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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors

Thank you for submitting this paper to this journal. Below are some comments that should be considered:

Major Issues:
1) Authors should consider revising the literature to a current date. The review process was carried out over a year ago. Please review the data.

2) The conclusion of the study above the data. The authors conclude that kinesiotaping is better than otherwise when the main outcome is that evidence is controversial. This conclusion isn't sufficiently supported.

3) The authors present in discussion a different view from the PROSPERO and methods, creating subgroups (different population, different segments affected by surgery...). What is the objective of the review? Can not The authors evaluate all types of surgery together?

4) Page 9, lines 227-235: The authors use the breast cancer surgery literature to discuss kinesiotaping. Here we have two problems: 1- The authors don't discuss their results against this literature; 2- The two reviews presented by the authors don't talk about kinesiotaping. Please rewrite this paragraph.

5) CONCLUSION: I invite the authors to a second look for the results and conclusion. The authors conclude "There are INDICATORS implying an effect of kinesiotape application on postoperative swelling in some indications", but the objective of the study was identify de effectiveness.

Minor Issues:
Page 3, line 56: Don't use "established". This indications were just proposed. Some of this indications were considered inconsistent in actual studies.

Page 3, line 62: The authors wrote "The aim of this review is to determine the current state of research on the use of kinesiotape for postoperative edema". That is not the aim of the study, this is the method. The objective is better wrote in the abstract (review the"evidence for the effectiveness of kinesiotaping in the postoperative..." edema).

Page 4, line 71: please, don't use "all existing studies". You try this but it is never guaranteed that your string has reached all the literature.
Page 4, line 77: The authors excluded studies analyzing edema associated with malignancy even in the post operative cancer. Why did the authors exclude these studies? There are a large number of this studies. Please, write the reasons for this exclusion.

Page 4, line 95: "June 2018". Isn't that outdated?

Page 5, line 96-101. The authors should exclude/summarize this paragraph considering that the string is indexed in this review.

Page 7, line 155-157: "No previous systematic review considering kinesiotape as a treatment of postoperative edema etiologically independent of malignancy could be identified." In the figure 1, "review article" is presented as an exclusion factor used.

Page 7, line 172: tendency is not result.

Page 9, line 242: "optimizes resources without jeopardizing the patients' recovery". Where the authors found this information? This review don't support this. Do you evaluate adverse effects? There isn't citation on this paragraph to support this information.

Page 16 and 17, lines 421 - 446: The legends of the figures 3 and 4 are too long and not appropriate for this local. Please, insert this informations in the text and summarize the legends.
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