

1 **Effectiveness and clinical relevance of kinesio taping in musculoskeletal disorders: A**  
2 **protocol for an overview of systematic reviews and evidence mapping**

3

4 **Authors:** Qingcong Mo<sup>a,#</sup>, Siqi Xu<sup>b,#</sup>, Fangfei Hu<sup>a</sup>, Xiaoyan Zheng<sup>b,\*</sup>

5 <sup>#</sup>Qingcong Mo and Siqi Xu contributed equally to this work

6

7 **Affiliations:**

8 <sup>a</sup>School of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, China.

9 <sup>b</sup>School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, China.

10

11 **\*Corresponding authors:**

12 Full name: Xiaoyan Zheng

13 Mailing address: School of Rehabilitation Sciences, Southern Medical University, 1023-1063

14 Shatai South Road, Guangzhou, China

15 E-mail address: [zxy18825147762@smu.edu.cn](mailto:zxy18825147762@smu.edu.cn)

16 Phone: (+86) 18825147762

17

## 18 **ABSTRACT**

### 19 **Introduction**

20 Kinesio taping (KT) has been extensively applied in the management of musculoskeletal  
21 disorders. Although plentiful systematic reviews (SRs) have evaluated its efficacy, there are no  
22 convincing conclusions due to disperse and inconclusive results, and its clinical relevance  
23 remains unclear. Hence, there is a need to summarise all the SRs for the comprehensive and  
24 consistent evidence. This overview aims to appraise the overall effectiveness of KT in  
25 musculoskeletal disorders, and provide evidence maps to visualise the findings.

### 26 **Method and analysis**

27 Electronic databases (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, MEDLINE, Embase,  
28 Epistemonikos, PEDro, Scopus, ISI Web of Science) and reference lists will be searched from  
29 inception to September 2024 for the SRs of randomised controlled trials (RCTs). The SRs  
30 involving comparisons of the effectiveness between single or adjunctive KT and other  
31 interventions for patients with musculoskeletal disorders will be included. The primary and  
32 additional outcome to be considered will be the core outcome set, and the patient-reported  
33 outcome measure and patient-important outcome, respectively. Two reviewers will  
34 independently screen and select studies, extract the data, and evaluate the reporting and  
35 methodological quality of eligible SRs as well as the risk of bias of included RCTs. For the SRs  
36 without meta-analysis, we will collate the number of RCTs that showed any differences in  
37 outcomes. For the SRs with meta-analysis, we will provide the original summary of evidence  
38 (e.g., pooled effects and heterogeneity) for outcomes with an evaluation of missing results and  
39 clinical relevance. The certainty of each outcome will be measured, and user-friendly maps of

40 findings will be presented graphically.

#### 41 **Ethics and dissemination**

42 Formal ethical approval for this study is not required, since the data will be only collected from  
43 published literature in public databases. The results will be disseminated in the peer-reviewed  
44 academic journal, and relevant datasets will be preserved in the online repository.

#### 45 **PROSPERO registration number**

46 CRD42024517528

#### 47 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 48 ● This study will be carried out and reported following the Cochrane Collaboration  
49 Handbook for Overviews of Reviews and the Preferred Reporting items for Overviews of  
50 Reviews statement.
- 51 ● This study will only include systematic reviews with and without meta-analysis of  
52 randomised controlled trials.
- 53 ● This study will evaluate the reporting and methodological quality of systematic reviews,  
54 examine the risk of bias and degree of overlap of randomised controlled trials, and manage  
55 discordant results by selecting the most representative research.
- 56 ● This study will perform the assessment of missing results and certainty for the evidence,  
57 interpret the clinical relevance between effects and outcomes, and provide evidence maps  
58 of comprehensive and systematic findings.
- 59 ● This study may not be up-to-date as newly published randomised controlled trials will not  
60 be included, and ultimate conclusions will probably be limited by clinical heterogeneity  
61 due to variations in dose or application method of kinesio taping.

## 62 INTRODUCTION

63 Musculoskeletal disorders are a major and serious healthcare issue.[1] It consist of a group of  
64 more than 150 different and irreversible diseases/conditions that affect the locomotor system  
65 (including muscles, bones, joints and adjacent connective tissues).[2,3] Among them, the most  
66 prevalent conditions are low back pain, fractures, osteoarthritis, other injuries, neck pain,  
67 amputation, and rheumatoid arthritis.[4,5] Globally, musculoskeletal disorders are common  
68 among adolescents to the elderly, and the highest burden is expected to be concentrated in  
69 people aged 50-54 years.[6,7] Over the past few decades, with the growth and  
70 aging of population, musculoskeletal disorders have become increasingly serious.[4,5]

71 Estimates of the prevalence of musculoskeletal disorders suggested substantial increases  
72 in global cases and years of life lived with disability, affecting approximately 1.71 billion  
73 individuals.[4,5] Patients with musculoskeletal disorders may suffer from various health-related  
74 negative outcomes, involving problems in pain intensity, functional status, psychological state,  
75 quality of life, and more.[5,8,9] The consequences of these problems may lead to work-related  
76 disability while reducing productivity and increasing direct and indirect economic  
77 costs.[3,8,10,11] In addition, the risk of developing other noncommunicable diseases,  
78 especially cardiovascular diseases, is higher in people with musculoskeletal disorders than in  
79 those without them.[12] As a typical feature of musculoskeletal disorders, co-occurring  
80 persistent pain in different body regions beyond the primary pain may have implications for  
81 patients' prognosis, treatment method, and outcome.[13,14] Hence, research on musculoskeletal  
82 disorders requires more attention, although they mainly lead to disability rather than  
83 death.[15,16]

84 In an attempt to meet the massive demand of rehabilitation services,[4,5] active  
85 management for musculoskeletal disorders is needed.[16-18] Currently, non-invasive  
86 treatments have a significant impact on the treatment of various musculoskeletal disorders.[15]  
87 Among them, kinesio taping (KT), a form of taping technique, has been extensively utilized  
88 across countries/regions for many years to support sports science and rehabilitation.[19] The  
89 application of KT in musculoskeletal disorders is widespread.[20]

90

### 91 **Description of the intervention**

92 KT is an elastic therapeutic taping tool consisting mainly of cotton, originally created and  
93 introduced by Dr. Kenso Kase in the 1970s.[21] It is lightweight, waterproof, breathable and  
94 available in a wide range of colours, types, lengths, widths, textures and techniques.[21]  
95 Following assessment and instruction from healthcare professionals, KT can be directly fixed  
96 to the target tissue with different combinations of cuts (e.g., Y, I, X tape), tensions (e.g.,  
97 percentage of stretch), and directions (e.g., muscle insertion to origin).[21] Wearing of KT may  
98 maintain the effect for 3 to 5 days, ideally following the 24 hours application rule based on the  
99 skin condition.[22]

100 Over the past decade, the popularity of KT is increasing worldwide given the promising  
101 benefits suggested by plentiful clinical studies.[19,22] KT assists users with musculoskeletal  
102 disorders in relieving pain intensity,[23] modulating extremity function,[23] and improving  
103 proprioception,[24] stability,[25] range of motion,[26] and quality of life.[27] These therapeutic  
104 effects are probably supported by the mechanisms of KT that it increases the subcutaneous  
105 space, stimulates skin sensory receptors, and provides support for mechanical behaviour and

106 biomechanics of the skin.[21,28-30] Applying different tensions of it on the skin may reduce  
107 partial pressure, accelerate blood and lymphatic circulation, and increase muscle temperature,  
108 thus promoting regional microcirculation.[21,31,32] People with a psychologically anticipated  
109 response to the effect of KT are likely to induce greater placebo effects, thus contributing to  
110 enhanced muscle function.[33-35] Although there is some evidence to support the theory of KT,  
111 its precise working mechanism remains unclear and many studies showed conflicting  
112 therapeutic results.[36] Consequently, the inconclusive findings of KT have resulted in a  
113 longstanding debate regarding the effectiveness and clinical relevance.

