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Dear Editor,

Please accept this revision for MS: 8490059539299565 - A comparative assessment of three formulations of botulinum toxin A for facial Rhytides: A systematic review and meta-analyses.

On behalf of all the author, we thank the reviewer(s) for their advice and assistance preparing this manuscript. We feel as though this is an important and timely study and thus the publication of the manuscript will allow for a transparent assessment of the available literature.

There were two primary concerns with respect to the review of the paper.

1. With respect to the Doctor's Evidence 2nd independent search. We were initially approached by the company and offered to have their assistance performing a 2nd search. Initially we thought this would be interesting to readers as it may allow for an unbiased comparison of a private companies search. However after consideration, we feel this may add confusion to the paper and thus we decided to delete this and focus on a standard library search as outlined in our protocol.

2. With respect to the comment regarding the sub-group analysis. we have updated the wording and have provided a reference as to the method we plan on using. We certainly hope to be able to assess for multivariate however if this is not possible, we will note this in our final manuscript.

We have also included other suggestions and ensured to the best of our knowledge that the paper confirms to journal standards.

Thank you very much for your suggestions,

James P. Bonaparte, MD, MSc, FRCSC