RESPONSE TO LETTER

Analysis of Acupoint Selection Rules for Guasha Treatment of Primary Headaches Based on Data Mining [Response to Letter]

Xujie Zhang¹, Xinrui Huang¹, Feilin Ni², Danhua Yang³, Min Xu⁴

¹Department of Infectious Disease, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China; ²Department of Neurology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China; ³Department of Gastroenterology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China; ⁴Dean's Office, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China; ⁴Dean's Office, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou, People's Republic of China;

Correspondence: Min Xu, Dean's Office, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, No. 54, Postal Circuit, Shangcheng District, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310006, People's Republic of China, Email yudi1212@163.com

Dear editor

We are very grateful to Tianai Shi and others for their strong interest in this study. In order to enhance the accuracy and impact of the research, we responded to the questions they raised.

Firstly, the most representative and comprehensive databases in Chinese databases include CNKI, Wanfang, and Sinomed, with relatively few Chongqing VIP databases. But with a more comprehensive search attitude, we agree to include it in the VIP database. After conducting a supplementary search in the VIP database, we found that there are no literature that needs to be supplemented.

Secondly, there are many subtypes of primary headache, and the differences between different subtypes are obvious. We cannot guarantee that retrieving subtypes separately will not reduce the sensitivity of the research results. In addition, we pursued a more widely applicable acupoint selection pattern, so we did not search for subtypes separately. Finally, through the included articles, it can be found that there is little mention of specific subtypes in these literature, which is also an area where the quality of traditional Chinese medicine literature needs to be improved. Due to the fact that this study belongs to a secondary research, which requires analysis based on previous research results, there are some imperfections, but this is limited to the content presented in the original research.

Thirdly, we have not excluded, nor do we wish to exclude, studies with poorer results compared to the control group. In fact, the studies we included all showed that guasha has a good therapeutic effect on intervening in primary headaches. Regarding the standards for quality evaluation, we select the corresponding evaluation tools based on the research type of the original literature for evaluation.¹ In scraping therapy, meridians are an important concept. We have sorted out the relevant content of meridians and acupoints in Table 2 and analyzed them in the discussion.

Pilot studies, empirical reports, and case reports, although not routine randomized controlled trials, are all small-scale clinical studies.

Finally, we believe that the process of acupoint extraction has been written according to the paradigm of data mining articles.

In summary, we greatly appreciate the comments provided by Shi et al on this study. We believe that this is a favorable situation for promoting the development of traditional Chinese medicine. With the attitude of mutual learning and communication, we also look forward to more high-quality research results in this field.

Disclosure

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare for this communication.

© 2025 Zhang et al. This work is published and licensed by Dove Medical Press Limited. The full terms of this license are available at https://www.dovepress.com/terms work you hereby accept the Terms. Non-commercial uses of the work are permitted without any further permission from Dove Medical Press Limited, provided the work is properly attributed. For permission for commercial use of this work, please see paragraphs A2 and 5 of our Terms (https://www.dovepress.com/terms.php).

Reference

1. Amomataris E, Munn Z. Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual [EB/OL]. 2017. Available from: https://wiki.joannabriggs.org/display/manual. Accessed March 8, 2025.

Dove Medical Press encourages responsible, free and frank academic debate. The contentTxt of the Journal of Pain Research 'letters to the editor' section does not necessarily represent the views of Dove Medical Press, its officers, agents, employees, related entities or the Journal of Pain Research editors. While all reasonable steps have been taken to confirm the contentTxt of each letter, Dove Medical Press accepts no liability in respect of the contentTxt of any letter, nor is it responsible for the contentTxt and accuracy of any letter to the editor.

Journal of Pain Research

Dovepress Taylor & Francis Group

Publish your work in this journal

The Journal of Pain Research is an international, peer reviewed, open access, online journal that welcomes laboratory and clinical findings in the fields of pain research and the prevention and management of pain. Original research, reviews, symposium reports, hypothesis formation and commentaries are all considered for publication. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: https://www.dovepress.com/journal-of-pain-research-journal

https://doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S526394