114

#### 115 **Significance of conducting the review**

116 Due to substantial controversy over the results of KT reported in the primary studies,  
117 researchers have carried out plentiful systematic reviews (SRs) with and without meta-analysis  
118 to evaluate the clinical effectiveness of KT.[37-40] However, the inconclusive evidence of  
119 musculoskeletal disorders was presented in the SRs as well, involving elbow,[41,42]  
120 shoulder,[43-45] back,[46-48] knee,[49-51] and spine.[52]

121 Meanwhile, the majority of SRs may not examine the clinical relevance of KT. The  
122 minimal clinically important difference (MCID) is considered to be the smallest change that  
123 appears to have a benefit implication for patient's treatment outcome.[53,54] The application  
124 of MCID assists in establishing numerical thresholds for clinical research that only identified  
125 statistically significant impacts of intervention with little or unknown clinical relevance for  
126 patients.[55-57] Nevertheless, Embry and Piccirillo retrieved the journal and found that large  
127 percentage of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) (69%) did not define the MCID or mention

128 it.[58] The lack of additional confirmation regarding the clinical relevance of KT presumably  
129 added difficulties to clinical interpretation of its effects.

130 As the number of SRs increased to date, the existing evidence of KT probably created gaps  
131 between research and practice, as well as variations in clinical opinions among healthcare  
132 providers.[59,60] Hence, there is a need to summarise and assess the overall effectiveness of  
133 KT in musculoskeletal disorders from all the SRs.

134 Overview of SRs, a method of reviewing multiple SRs, is capable of collating broad  
135 information, synthesizing diverse findings, and presenting a well-organized and detailed  
136 summary of evidence.[61,62] This evidence-based method is frequently applied to develop a  
137 unified perspective when there are conflicting conclusions on a specific topic at the level of the  
138 SRs due to different selection methods, potential sources of heterogeneity and risk of bias, and  
139 variable reporting and methodological quality.[61,62] In addition, evidence mapping is a  
140 effective and evolving methodological tool for integrating and presenting evidence through  
141 user-friendly visual graphics.[63,64] Cupler and colleagues have provided an evidence map of  
142 four types of taping (KT, Rigid taping, McConnell taping and Mulligan taping) for  
143 musculoskeletal conditions.[65] However, the limitation of the study is that the evidence maps  
144 were based on the included RCTs and did not clarify the relationship between the outcomes and  
145 the contradictory findings of the SRs. Application of evidence mapping for overview of SRs  
146 plays a complementary role in conveniently identifying research gaps and rapidly disseminating  
147 knowledge.[63,64,66,67]

148 To date, no studies have evaluated the existing evidence on the effectiveness and clinical  
149 relevance of KT in musculoskeletal disorders from the SRs. To fill the gap of knowledge, we

150 will conduct an overview of SRs and evidence mapping to inform evidence-based clinical  
151 practice and support healthcare decision-making. The relevant findings obtained by this study  
152 will be expected to benefit researchers, physiotherapists, stakeholders, and particularly multiple  
153 patients at various stages of musculoskeletal rehabilitation.

154

### 155 **Objective and research question**

156 This study aims to appraise the overall effectiveness of KT in musculoskeletal disorders, and  
157 provide evidence maps to visualise the findings. This study will examine the following research  
158 questions: (1) Is KT effective in patients diagnosed with musculoskeletal disorders? (2) What  
159 types of outcomes does KT demonstrate positive, no, or negative effects on?

160

## 161 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

### 162 **Protocol and registration**

163 This study is designed as an overview of SRs and evidence mapping. We have prospectively  
164 registered this protocol within the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews  
165 (PROSPERO, Registration number: CRD42024517528). The protocol has been presented in  
166 accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis  
167 Protocols (PRISMA-P) statement (Supplementary File 1).[68] We will conduct the overview  
168 following the methodology of Cochrane Collaboration Handbook for Overviews of  
169 Reviews.[69]

170

### 171 **Patient and public involvement**



172 No patients or the public involved in this overview of SRs and evidence mapping.

173

## 174 **Eligibility criteria**

### 175 Types of studies

176 Standard-compliant SRs with and without meta-analysis of RCTs will be considered for  
177 inclusion. The definition of systematic review and meta-analysis will be adhered to the  
178 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) 2020  
179 statement,[70] as follows: systematic review means to use explicit, systematic methods to  
180 collate and synthesise findings of studies that address a articulated question; meta-analysis is a  
181 statistical method for synthesising results when research effect estimates and their variances are  
182 available. If the SRs were published in other languages than English, or only searched one  
183 database, or no details of primary RCTs were provided, they will be excluded. Protocols of  
184 overview and SRs, scoping review and network meta-analysis will be excluded as well.

185

### 186 Types of participants

187 Guided by the International Classification of Diseases 11th revision (ICD-11),[71] we will  
188 include participants who have a diagnosis of musculoskeletal disorders. Eligible individuals  
189 will be included, regardless of their age, gender, and region. Additionally, we will exclude  
190 animals from participation.

191

### 192 Types of interventions

193 The SRs that evaluated the effectiveness of KT in musculoskeletal disorders will be considered

194 for inclusion. KT must be used as a core treatment method in the experimental group, either as  
195 monotherapy or combination therapy. The way of applying KT on the body must be related to  
196 the musculoskeletal system. It will not be limited by tension, direction, and regimen.

197

198 Types of comparators

199 No strict intervention limitations on the type of control group will be set, such as no treatment,  
200 standard of care, placebo control, medication therapy, rehabilitation, and other interventions  
201 (e.g., traditional Chinese medicine therapy, surgical treatment). KT as a treatment method will  
202 be excluded in this group.

203

204 Types of outcome measures

205 With the ability to lower the risk of heterogeneity, inconsistency, and outcome-reporting bias  
206 between trials, the core outcome set will be the primary outcome.[72] First, we will search  
207 specific musculoskeletal disorders related to KT usage in eligible SRs on the MEDLINE or the  
208 website (<https://comet-initiative.org/>). Then, we will select the most up-to-date (i.e., date  
209 approaching 2022-2024), credible (e.g., registered research, multi-round survey, more  
210 stakeholders included), and standard (e.g., reported more complete items in the checklist of  
211 Core Outcome Set-STAndards for Development)[73] core outcome set to consider any  
212 promising outcomes that must be relevant to patients.

213 If partial musculoskeletal disorders are not assessed by the core outcome set, we plan to  
214 consider patient-reported outcome measures [74] and patient-important outcomes.[75] They are  
215 able to reflect patient perspectives on their symptoms, functional status, quality of life, and

216 more. The following additional outcomes will be considered:

217 1. Pain intensity, which measured by standard or specific scales (e.g., Numerical Rating Scale  
218 (NRS), Visual Analogue Scale (VAS)).

219 2. Upper and lower limb function and/or disability status, which measured by standard or  
220 specific scales (e.g., Range of Motion (ROM), Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand  
221 (DASH), Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Patella Questionnaire (VISA-P), Roland-  
222 Morris Disability Questionnaire (RMDQ)).

223 3. Quality of life, which measured by standard or specific scales (e.g., Short-Form 36 Health  
224 Survey Questionnaire (SF-36), EORTC Core Quality of Life questionnaire (EORTC QLQ-C30),  
225 WHO Quality of Life Brief Questionnaire (WHOQOL-BREF)).

226 4. Disease-specific symptom, which measured by standard or specific scales (e.g., Grip Strength  
227 (GS) for lateral epicondylitis).

228

### 229 **Search strategy and selection**

230 According to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses  
231 literature search extension (PRISMA-S) guideline,[76] our search will be conducted in the  
232 following electronic databases (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, MEDLINE,  
233 Embase, Epistemonikos, PEDro, Scopus, ISI Web of Science) from inception to September  
234 2024. We will also perform a search to identify any registered yet unpublished SRs and grey  
235 literature in the PROSPERO and OpenGrey, respectively. In addition, we will hand-search the  
236 reference lists of included SRs for any relevant cited SRs in Google Scholar. The search strategy  
237 is developed involving the integration of MeSH terms, keywords and free text terms related to

238 KT: (kinesio taping OR kinesio tape OR kinesiotaping OR kinesiotap OR physiotape OR tape  
239 OR taping) AND (systematic review OR meta-analysis).

