to answer	2 (2.9%)	4 (4.8%)	7 (8.3%)	13 (5.5%)

[1] Subjects were able to report more than one insurance type.

Table 2: Baseline Clinical Characteristics

	Control (N=68)	Auricular (N=84)	Peripheral (N=84)	Total (N=236)
PRIMARY current pain location				
Neck	9 (13.2%)	13 (15.5%)	12 (14.3%)	34 (14.4%)
Upper back	6 (8.8%)	7 (8.3%)	5 (6.0%)	18 (7.6%)
Lower back	25 (36.8%)	32 (38.1%)	30 (35.7%)	87 (36.9%)
Left Arm	7 (10.3%)	7 (8.3%)	6 (7.1%)	20 (8.5%)
Right Arm	4 (5.9%)	5 (6.0%)	5 (6.0%)	14 (5.9%)
Left Leg	6 (8.8%)	7 (8.3%)	14 (16.7%)	27 (11.4%)
Right Leg	11 (16.2%)	13 (15.5%)	12 (14.3%)	36 (15.3%)
Pain in more than one location				
Yes	46 (67.6%)	60 (71.4%)	52 (61.9%)	158 (66.9%)
Onset of current pain				
Gradual	15 (22.4%)	21 (25.0%)	20 (24.1%)	56 (23.9%)
Sudden	12 (17.9%)	15 (17.9%)	20 (24.1%)	47 (20.1%)
Due to Trauma or Injury	40 (59.7%)	48 (57.1%)	43 (51.8%)	131 (56.0%)
Previous episodes of pain in the past year				
Yes	24 (36.4%)	32 (38.6%)	31 (40.3%)	87 (38.5%)
In the past 3 months, how often did you have pain?				
Never	14 (20.6%)	15 (17.9%)	20 (23.8%)	49 (20.8%)
Some days	33 (48.5%)	36 (42.9%)	36 (42.9%)	105 (44.5%)
Most days	11 (16.2%)	18 (21.4%)	12 (14.3%)	41 (17.4%)
Every day	10 (14.7%)	15 (17.9%)	16 (19.0%)	41 (17.4%)
In the past 3 months, how often did pain limit your life or work activities?				
Never	24 (35.3%)	26 (31.0%)	29 (34.5%)	79 (33.5%)
Some days	27 (39.7%)	35 (41.7%)	28 (33.3%)	90 (38.1%)
Most days	8 (11.8%)	16 (19.0%)	11 (13.1%)	35 (14.8%)
Every day	9 (13.2%)	7 (8.3%)	16 (19.0%)	32 (13.6%)
Baseline 24-hour PROMIS physical function				
Median (IQR)	12 (7, 16)	11 (6, 16)	10 (6, 16)	11 (6, 16)
Range	4 – 20	4 – 20	4 – 20	4 – 20
Missing	0	1	1	2
Baseline 24-hour PROMIS pain interference				
Median (IQR)	15.5 (7, 18)	15 (8, 20)	16 (10, 20)	16 (8, 20)
Range	4 – 20	4 – 20	4 – 20	4 – 20
Missing	0	1	1	2

Baseline 24-hour PROMIS sleep				
Median (IQR)	13 (12, 14)	12 (12, 14)	12.5 (12, 15)	13 (12, 14)
Range	8 – 20	7 – 20	10 – 20	7 – 20
Missing	1	2	2	5
Self-reported opioid use in past week				
Yes	18 (26.5%)	23 (27.4%)	16 (19.0%)	57 (24.2%)
No	50 (73.5%)	61 (72.6%)	68 (81.0%)	179 (75.8%)
Self-reported non-opioid medication use in past week				
Yes	52 (76.5%)	71 (84.5%)	66 (78.6%)	189 (80.1%)
No	16 (23.5%)	13 (15.5%)	18 (21.4%)	47 (19.9%)
Baseline ASSIST-Opioid score[1]				
Yes opioid use	6	12	10	28
No opioid use	62	71	74	207
Missing	0	1	0	1
Median (IQR)[1]	0 (0, 0)	6 (0, 12.3)	1.5 (0, 6)	1 (0, 6)
Range[1]	0 – 20	0 – 33	0 – 31	0 – 33
Ever received acupuncture before				
Yes	8 (13.1%)	15 (21.7%)	12 (18.5%)	35 (17.9%)
No	53 (86.9%)	54 (78.3%)	53 (81.5%)	160 (82.1%)
Missing	7	15	19	41

[1]ASSIST scores are only reported among those answering Yes to non-medical opioid use in the ASSIST questionnaire.

