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Author’s response to reviews:

18 December 2017
Lise Estcourt
Systematic Reviews

https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/

Dear Dr Estcourt,

RE SYS-D-17_00323

I thank you for the review of our manuscript entitled: “A systematic Review: Efficacy of Botulinum Toxin in Walking and Quality of Life in Post-Stroke Lower Limb Spasticity,” and for
providing reviewers comments and recommendations. We have addressed the reviewers’ issues as stated point by point in the attachment to this letter.

My co-authors and I are pleased to accept your invitation to re-submit the manuscript for consideration and look forward to a positive outcome.

In addition to the response to the reviewers’ comments we have, in amending the manuscript taken the opportunity to make some small editing changes to improve language and flow. These changes are not substantial nor do they affect the argument of the work.

Thank you again for your consideration of our work.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Anupam Datta Gupta
Senior Consultant, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital
28 Woodville Road, Woodville South
South Australia-5011

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS
Abstract
Methods
Date of the literature search provided and the restrictions discussed. (Lines 59-61).
Results
Quality assessment and reasons for not doing meta-analysis discussed. (Lines 68-70).
Background

We have highlighted the difference between reviews mentioned in the Background and the current review. (Line 85).

The future tense “this review will” has been changed to “this study”. (Line 89).

Meta-analysis has been removed from the Background. (Line 113).

Methods

Assessment of Methodological Quality

The first sentence under Assessment of Methodological Quality has been removed and the sentence “The authors screened independently the title and abstract of studies, identified through the literature search for potential inclusion,” has been included under Inclusion and Exclusion criteria

In dealing with methodological quality we have included the sentence: “No studies included in this review were excluded based on their quality scoring. Table 2 shows that accepted studies achieved a quality score of at least 8. Below this score studies were excluded because they were not RCT’s or included a placebo control,” as the first sentence of included studies. (Line 175-178).

A brief description of the Joanna Briggs Institutes instrument is included. (Line 170-173).

Results

The first two sections of the Result are sub-entitled as “Description of the included studies” and “Quality of the included studies”.

We have identified that no trials were excluded based on quality scoring and that a quality score below 8 identified non RCT’s. (Line 177-178).

We have justified that a meta-analysis was not appropriate. (Lines 213-219).

As above.

Conclusion

The Link to the Clinical Registry Number has been included. (Line 414).