240 Two independent literature reviewers will screen titles and abstracts of the SRs output  
241 through the EndNote V.21 software to identify eligible articles. Then, the same reviewers will  
242 download the promising SRs and assessed them by full-text reading for final inclusion.  
243 Afterwards, applying Gwet's AC1 statistics and related 95% confidence interval (CI),<sup>[77]</sup> one  
244 reviewer will evaluate the agreement on study selection between two reviewers using R  
245 language V.4.3.2. Considering that application of the classification from Landis and Koch to  
246 Gwet's AC1 is inappropriate,<sup>[78]</sup> the inter-rater reliability will be cautiously explained. The  
247 Fisher's exact test will be performed to determine its statistical significance (P value). Any  
248 disagreement will be discussed or consulted the third reviewer for a consensus.

249

## 250 **Data extraction**

251 We will extract and cross-check data from the SRs in standardised tables based on predefined  
252 criteria, using an electronic form of Microsoft Excel 2019. All data must be related to KT only.  
253 Data concerning the basic information (first author's name, year of publication, country/region  
254 of the first author's affiliation, and number of the included primary RCTs), participants  
255 characteristic (number of participants and disease or condition), search strategy (number and  
256 names of databases searched and date range of search), type of comparison, outcome  
257 measurement, evidence assessment tool (risk of bias and certainty of evidence) and study  
258 conclusion (e.g., positive effect, no effect, negative effect) will be extracted. If we identified  
259 discrepant data of included same studies in different SRs, we plan to contact the corresponding

260 authors or to retrieve and follow the raw data of primary RCTs.

261 If the SRs with meta-analysis analysed outcomes with more than one study, two reviewers  
262 will extract the analytical methods (fixed or random effects model), heterogeneity (Cochran's  
263 Q test P value and I-square statistic), pooled effects with 95% CI (mean difference (MD) or  
264 standardized mean difference (SMD) for continuous outcome; relative risk (RR) or odds ratio  
265 (OR) for binary outcome), direction (differences in favour of KT or control intervention),  
266 statistical significance (P value) and publication bias (at least 10 studies). If the follow-up data  
267 is available, we will extract them as well.

268 To provide a complete summary of KT, we will use the Risk of Bias due to Missing  
269 Evidence (ROB-ME) tool to assess the meta-analysis results.[79] Briefly, three steps will be  
270 conducted following the tool: select meta-analyses related to outcome (step 1), determine which  
271 eligible studies have missing results (step 2), and consider potential for missing studies (step 3).  
272 Response options for the signal questions are categorised as 'yes', 'probably yes', 'probably  
273 no', 'no', 'no information' or 'not applicable'. Then, the results will be judged and interpreted  
274 as 'low risk of bias', 'some concerns' or 'high risk of bias'. Discrepancies considered potentially  
275 relevant by one reviewer will be discussed and, if needed, will be ultimately resolved by the  
276 third reviewer.

277

### 278 **Managing the overlap between primary RCTs**

279 As the number of SRs and updated SRs for KT increased to date, the identical or highly similar  
280 questions related to musculoskeletal disorders were probably answered.[80] To avoid double  
281 counting data from overlapped SRs, we will extract the information on characteristics of

282 primary RCTs separately (first author's name, year of publication, number of participants, type  
283 of comparison, pre- and post-intervention outcome measurement data with or without follow-  
284 up). After removing duplicated articles, we will combine the results into a table.

285 Based on the specific clinical question, a matrix of included primary RCTs in the SRs will  
286 be created and visualised to evaluate the amount of overlapping using the Graphical  
287 Representation of Overlap for OVERviews (GROOVE) tool.[81] When collating each outcome  
288 in the matrix, we will calculate the corrected covered area (CCA) regardless of any structural  
289 missing data. The CCA refers to a measurement for the degree of overlap and it will be  
290 interpreted as 'slight overlap' (0%–5%), 'moderate overlap' (6%–10%), 'high overlap' (11%–  
291 15%) or 'very high overlap' (>15%).[82]

292

### 293 **Assessment of the reporting quality**

294 Transparent and complete reporting of SRs supports to examine the feasibility of the methods  
295 and the reliability of the findings, thus bolstering evidence-based decision-making.[70,83] Two  
296 reviewers will separately evaluate the reporting quality of SRs with and without meta-analysis  
297 in accordance with the Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) reporting guideline [83] and  
298 the PRISMA 2020 statement.[70] The SwiM guideline consists of 9 items and contains critical  
299 features of synthesis in the SRs without meta-analysis (e.g., the method of study category, data  
300 presentation, finding summary). The PRISMA checklist covers 27 items and is designed for  
301 SRs with meta-analysis that require detailed reporting in different sections (e.g., abstract,  
302 methods, results). Each item of the above checklist will be recorded and graded as 'completely  
303 reported', 'partially reported' or 'not reported' depending on whether the domains were clearly

304 documented. Then, we will calculate the compliance rate of the reporting in each of SRs to  
305 overview the overall reporting quality. Any differences of opinion will be resolved through  
306 discussion or determined by the third reviewer.

307

### 308 **Assessment of the methodological quality and the risk of bias**

309 The quality assessment of eligible SRs includes both the methodological quality and the risk of  
310 bias [84]. Two reviewers will independently assess them by the A Measurement Tool to Assess  
311 Systematic Reviews 2 (AMSTAR 2) [85] and Risk of Bias in Systematic reviews (ROBIS),[86]  
312 respectively. The AMSTAR 2 is a valid, reliable and user-friendly appraisal tool and most of  
313 the questions are binary.[87] After answering 16 original items (recommended critical domains  
314 are 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15), the overall methodological confidence of SRs will be judged as  
315 follows: ‘high’ (no or one non-critical weakness), ‘moderate’ (more than one non-critical  
316 weakness), ‘low’ (one critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses) or ‘critically  
317 low’ (more than one critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses). The ROBIS  
318 has rigorous methodology and is intended for assessing the level of bias within SRs through  
319 three phases: assess the relevance of SRs to outcome for KT (phase 1), identify concerns with  
320 the review process including study eligibility criteria, identification and selection of studies,  
321 data collection and study appraisal, synthesis and findings (phase 2), judge the risk of bias based  
322 on the concerns of each domain bias (phase 3).[86] The overall risk of bias will be rated as  
323 ‘low’, ‘unclear’ or ‘high’ according to the answers to signalling questions.

324 In addition, we plan to re-evaluate the quality of each primary RCTs using the Cochrane  
325 Risk of Bias assessment tool 2.0 (ROB 2.0),[88] if the SRs appraised the risk of bias by means

326 of other tool (e.g., Cochrane risk of bias tool, Jadad scale, PEDro scale). The ROB 2.0 consists  
327 of five bias domain originating from the randomisation process, deviations from intended  
328 interventions, missing outcome data, measurement of the outcome and selection of the reported  
329 result. Each domain will be required to rank the levels of evidence bias through a series of  
330 signalling questions to determine the judgement of overall risk of bias as ‘low risk of bias’,  
331 ‘some concerns’ or ‘high risk of bias’.[88] Any differences will be settled through discussion  
332 or with the assistance of the third reviewer.