Table 3: Pain Outcomes at 1 Hour

	Control (N=68)	Auricular (N=84)	Peripheral (N=84)	Total (N=236)	P-Value
Current pain NRS at time of triage					
Mean (SD)	7.8 (2.0)	7.7 (2.2)	8.0 (2.1)	7.8 (2.1)	
Range	3 – 10	2 – 10	2 – 10	2 – 10	
Missing	2	0	1	3	
Current pain NRS at study enrollment (ED baseline)					
Mean (SD)	6.9 (2.2)	7.0 (2.3)	7.2 (2.3)	7.0 (2.3)	
Range	0 – 10	2 – 10	0 – 10	0 – 10	
Missing	0	0	1	1	
Current pain NRS at 1 hour					
Mean (SD)	6.6 (1.9)	4.9 (2.9)	5.6 (2.6)	5.6 (2.6)	
Range	2 – 10	0 – 10	0 – 10	0 – 10	
Missing	4	3	2	9	
Change in pain: triage to baseline (enrollment)					
Mean (SD)	-0.8 (1.8)	-0.8 (1.8)	-0.8 (2.1)	-0.8 (1.9)	
Range	(-8.0-2.0)	(-8.0-4.0)	(-9.0-7.0)	(-9.0-7.0)	
Change in pain NRS at 1 hour					<0.001[1]
Mean (SD)	-0.4 (1.9)	-2.1 (2.9)	-1.6 (2.0)	-1.4 (2.4)	
Range	-5 – 5	-9 – 7	-7 – 5	-9 – 7	
Percent change in pain at 1 hour					<0.002[2]
Mean (SD)	3.9 (51.6)	-24.8 (56.6)	-20.5 (48.5)	-15.0 (53.6)	
Range	-71.4 – 250.0	-100.0 – 350.0	-100.0 – 300.0	-100.0 – 350.0	
Difference in changes: (baseline to one-hour) - (triage to baseline)					0.0062[3]
Mean (SD)	0.4 (3.1)	-1.4 (4.0)	-0.9 (3.1)	-0.7 (3.5)	
Range	(-4.0-13.0)	(-11.0-8.0)	(-12.0-8.0)	(-12.0-13.0)	
ED Analgesia Received Pre-Baseline	37 (54.4%)	54 (64.3%)	46 (54.8%)	137 (58.1%)	
Opioid pre-baseline	17 (25.0%)	22 (26.2%)	17 (20.2%)	56 (23.7%)	
Non-opioid pre-baseline	31 (45.6%)	49 (58.3%)	40 (47.6%)	120 (50.8%)	
Analgesia Post-Baseline to 1 hour	24 (35.3%)	22 (26.2%)	17 (20.2%)	63 (26.7%)	0.113[4]
Opioid post-Baseline to 1 hour	9 (13.2%)	6 (7.1%)	5 (6.0%)	20 (8.5%)	0.238[4]

Non-opioid post-baseline to 1 hr	21 (30.9%)	17 (20.2%)	13 (15.5%)	51 (21.6%)	0.067[4]
Discharge opioid prescription	10 (14.7%)	8 (9.5%)	6 (7.1%)	24 (10.2%)	0.169[4]
Overall satisfaction with acupuncture at 1 hour					0.51[4]
Mean (SD)	NA	4.3 (1.0)	4.4 (0.9)	4.4 (0.9)	
Median (IQR)	NA	5 (4, 5)	5 (4, 5)	5 (4, 5)	
Missing	NA	7	9	16	

Missing values were imputed for 1-hour change score calculations.

[1] p-value from overall ANOVA test. P-values for pairwise comparisons, adjusting for multiple comparisons using Tukey's method, are:

Control vs Auricular: <0.001

Control vs Peripheral: 0.003

Auricular vs Peripheral: 0.340

[2] p-value from overall ANOVA test. P-values for pairwise comparisons, adjusting for multiple comparisons using Tukey's method, are:

Control vs Auricular: 0.002

Control vs Peripheral: 0.007

Auricular vs Peripheral: 0.902

[3]ANOVA overall F-Test. P-values for pairwise comparisons, adjusting for multiple comparisons using Tukey's method, are:

Control vs Auricular: 0.005

Control vs Peripheral: 0.076

Auricular vs Peripheral: 0.532

[4]Wilcoxon

eTable: Adverse Events

	Control (N=68)	Auricular (N=84)	Peripheral (N=84)	Total (N=236)	p value
Number of AEs in ED					0.37[1]
0	66 (97.1%)	81 (96.4%)	84 (100.0%)	231 (97.9%)	
1	2 (2.9%)	2 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.7%)	
3	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	

[1]Fisher Exact

eTable: Adverse Events (AEs). Patient-reported AEs in the ED included transient needle site pain or irritation (n=3), and non-acupuncture related episodes of fainting related to blood draw (n=1) and nausea related to opioid medication (n=1), respectively, as part of usual ED care. Some patients reported more than one adverse event.