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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for requesting to review this interesting paper. I would like also to congratulate the authors. I have only a few suggestions to make:

Abstract-Methods:

I suggest the addition of the date of the literature search and whether any restrictions were applied?

Abstract-Results:

I suggest the addition of the quality assessment of the five included trials to the results. Also noted the reasons for not performing meta-analysis was "design shortcoming", a clearer explanation is needed, as all five included trials are RCTs.

Background:

* The authors mentioned the existence of three reviews on the usage of BoNTA, I suggest to highlight the differences between these reviews and the current review.

* The future tense "This review will", this is usually used for the review protocol, please change as appropriate.

* "the objective of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to assess the available evidence of BoNTA injection". Meta-analysis was not performed, I suggest to remove meta-analysis from the background.

Methods:

I suggest the addition of a subheading "Review Searches".
Assessment of Methodological Quality:

* I suggest to move the first sentence: "The reviewers screened independently the title and abstract of studies, identified through the literature search for potential inclusion" to the review searches/Method.

* If the methodological quality was one of the inclusion criteria in this review, I suggest to make this clearer in the inclusion/exclusion criteria. "Those with RCT scores ≥ 8 were included in the study ". Please revise as appropriate.

* I also suggest to add a brief description of the Joanna Briggs Institute's instrument.

Results:

* This paragraph should be divided into two paragraphs: description of the include studies and quality of the included studies.

* I would like the authors to clarify that no trials were excluded based on their quality scoring.

* Reasons for not performing meta-analysis should be clearer? as all the five included trials measured spasticity, I assume specificity is not one of the review outcome.

* The outcome walking was measured across the included trials reasons for not performing meta-analysis should be stated in details.

Conclusion:

The authors are performing their own RCT, I suggest to add the link to the clinical trial registry number.
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