333

### 334 **Strategies for data analysis**

335 Within the SRs without meta-analysis, we will collate and summarise the number of RCTs that  
336 demonstrated any differences in the outcomes (i.e., statistically significant positive effect  
337 [direction of effect in favour of KT], statistically significant negative effect [direction of effect  
338 in favour of control intervention] and non-statistically significant effect). Statistical significance  
339 will be defined as a P value less than 0.05.[89] If the SRs incorporated comparisons that did not  
340 meet the eligible inclusion criteria, the corresponding RCTs will not be applicable for  
341 calculation. Using the vote counting method, we plan to present these RCTs as a percentage of  
342 all primary studies in the SRs along with 95% CI (Wilson interval).[90]

343       Regarding the SRs with meta-analysis, we will present the original summary of evidence  
344 (e.g., pooled effects, heterogeneity and direction) without carrying new meta-analyses for  
345 outcomes. However, when the same conceptual outcome that included interventions beyond  
346 KT (e.g., Rigid taping, McConnell taping, Mulligan taping) or was reported by different  
347 measurements (e.g., outcome of interest that should be calculated in MD but was calculated in



348 SMD), we plan to back-translate the primary data in the SRs to re-estimate the overall effects.  
349 For re-analysing the outcome data that incorporated other distinct types of KT, we will exclude  
350 these RCTs by examining the characteristics of primary studies. Then, the associated findings  
351 (i.e., pooled effects, heterogeneity and direction) will be extracted, and the publication bias (at  
352 least 10 RCTs) will be evaluated by the Egger's regression test. For the conversion of  
353 appropriate outcome measurements, we will present the binary outcomes as RR since the usage  
354 of OR in RCTs may exaggerate the effect size, leading to the misinterpretation in decision-  
355 making.[91,92] And the continuous outcomes will be presented as MD (same conceptual  
356 outcomes are measured on same scales) or SMD (same conceptual outcomes are measured on  
357 different scales).[93] In the above procedures, to maximise the retention of the authors' data  
358 processing methods, the re-estimation will be performed under the same settings corresponding  
359 to the SRs using the Review Manager V.5.4 software.

360

### 361 **Strategies for managing concordant or discordant results**

362 To provide the concordant evidence, we will organise the final results of KT (i.e., the proportion  
363 of RCTs that showed any effect and the overall pooled effects) from the SRs with and without  
364 meta-analysis into three categories (positive effect, no effect, and negative effect).[69] Table 1  
365 provides detailed criteria for classification. A threshold of 80% SRs in the same classification  
366 will be set to determine the concordance of results [94] and the robustness of review findings  
367 will be discussed.[95]

368

Type of systematic review	Category of effect	Description
Systematic review without meta-analysis	Positive effect	The proportion of RCTs that showed statistically significant effect in favour of KT is the highest
	No effect	The proportion of RCTs that showed non-statistically significant effect is the highest
	Negative effect	The proportion of RCTs that showed statistically significant effect in favour of control intervention is the highest
Systematic review with meta-analysis	Positive effect	Continuous outcome: the statistically significant pooled effect size and associated 95% CI is higher than 0 points (direction of effect in favour of KT) Dichotomous outcome: the statistically significant pooled effect size and associated 95% CI is higher than 1 points (direction of effect in favour of KT)
	No effect	Continuous outcome: the associated 95% CI of pooled effect size crosses 0 points Dichotomous outcome: the associated 95% CI of pooled effect size crosses 1 points
	Negative effect	Continuous outcome: the statistically significant pooled effect size and associated 95% CI is lower than 0 points (direction of effect in favour of control intervention) Dichotomous outcome: the statistically significant pooled effect size and associated 95% CI is lower than 1 points (direction of effect in favour of control intervention)

369 **Table 1** Effects classification criteria. CI, confidence interval; RCTs, randomised controlled  
370 trials; KT, kinesio taping.

371

372 When there are discordant results, methods of treatment involves examining and recording  
373 discordance, using adjunct decision rules or tools, and selecting the most representative study  
374 among the SRs.[96] In this management, we will consider varied standards for choosing the  
375 best SR, as the new meta-analyses will not be conducted and the utilization of Jadad algorithm

376 will be difficult to follow (i.e., limitations in operationalization and interpretation).[97] First,  
377 we will examine the resemblance of clinical question (e.g., moderate to very high overlap  
378 presented in CCA, similar scale used to combine effect size) across the SRs. Afterwards, the  
379 four-domain strategies (comprehensiveness, timeliness, riskiness, and reporting) will be applied  
380 to select the best SR that reported relatively trustworthy findings, as below:

- 381 1. Comprehensiveness: the SRs included the highest number of RCTs and participants.
- 382 2. Timeliness: the SRs conducted the most recent search date (i.e., date approaching 2022-2024)  
383 in the largest number of databases (e.g., MEDLINE, Embase, CINAHL).
- 384 3. Riskiness: the SRs that were evaluated as the highest methodological quality and the lowest  
385 risk of bias according to the AMSTAR 2 and ROBIS tool.
- 386 4. Reporting: the SRs reported the most complete items (number of items completely reported  
387 and partially reported) in the checklist of the SwiM guideline and the PRISMA 2020 statement.

388

### 389 **Assessment of the certainty of evidence**

390 Certainty of evidence supports the clinical and health decision-making process and its  
391 assessment is an essential part of overview of SRs according to the Cochrane guidelines.[98,99]  
392 For the SRs without meta-analysis, we will assess the overall quality of evidence following the  
393 Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE)  
394 framework.[100] Details of the application of the GRADE framework in the SRs without meta-  
395 analysis are in Supplementary File 2.

396 If the SRs with meta-analysis used the GRADE methodology to determine the quality of  
397 evidence, we will extract and present the following information associated with outcomes: five

398 domains of downgrade (risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision and reporting bias),  
399 three domains of upgrade (large effects, dose response and opposing plausible residual bias and  
400 confounding) and the corresponding certainty (high quality, moderate quality, low quality and  
401 very low quality).[101] In contrast, if these SRs did not report the certainty of evidence, we will  
402 evaluate the overall quality of summary of evidence by the GRADE methodology.

403

#### 404 **Assessment and interpretation of clinical relevance**

405 We propose comparing the continuous pooled effects with 95% CI from each meta-analysis to  
406 the MCID. With the increasing publication of MCID measurements involving different  
407 outcomes in musculoskeletal disorders,[102-105] there may be overlap. Hence, we will search  
408 and select the MCID that most closely resemble the outcomes and participants in electronic  
409 databases corresponding to our search strategy (e.g., MEDLINE, Embase, ISI Web of Science).  
410 Priority consideration will be given to the MCID determined through anchor-based methods.  
411 The MCID described as percentage change from baseline for outcomes will not be considered  
412 since this method may not be suitable for statistical analysis.[106] If the included MCID is  
413 appropriate, the pooled effects reported in MD will be directly compared to it. The pooled  
414 effects reported in SMD will not be compared to the MCID as various lumped scales may lead  
415 to substantial uncertainty. Nevertheless, when the pooled effects reported in SMD is greater  
416 than 0.5 (medium effect size), we will consider the difference between KT and other  
417 interventions as the MCID.[55,93] If the appropriate MCID is not available, we will select and  
418 use the standard deviation for distribution-based calculation.[55,56] Details of the calculation  
419 of clinical relevance are in Supplementary File 3.

420 Subsequently, we will adopt the systematic method provided from Man-Son Hing et al. to  
421 determine and interpret the clinical relevance of results (Figure 1).[107] The approach focuses  
422 on four levels of clinical importance between the MCID and the pooled effects with 95% CI, as  
423 below:

- 424 1. Definite: the lower limit of the 95% CI is greater than the MCID.
- 425 2. Probable: the lower limit of the 95% CI is smaller than the MCID, but the pooled effect size  
426 is greater than the MCID.
- 427 3. Possible: the pooled effect size is smaller than the MCID, but the upper limit of the 95% CI  
428 is greater than the MCID.
- 429 4. Definitely not: the upper limit of the 95% CI is smaller than the MCID.

