|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Supplementary Table1*. The operating performance scale of the instrument** | | |
| **Category** | **Grade** | **Explanation** |
| Operability of instrument | 1 | It’s very easy to operate |
| 2 | It's easy to operate |
| 3 | It's a little bit to operate |
| 4 | It's difficult to operate |
| 5 | It's very difficult to operate |
| Sensitivity of parameter adjustment | 1 | It’s very quick to respond |
| 2 | It’s quick to respond without use disorders |
| 3 | It’s slow to respond with little use disorders |
| 4 | It’s slow to respond with severe use disorders, but can be used for treatment |
| 5 | It’s slow to respond and can not be used for treatment |
| Stability of voltage output | 1 | It’s stable |
| 2 | It’s a little bit unstable without use disorders |
| 3 | It’s unstable with little use disorders |
| 4 | It’s unstable with severe use disorders, but can be used for treatment |
| 5 | It’s unstable and can not be used for treatment |
| Instrument fault | 1 | None |
| 2 | It has a little instrument fault without use disorders |
| 3 | It has some instrument fault with little use disorders |
| 4 | It has some instrument faults with severe use disorders but can be used for treatment |
| 5 | It has severe instrument fault and can not be used for treatment |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Supplementary Table2*. VAS score after treatment at week1, mean (SD)a** | | | | |
|  | **CX-DZ-II (n=83)** | **SDZ-II (n=80)** | **Difference (95% CI)** | *p* ***value*** |
| VAS score after 1st treatmentb | 5.05(1.26) | 5.19(1.26) | -0.15(-0.54,0.24) | 0.462 |
| VAS score after 2nd treatmentc | 4.48 (1.31) | 4.52(1.43) | -0.04(-0.46,0.39) | 0.855 |
| VAS score after 3rd treatmentd | 3.89(1.33) | 4.06(1.45) | -0.17(-0.60,0.26) | 0.434 |
| VAS score after 4th treatmente | 3.43(1.27) | 3.52(1.47) | -0.09(-0.51,0.34) | 0.684 |
| VAS score after 5th treatmentf | 3.07(1.17) | 3.12(1.44) | -0.05(-0.46,0.35) | 0.794 |

aStatistical analyses set were based on intention-to-treat population.

bThe number of participants providing data of VAS was 82 in CX-DZ-II group and 81 in SDZ-II group.

cThe number of participants providing data of VAS was 80 in CX-DZ-II group and 81 in SDZ-II group.

dThe number of participants providing data of VAS was 79 in CX-DZ-II group and 80 in SDZ-II group.

eThe number of participants providing data of VAS was 78 in CX-DZ-II group and 81 in SDZ-II group.

fThe number of participants providing data of VAS was 76 in CX-DZ-II group and 78 in SDZ-II group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Supplementary Table3*. Instrument fault list of two groups during the whole study** | | |
| **Instrument fault, n(%)** | **CX-DZ-II group (n=83)** | **SDZ-II group (n=80)** |
| Screen flicker | 1(1.20%) | 0 |
| Damage of chip | 1(1.20%) | 0 |
| Inserted needles were pulled out because of the improper disposal of wire | 2(2.41%） | 0 |
| Transient increase of electricity without expectation | 2(2.41%） | 2(2.50%) |
| The intensity of electricity could not be adjusted | 0 | 1(1.25%) |