

**Supplementary Table S6.** GRADE summary of findings table

Summary of findings							
With Botox-A compared to without Botox-A for summary findings table							
Patient or population: spinal cord injury							
Setting: N/A							
Intervention: Botox-A							
Comparison: without Botox-A							
Outcome	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Effect	Certainty
No. of participants (studies)							
Spasticity	Serious <sup>a)</sup>	Serious <sup>b)</sup>	Not serious	Serious <sup>c)</sup>	Undetected <sup>d)</sup>	(SMD, -1.73; 95% CI, -2.51 to -0.95)	⊕○○○ Very low
Assessed with: MAS, MTS							
No. of participants: 39							
(5 non-randomized studies)							
Pain	Serious <sup>a)</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>c)</sup>	Undetected <sup>d)</sup>	(SMD, -1.79; 95% CI, -2.67 to -0.91)	⊕⊕○○ Low
No. of participants: 13							
(2 non-randomized)							

Grading of Recommended Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group grades of evidence

High certainty: we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect.

Moderate certainty: we are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.

Low certainty: our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.

Very low certainty: we have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect.

Botox-A, botulinum toxin-A; N/A, not applicable; SMD, standardized mean difference; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval.

<sup>a)</sup>Downgraded one point for risk of bias as lack of randomization and concealment of allocation, and studies rated as fair (unclear risk of bias) to good (low risk of bias) quality.

<sup>b)</sup>Downgraded one point for inconsistency as moderate heterogeneity was present.

<sup>c)</sup>Downgraded one point for imprecision as optimal information size (OIS) less than standard. In other words, sample sizes <400.

<sup>d)</sup>While our search strategy was comprehensive in retrieving relevant literature, the number of studies available was insufficient to assess publication bias using funnel plot and/or Egger regression test. Therefore, we rated publication bias as undetected.