430

### 431 **Evidence mapping of findings**

432 To provide credible evidence maps related to KT, we will summarise the evidence from the SRs  
433 and create user-friendly matrices of the relationship between effectiveness (positive effect, no  
434 effect, and negative effect) and outcomes. Then, we will grade the strength of evidence into five  
435 levels (convincing, highly suggestive, suggestive, weak, and non-significant evidence).[108-  
436 110] For the SRs without meta-analysis, we will evaluate the strength of evidence of positive  
437 or negative effects using the binomial test. This test (null hypothesis is equal to 0.5) will be  
438 applied to detect whether KT has a true effect.[90] For the SRs with meta-analysis, the strength  
439 of evidence will be assessed through strict criteria (e.g., number of participants and statistical  
440 significance). We will calculate the 95% prediction interval from the primary study specific  
441 data that corresponds to the SRs for outcomes. We plan to examine the excess of statistically

442 significant bias by detecting whether the number of observed nominally significant studies  
443 differs from the expected number of research with significant results.[111] Details of the  
444 classification criteria for strength of evidence are in Table 2.

445

Type of systematic review	Strength of evidence	Description
Systematic reviews with meta-analysis	Class I: convincing evidence	Number of included participants>1000; statistical significance at $P<10^{-6}$ ; no large heterogeneity (I-square<50%); 95% prediction interval not including null value; no small-study effects; no excess significance bias
	Class II: highly suggestive evidence	Number of included participants>1000; statistical significance at $P<10^{-6}$ ; largest study significant
	Class III: suggestive evidence	Number of included participants>1000; statistical significance at $P<10^{-3}$
	Class IV: weak evidence	Statistical significance at $P<0.05$
Systematic reviews without meta-analysis	Non-significant evidence	Statistical significance at $P>0.05$
	Class I: convincing evidence	Probability of observing the evidence if positive or negative effects are not true at $P<0.05$
	Class IV: weak evidence	Probability of observing the evidence if positive or negative effects are not true at $P>0.05$
	Non-significant evidence	Evidence of no effect observed

446 **Table 2** Classification criteria of strength of evidence.

447

#### 448 **Strategies for evidence synthesis**

449 We will report the overview following the Preferred Reporting items for Overviews of Reviews  
450 (PRIOR) statement.[112] The selection of the SRs will be reported using the PRISMA flow  
451 chart in accordance with the PRISMA-S guideline, and the associated inter-rater reliability  
452 (Gwet's AC1 statistics) will be presented in narrative form. A list of included and excluded SRs

453 will be provided with descriptive explanation of reasons.

454 The characteristics of the included SRs regarding the relevant details of basic information,  
455 participant characteristic, search strategy, type of comparison, outcome measurement, evidence  
456 assessment tool and study conclusion will be summarised and reported in tabular form. The  
457 matrix of evidence table at the outcome level will be visually presented in the heat map graphics  
458 that informed the degree of overlap between primary RCTs in the SRs.

459 We will report the results concerning the quality of the RCTs (risk of bias assessed by the  
460 ROB 2.0 tool) and the quality of the SRs (reporting assessed by the SWiM guideline and the  
461 PRISMA 2020 statement, methodology assessed by the AMSTAR 2, risk of bias assessed by  
462 the ROBIS tool) in tables. The final summary of evidence (the proportion of RCTs that showed  
463 any effect and the overall pooled effects) will be tabulated, along with the discussion of  
464 sensitivity to concordant or discordant results.

465 The effectiveness (positive, unclear, negative effect) of KT for each outcome of interest in  
466 musculoskeletal disorders will be presented accompanied by the clinical relevance and certainty  
467 of evidence using tables and figures. The visual evidence maps of evidence (the relationship  
468 between effectiveness and outcomes) with the corresponding strengths will be plotted, sub-  
469 grouped by different body regions (lower extremity, upper extremity, spinal conditions, and not  
470 otherwise classified).[65]

471

## 472 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

473 This overview of SRs and evidence mapping does not require ethical approval, as the data will  
474 be only collected from published literature in public databases. This results will be published

475 in the peer-reviewed academic journal, and relevant datasets will be preserved in the online

476 repository.

477



478 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

479 QM and SX, as co- first authors, made equal contributions to the study. QM, SX, FH and XZ  
480 contributed to the conception and design of the study. SX and FH designed the eligibility criteria  
481 and search strategies. QM, SX and FH developed the study quality evaluation, data extraction  
482 and analysis plan, and evidence presenting method. XZ is the study guarantor. All authors  
483 drafted the protocol and approved the final version for publication.

484

485 **FUNDING STATEMENT**

486 This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 82205245),  
487 the Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong, China (No. 2023A1515011143), the Science  
488 and Technology Program of Guangzhou, China (No. 2023A04J0421), the Teaching quality and  
489 teaching reform project of Southern Medical University in 2022 ( [2022] 22), the National  
490 College Student Innovation and Entrepreneurship Training Program (No. 202212121048 and  
491 202312121264).

492

493 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

494 Not applicable.

495

496 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT**

497 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form ([www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-](http://www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-interest/)  
498 [interest/](http://www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-interest/)) and declare: no support from any organization for the submitted work; no financial  
499 relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the

500 previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced  
501 the submitted work.

502

### 503 **DATA SHARING**

504 No additional data are available.

505

### 506 **REFERENCES**

- 507 [1] GBD 2019 Diseases and Injuries Collaborators. Global burden of 369 diseases and  
508 injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global  
509 Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet* 2020;396:1204-22. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
510 6736(20)30925-9
- 511 [2] Gómez-Galán M, Pérez-Alonso J, Callejón-Ferre AJ, et al. Musculoskeletal disorders:  
512 OWAS review. *Ind Health* 2017;55:314-37. doi:10.2486/indhealth.2016-0191
- 513 [3] World Health Organization. Musculoskeletal health [online]. 2022.  
514 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/musculoskeletal-conditions> (accessed  
515 23 January 2024).
- 516 [4] Cieza A, Causey K, Kamenov K, et al. Global estimates of the need for rehabilitation  
517 based on the Global Burden of Disease study 2019: a systematic analysis for the Global  
518 Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet* 2021;396:2006-17. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
519 6736(20)32340-0
- 520 [5] Chen N, Fong DYT, Wong JYH. Secular Trends in Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation Needs  
521 in 191 Countries and Territories From 1990 to 2019. *JAMA Netw Open* 2022;5:e2144198.

- 522 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.44198
- 523 [6] Guan SY, Zheng JX, Sam NB, et al. Global burden and risk factors of musculoskeletal  
524 disorders among adolescents and young adults in 204 countries and territories, 1990-  
525 2019. *Autoimmun Rev* 2023;22:103361. doi:10.1016/j.autrev.2023.103361
- 526 [7] Liu S, Wang B, Fan S, et al. Global burden of musculoskeletal disorders and attributable  
527 factors in 204 countries and territories: a secondary analysis of the Global Burden of  
528 Disease 2019 study. *BMJ Open* 2022;12:e062183. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-062183
- 529 [8] Briggs AM, Cross MJ, Hoy DG, et al. Musculoskeletal Health Conditions Represent a  
530 Global Threat to Healthy Aging: A Report for the 2015 World Health Organization World  
531 Report on Ageing and Health. *Gerontologist* 2016;56 Suppl 2:S243-55.  
532 doi:10.1093/geront/gnw002
- 533 [9] Chen N, Fong DYT, Wong JYH. Trends in Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation Needs in  
534 China From 1990 to 2030: A Bayesian Age-Period-Cohort Modeling Study. *Front Public*  
535 *Health* 2022;10:869239. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2022.869239
- 536 [10] Bevan S. Economic impact of musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) on work in  
537 Europe. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2015;29:356-73. doi:10.1016/j.berh.2015.08.002
- 538 [11] Dieleman JL, Cao J, Chapin A, et al. US Health Care Spending by Payer and Health  
539 Condition, 1996-2016. *JAMA* 2020;323:863-84. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.0734
- 540 [12] Williams A, Kamper SJ, Wiggers JH, et al. Musculoskeletal conditions may increase the  
541 risk of chronic disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *BMC*  
542 *Med* 2018;16:167. doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1151-2
- 543 [13] El-Tallawy SN, Nalamasu R, Salem GI, et al. Management of Musculoskeletal Pain: An

- 544 Update with Emphasis on Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain. *Pain Ther* 2021;10:181-209.  
545 doi:10.1007/s40122-021-00235-2
- 546 [14] Øverås CK, Nilsen TIL, Sjøgaard K, et al. Temporal stability in the prevalence and pattern  
547 of co-occurring musculoskeletal pain among people with persistent low back pain:  
548 population-based data from the Norwegian HUNT Study, 1995 to 2019. *Pain*  
549 2023;164:2812-21. doi:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002981
- 550 [15] Belluzzi E, Pozzuoli A, Ruggieri P. Musculoskeletal Diseases: From Molecular Basis to  
551 Therapy. *Biomedicines* 2023;12:32. doi:10.3390/biomedicines12010032
- 552 [16] Safiri S, Kolahi AA, Cross M, et al. Prevalence, Deaths, and Disability-Adjusted Life  
553 Years Due to Musculoskeletal Disorders for 195 Countries and Territories 1990-  
554 2017. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2021;73:702-14. doi:10.1002/art.41571
- 555 [17] Woolf AD, Erwin J, March L. The need to address the burden of musculoskeletal  
556 conditions. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2012;26:183-224.  
557 doi:10.1016/j.berh.2012.03.005
- 558 [18] Lewis R, Gómez Álvarez CB, Rayman M, et al. Strategies for optimising  
559 musculoskeletal health in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2019;20:164.  
560 doi:10.1186/s12891-019-2510-7
- 561 [19] Qin Y, Li M, Han J, et al. Research hotspots and trends of Kinesio Taping from 2011 to  
562 2020: a bibliometric analysis. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* 2023;30:2029-41.  
563 doi:10.1007/s11356-022-22300-9
- 564 [20] Tran L, Makram AM, Makram OM, et al. Efficacy of Kinesio Taping Compared to Other  
565 Treatment Modalities in Musculoskeletal Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-

- 566           Analysis. *Res Sports Med* 2023;31:416-39. doi:10.1080/15438627.2021.1989432
- 567 [21] Kase K, Wallis J, Kase T. Clinical Therapeutic Applications of the Kinesio Taping  
568           Method: 3rd Edition. Albuquerque, NM: Kinesio Taping Association 2013:1-41.
- 569 [22] Andrýsková A, Lee JH. The Guidelines for Application of Kinesiology Tape for  
570           Prevention and Treatment of Sports Injuries. *Healthcare* 2020;8:144.  
571           doi:10.3390/healthcare8020144
- 572 [23] Rahlf AL, Braumann KM, Zech A. Kinesio Taping Improves Perceptions of Pain and  
573           Function of Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis: A Randomized, Controlled Trial. *J Sport*  
574           *Rehabil* 2019;28:481-7. doi:10.1123/jsr.2017-0306
- 575 [24] Cho HY, Kim EH, Kim J, et al. Kinesio taping improves pain, range of motion, and  
576           proprioception in older patients with knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled  
577           trial. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2015;94:192-200. doi:10.1097/PHM.000000000000148
- 578 [25] Safari S, Mohsenifar H, Amiri A. The immediate effect of synergistic muscles kinesio  
579           taping on function and balance of volleyball players with functional ankle instability: A  
580           randomized controlled trial. *Foot* 2023;57:102058. doi:10.1016/j.foot.2023.102058
- 581 [26] Ay S, Konak HE, Evcik D, et al. The effectiveness of Kinesio Taping on pain and  
582           disability in cervical myofascial pain syndrome. *Rev Bras Reumatol Engl Ed* 2017;57:93-  
583           9. doi:10.1016/j.rbre.2016.03.012
- 584 [27] Espí-López GV, Inglés M, Ferrando AC, et al. Effect of Kinesio taping on clinical  
585           symptoms in people with fibromyalgia: A randomized clinical trial. *J Back Musculoskelet*  
586           *Rehabil* 2019;32:561-7. doi:10.3233/BMR-171100
- 587 [28] Alqahtani AS, Parveen S. Kinesio Taping as a Therapeutic Tool for Masticatory

- 588 Myofascial Pain Syndrome-An Insight View. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*  
589 2023;20:3872. doi:10.3390/ijerph20053872
- 590 [29] Cimino SR, Beaudette SM, Brown SHM. Kinesio taping influences the mechanical  
591 behaviour of the skin of the low back: A possible pathway for functionally relevant  
592 effects. *J Biomech* 2018;67:150-6. doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2017.12.005
- 593 [30] He F, Wang X, Yu M, et al. Effects of Kinesio taping on skin deformation during knee  
594 flexion and extension: a preliminary study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2022;23:187.  
595 doi:10.1186/s12891-022-05148-5
- 596 [31] Kirmizigil B, Chauchat JR, Yalciner O, et al. The Effectiveness of Kinesio Taping in  
597 Recovering From Delayed Onset Muscle Soreness: A Crossover Study. *J Sport Rehabil*  
598 2019;29:385-93. doi:10.1123/jsr.2018-0389
- 599 [32] Liu K, Duan Z, Chen L, et al. Short-Term Effect of Different Taping Methods on Local  
600 Skin Temperature in Healthy Adults. *Front Physiol* 2020;11:488.  
601 doi:10.3389/fphys.2020.00488
- 602 [33] Lam J, Chan P, Constantinou M, et al. Personal belief on elastic tape and tape tension  
603 affect perceived performance, but not muscle activity and endurance. *Physiother Theory*  
604 *Pract* 2023;39:1-7. doi:10.1080/09593985.2023.2172703
- 605 [34] Au IPH, Fan PCP, Lee WY, et al. Effects of Kinesio tape in individuals with lateral  
606 epicondylitis: A deceptive crossover trial. *Physiother Theory Pract* 2017;33:914-9.  
607 doi:10.1080/09593985.2017.1359871
- 608 [35] Mak DN, Au IP, Chan M, et al. Placebo effect of facilitatory Kinesio tape on muscle  
609 activity and muscle strength. *Physiother Theory Pract* 2019;35:157-62.

- 610 doi:10.1080/09593985.2018.1441936
- 611 [36] Chinese expert consensus group of clinical application of kinesio taping. Clinical  
612 application of kinesio taping in China: Expert consensus. *Chinese Journal of Physical  
613 Medicine and Rehabilitation* 2021;43:97-108. doi:10.3760/cma.j.issn.0254-  
614 1424.2021.02.001
- 615 [37] Ramírez-Vélez R, Hormazábal-Aguayo I, Izquierdo M, et al. Effects of kinesio taping  
616 alone versus sham taping in individuals with musculoskeletal conditions after  
617 intervention for at least one week: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Physiotherapy*  
618 2019;105:412-20. doi:10.1016/j.physio.2019.04.001
- 619 [38] Parreira Pdo C, Costa Lda C, Hespanhol LC Jr, et al. Current evidence does not support  
620 the use of Kinesio Taping in clinical practice: a systematic review. *J Physiother*  
621 2014;60:31-9. doi:10.1016/j.jphys.2013.12.008
- 622 [39] Kalron A, Bar-Sela S. A systematic review of the effectiveness of Kinesio Taping--fact or  
623 fashion?. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 2013;49:699-709.
- 624 [40] Morris D, Jones D, Ryan H, et al. The clinical effects of Kinesio® Tex taping: A  
625 systematic review. *Physiother Theory Pract* 2013;29:259-70.  
626 doi:10.3109/09593985.2012.731675
- 627 [41] Landesa-Piñeiro L, Leirós-Rodríguez R. Physiotherapy treatment of lateral epicondylitis:  
628 A systematic review. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil* 2022;35:463-77. doi:10.3233/BMR-  
629 210053
- 630 [42] George CE, Heales LJ, Stanton R, et al. Sticking to the facts: A systematic review of the  
631 effects of therapeutic tape in lateral epicondylalgia. *Phys Ther Sport* 2019;40:117-27.

632 doi:10.1016/j.ptsp.2019.08.011

633 [43] Gianola S, Iannicelli V, Fascio E, et al. Kinesio taping for rotator cuff disease. *Cochrane*  
634 *Database Syst Rev* 2021;8:CD012720. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012720.pub2

635 [44] Ghozy S, Dung NM, Morra ME, et al. Efficacy of kinesio taping in treatment of shoulder  
636 pain and disability: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled  
637 trials. *Physiotherapy* 2020;107:176-88. doi:10.1016/j.physio.2019.12.001

638 [45] Celik D, Karaborklu Argut S, Coban O, et al. The clinical efficacy of kinesio taping in  
639 shoulder disorders: a systematic review and meta analysis. *Clin Rehabil* 2020;34:723-40.  
640 doi:10.1177/0269215520917747

641 [46] Pan L, Li Y, Gao L, et al. Effects of Kinesio Taping for Chronic Nonspecific Low Back  
642 Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Altern Ther Health Med* 2023;29:68-76.

643 [47] Sheng Y, Duan Z, Qu Q, et al. Kinesio taping in treatment of chronic non-specific low  
644 back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Rehabil Med* 2019;51:734-40.  
645 doi:10.2340/16501977-2605

646 [48] Luz Júnior MAD, Almeida MO, Santos RS, et al. Effectiveness of Kinesio Taping in  
647 Patients With Chronic Nonspecific Low Back Pain: A Systematic Review With Meta-  
648 analysis. *Spine* 2019;44:68-78. doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000002756

649 [49] Melese H, Alamer A, Hailu Temesgen M, et al. Effectiveness of Kinesio Taping on the  
650 Management of Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled  
651 Trials. *J Pain Res* 2020;13:1267-76. doi:10.2147/JPR.S249567

652 [50] Wu H, Yao R, Wu J, et al. Does kinesio taping plus exercise improve pain and function in  
653 patients with knee osteoarthritis?: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized



- 654 controlled trials. *Front Physiol* 2022;13:961264. doi:10.3389/fphys.2022.961264
- 655 [51] Ouyang JH, Chang KH, Hsu WY, et al. Non-elastic taping, but not elastic taping,  
656 provides benefits for patients with knee osteoarthritis: systemic review and meta-  
657 analysis. *Clin Rehabil* 2018;32:3-17. doi:10.1177/0269215517717307
- 658 [52] Vanti C, Bertozzi L, Gardenghi I, et al. Effect of taping on spinal pain and disability:  
659 systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Phys Ther* 2015;95:493-506.  
660 doi:10.2522/ptj.20130619
- 661 [53] McGlothlin AE, Lewis RJ. Minimal clinically important difference: defining what really  
662 matters to patients. *JAMA* 2014;312:1342-3. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.13128
- 663 [54] Jaeschke R, Singer J, Guyatt GH. Measurement of health status. Ascertaining the  
664 minimal clinically important difference. *Control Clin Trials* 1989;10:407-15.  
665 doi:10.1016/0197-2456(89)90005-6
- 666 [55] Sedaghat AR. Understanding the Minimal Clinically Important Difference (MCID) of  
667 Patient-Reported Outcome Measures. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2019;161:551-60.  
668 doi:10.1177/0194599819852604
- 669 [56] Engel L, Beaton DE, Touma Z. Minimal Clinically Important Difference: A Review of  
670 Outcome Measure Score Interpretation. *Rheum Dis Clin North Am* 2018;44:177-88.  
671 doi:10.1016/j.rdc.2018.01.011
- 672 [57] Angst F, Aeschlimann A, Angst J. The minimal clinically important difference raised the  
673 significance of outcome effects above the statistical level, with methodological  
674 implications for future studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;82:128-36.  
675 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.11.016

- 676 [58] Embry TW, Piccirillo JF. Minimal Clinically Important Difference Reporting in  
677 Randomized Clinical Trials. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020;146:862-3.  
678 doi:10.1001/jamaoto.2020.1586
- 679 [59] Cheatham SW, Baker RT, Abdenour TE. Kinesiology Tape: A Descriptive Survey of  
680 Healthcare Professionals in the United States. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* 2021;16:778-96.  
681 doi:10.26603/001c.22136
- 682 [60] Hill CE, Stanton R, Heales LJ, et al. Therapeutic tape use for lateral elbow tendinopathy:  
683 A survey of Australian healthcare practitioners. *Musculoskelet Sci Pract* 2020;48:102160.  
684 doi:10.1016/j.msksp.2020.102160
- 685 [61] Hunt H, Pollock A, Campbell P, et al. An introduction to overviews of reviews: planning  
686 a relevant research question and objective for an overview. *Syst Rev* 2018;7:39.  
687 doi:10.1186/s13643-018-0695-8
- 688 [62] Lunny C, Brennan SE, McDonald S, et al. Toward a comprehensive evidence map of  
689 overview of systematic review methods: paper 1-purpose, eligibility, search and data  
690 extraction. *Syst Rev* 2017;6:231. doi:10.1186/s13643-017-0617-1
- 691 [63] Alahdab F, Murad MH. Evidence maps: a tool to guide research agenda setting. *BMJ*  
692 *Evid Based Med* 2019;24:209-11. doi:10.1136/bmjebm-2018-111137
- 693 [64] Miake-Lye IM, Hempel S, Shanman R, et al. What is an evidence map? A systematic  
694 review of published evidence maps and their definitions, methods, and products. *Syst Rev*  
695 2016;5:28. doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0204-x
- 696 [65] Cupler ZA, Alrwaily M, Polakowski E, et al. Taping for conditions of the  
697 musculoskeletal system: an evidence map review. *Chiropr Man Therap* 2020;28:52.

- 698 doi:10.1186/s12998-020-00337-2
- 699 [66] Saran A, White H. Evidence and gap maps: a comparison of different  
700 approaches. *Campbell Syst Rev* 2018;14:1-38. doi:10.4073/cmdp.2018.2
- 701 [67] Lu L, Zhang Y, Ge S, et al. Evidence mapping and overview of systematic reviews of the  
702 effects of acupuncture therapies. *BMJ Open* 2022;12:e056803. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-  
703 2021-056803
- 704 [68] Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review  
705 and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015;4:1.  
706 doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
- 707 [69] Pollock M, Fernandes RM, Becker LA, et al. Chapter V: Overviews of Reviews. In:  
708 Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic  
709 Reviews of Interventions* version 6.4. Cochrane, 2023. Available:  
710 [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook).
- 711 [70] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated  
712 guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- 713 [71] World Health Organization. ICD-11 for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics [online]. 2024.  
714 <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en> (accessed 26 January 2024).
- 715 [72] Williamson PR, Altman DG, Bagley H, et al. The COMET Handbook: version 1.0. *Trials*  
716 2017;18:280. doi:10.1186/s13063-017-1978-4
- 717 [73] Kirkham JJ, Davis K, Altman DG, et al. Core Outcome Set-STANDards for Development:  
718 The COS-STAD recommendations. *PLoS Med* 2017;14:e1002447.  
719 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002447

- 720 [74] Black N. Patient reported outcome measures could help transform healthcare. *BMJ*  
721 2013;346:f167. doi:10.1136/bmj.f167
- 722 [75] Møller MH. Patient-important outcomes and core outcome sets: increased attention  
723 needed!. *Br J Anaesth* 2019;122:408-10. doi:10.1016/j.bja.2019.02.007
- 724 [76] Rethlefsen ML, Kirtley S, Waffenschmidt S, et al. PRISMA-S: an extension to the  
725 PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic Reviews. *Syst Rev*  
726 2021;10:39. doi:10.1186/s13643-020-01542-z
- 727 [77] Gwet KL. Handbook of Inter-Rater Reliability: The Definitive Guide to Measuring the  
728 Extent of Agreement Among Raters: 4th ed. Gaithersburg: Advances Analytics 2014:101-  
729 28.
- 730 [78] Vach W, Gerke O. Gwet's AC1 is not a substitute for Cohen's kappa - A comparison of  
731 basic properties. *MethodsX* 2023;10:102212. doi:10.1016/j.mex.2023.102212
- 732 [79] Page MJ, Sterne JAC, Boutron I, et al. ROB-ME: a tool for assessing risk of bias due to  
733 missing evidence in systematic reviews with meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2023;383:e076754.  
734 doi:10.1136/bmj-2023-076754
- 735 [80] Lunny C, Pieper D, Thabet P, et al. Managing overlap of primary study results across  
736 systematic reviews: practical considerations for authors of overviews of reviews. *BMC*  
737 *Med Res Methodol* 2021;21:140. doi:10.1186/s12874-021-01269-y
- 738 [81] Pérez-Bracchiglione J, Meza N, Bangdiwala SI, et al. Graphical Representation of  
739 Overlap for OVERviews: GROOVE tool. *Res Synth Methods* 2022;13:381-8.  
740 doi:10.1002/jrsm.1557
- 741 [82] Pieper D, Antoine SL, Mathes T, et al. Systematic review finds overlapping reviews were

- 742 not mentioned in every other overview. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;67:368-75.  
743 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.11.007
- 744 [83] Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, et al. Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in  
745 systematic reviews: reporting guideline. *BMJ* 2020;368:l6890. doi:10.1136/bmj.l6890
- 746 [84] Perry R, Whitmarsh A, Leach V, et al. A comparison of two assessment tools used in  
747 overviews of systematic reviews: ROBIS versus AMSTAR-2. *Syst Rev* 2021;10:273.  
748 doi:10.1186/s13643-021-01819-x
- 749 [85] Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic  
750 reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions,  
751 or both. *BMJ* 2017;358:j4008. doi:10.1136/bmj.j4008
- 752 [86] Whiting P, Savović J, Higgins JP, et al. ROBIS: A new tool to assess risk of bias in  
753 systematic reviews was developed. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016;69:225-34.  
754 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.06.005
- 755 [87] Lorenz RC, Matthias K, Pieper D, et al. A psychometric study found AMSTAR 2 to be a  
756 valid and moderately reliable appraisal tool. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2019;114:133-40.  
757 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.05.028
- 758 [88] Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in  
759 randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. doi:10.1136/bmj.l4898
- 760 [89] Greenland S, Senn SJ, Rothman KJ, et al. Statistical tests, P values, confidence intervals,  
761 and power: a guide to misinterpretations. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2016;31:337-50.  
762 doi:10.1007/s10654-016-0149-3
- 763 [90] McKenzie JE, Brennan SE. Chapter 12: Synthesizing and presenting findings using other

- 764 methods. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al, eds. Cochrane Handbook for  
765 Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4. Cochrane, 2023. Available:  
766 [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook).
- 767 [91] Balasubramanian H, Ananthan A, Rao S, et al. Odds ratio vs risk ratio in randomized  
768 controlled trials. *Postgrad Med* 2015;127:359-67. doi:10.1080/00325481.2015.1022494
- 769 [92] Knol MJ, Duijnhoven RG, Grobbee DE, et al. Potential misinterpretation of treatment  
770 effects due to use of odds ratios and logistic regression in randomized controlled  
771 trials. *PLoS One* 2011;6:e21248. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0021248
- 772 [93] Andrade C. Mean Difference, Standardized Mean Difference (SMD), and Their Use in  
773 Meta-Analysis: As Simple as It Gets. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2020;81:20f13681.  
774 doi:10.4088/JCP.20f13681
- 775 [94] Belur J, Tompson L, Thornton A, et al. Interrater Reliability in Systematic Review  
776 Methodology: Exploring Variation in Coder Decision-Making. *Sociological Methods &*  
777 *Research* 2021;50:837-65. doi:10.1177/0049124118799372
- 778 [95] Moja L, Fernandez del Rio MP, Banzi R, et al. Multiple systematic reviews: methods for  
779 assessing discordances of results. *Intern Emerg Med* 2012;7:563-8. doi:10.1007/s11739-  
780 012-0846-1
- 781 [96] Lunny C, Brennan SE, McDonald S, et al. Toward a comprehensive evidence map of  
782 overview of systematic review methods: paper 2-risk of bias assessment; synthesis,  
783 presentation and summary of the findings; and assessment of the certainty of the  
784 evidence. *Syst Rev* 2018;7:159. doi:10.1186/s13643-018-0784-8
- 785 [97] Lunny C, Thirugnanasampanthar SS, Kanji S, et al. How can clinicians choose between

- 786 conflicting and discordant systematic reviews? A replication study of the Jadad  
787 algorithm. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2022;22:276. doi:10.1186/s12874-022-01750-2
- 788 [98] Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schünemann HJ, et al. GRADE guidelines: a new series of  
789 articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:380-2.  
790 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.09.011
- 791 [99] Schünemann HJ, Higgins JPT, Vist GE, et al. Chapter 14: Completing ‘Summary of  
792 findings’ tables and grading the certainty of the evidence. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J,  
793 Chandler J, et al, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*  
794 version 6.4. Cochrane, 2023. Available: [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook).
- 795 [100] Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating  
796 quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;336:924-6.  
797 doi:10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD
- 798 [101] Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality  
799 of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:401-6. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.07.015
- 800 [102] Katajapuu N, Heinonen A, Saltychev M. Minimal clinically important difference and  
801 minimal detectable change of the World Health Organization Disability Assessment  
802 Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0) amongst patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain. *Clin*  
803 *Rehabil* 2020;34:1506-11. doi:10.1177/0269215520942573
- 804 [103] Benaim C, Blaser S, Léger B, et al. "Minimal clinically important difference" estimates  
805 of 6 commonly-used performance tests in patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain  
806 completing a work-related multidisciplinary rehabilitation program. *BMC Musculoskelet*  
807 *Disord* 2019;20:16. doi:10.1186/s12891-018-2382-2

- 808 [104]Franchignoni F, Vercelli S, Giordano A, et al. Minimal clinically important difference of  
809 the disabilities of the arm, shoulder and hand outcome measure (DASH) and its shortened  
810 version (QuickDASH). *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2014;44:30-9.  
811 doi:10.2519/jospt.2014.4893
- 812 [105]Salaffi F, Stancati A, Silvestri CA, et al. Minimal clinically important changes in chronic  
813 musculoskeletal pain intensity measured on a numerical rating scale. *Eur J Pain*  
814 2004;8:283-91. doi:10.1016/j.ejpain.2003.09.004
- 815 [106]Vickers AJ. The use of percentage change from baseline as an outcome in a controlled  
816 trial is statistically inefficient: a simulation study. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2001;1:6.  
817 doi:10.1186/1471-2288-1-6
- 818 [107]Man-Son-Hing M, Laupacis A, O'Rourke K, et al. Determination of the clinical  
819 importance of study results. *J Gen Intern Med* 2002;17:469-76. doi:10.1046/j.1525-  
820 1497.2002.11111.x
- 821 [108]Fusar-Poli P, Radua J. Ten simple rules for conducting umbrella reviews. *Evid Based*  
822 *Ment Health* 2018;21:95-100. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2018-300014
- 823 [109]Huang Y, Chen Z, Chen B, et al. Dietary sugar consumption and health: umbrella  
824 review. *BMJ* 2023;381:e071609. doi:10.1136/bmj-2022-071609
- 825 [110]Berendsen S, Berendse S, van der Torren J, et al. Cognitive behavioural therapy for the  
826 treatment of schizophrenia spectrum disorders: an umbrella review of meta-analyses of  
827 randomised controlled trials. *EclinicalMedicine* 2024;67:102392.  
828 doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2023.102392
- 829 [111]Ioannidis JP, Trikalinos TA. An exploratory test for an excess of significant



830 findings. *Clin Trials* 2007;4:245-53. doi:10.1177/1740774507079441

831 [112]Gates M, Gates A, Pieper D, et al. Reporting guideline for overviews of reviews of

832 healthcare interventions: development of the PRIOR statement. *BMJ* 2022;378:e070849.

833 doi:10.1136/bmj-2022-070849

834

835 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

836 **Figure 1** Method of interpreting clinical relevance developed by Man-Son-Hing et al.[107] and  
837 adapted. Dotted lines represent the clinical relevance threshold. MCID, minimal clinically  
838 important difference.

