Review

Botulinum Toxin Resistance: A Comprehensive Systematic Review of Mechanisms, Risk Factors, Diagnosis, and Management Strategies

Reza Ghalamghash *

Posted Date: 5 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

Keywords: Botulinum Toxin; Resistance; Immunogenicity; Neutralizing Antibodies; Treatment Failure

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

Review

Botulinum Toxin Resistance: A Comprehensive Systematic Review of Mechanisms, Risk Factors, Diagnosis and Management Strategies

Reza Ghalamghash

Founder of Premium Doctors and Academic Director, Premium College, Toronto, Canada;
Reza@PremiumDoctors.org; Tel: +1 (647) 822-9570, ORCID: 0009-0004-1745-1315

Abstract: Background: Botulinum neurotoxin (BoNT) has transformed the treatment of neurological, pain, and aesthetic conditions by inducing temporary muscle paralysis through inhibition of acetylcholine release at the neuromuscular junction. However, treatment failure or resistance poses a significant clinical challenge. Resistance manifests as primary non-response (innate insensitivity) or secondary non-response (loss of efficacy after initial success), driven by immunological factors like neutralizing antibodies (NAbs) or non-immunological factors such as suboptimal dosing or inaccurate muscle targeting. Factors like cumulative dose, injection frequency, and BoNT formulation influence NAb development, with newer formulations showing lower immunogenicity. Diagnosis integrates clinical and laboratory assays, though current NAb testing has limitations. Management strategies include optimizing treatment parameters, switching serotypes, or exploring novel toxins. **Methods**: A systematic search of PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library was conducted, focusing on literature from 2015–2025, with seminal older works included for foundational context. Keywords included "botulinum toxin resistance," "immunogenicity," and "neutralizing antibodies." Inclusion criteria encompassed peer-reviewed studies on human subjects addressing mechanisms, risk factors, diagnosis, or management of BoNT resistance. Data were extracted using a standardized form and synthesized qualitatively into themes: molecular mechanisms, immunological and non-immunological factors, diagnosis, and management. **Results**: Resistance is multifaceted, with NAbs causing secondary failure in 10.1–10.3% of cases, varying by indication (e.g., 2.1% in cervical dystonia, 26.7% in blepharospasm). Risk factors for NAb formation include high cumulative doses, frequent injections, and complexing proteins in formulations, though recent studies suggest HLA polymorphisms play a significant role. Non-immunological causes, such as suboptimal dosing or incorrect diagnosis, are prevalent and often correctable. Diagnostic approaches combine clinical assessment (e.g., dose creep) with assays like the Mouse Hemidiaphragm Assay (MHDA), though ethical and practical limitations highlight the need for in vitro alternatives. Management includes dose optimization, EMG-guided injections, switching to less immunogenic formulations (e.g., incobotulinumtoxinA), or alternative serotypes (BoNT/B, BoNT/F), alongside emerging strategies like novel serotypes (e.g., BoNT/X). **Conclusions**: BoNT resistance requires a systematic approach to distinguish immunological from non-immunological causes. Clinicians should prioritize correcting non-immunological factors before diagnosing NAb-mediated resistance. Advances in low-immunogenicity formulations and diagnostic tools are critical to sustain BoNT's therapeutic efficacy. Future research should focus on in vitro NAb assays, genetic predictors of resistance, and novel formulations to ensure long-term benefits for patients.

Keywords: botulinum toxin; resistance; immunogenicity; neutralizing antibodies; treatment failure

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview of Botulinum Neurotoxin (BoNT) and Its Therapeutic Applications

Botulinum neurotoxin (BoNT), primarily serotypes A and B, is a potent neurotoxin produced by *Clostridium botulinum* (Pirazzini et al., 2017). Its therapeutic utility stems from its ability to induce temporary flaccid paralysis by inhibiting acetylcholine release at peripheral cholinergic nerve terminals (Aoki & Guyer, 2001). BoNT is widely used in neurology for disorders like cervical dystonia, blepharospasm, hemifacial spasm, and spasticity in cerebral palsy or multiple sclerosis (Brashear et al., 2005). It also manages chronic pain (e.g., migraines, neuropathic pain), autonomic dysfunctions (e.g., hyperhidrosis, overactive bladder), and aesthetic concerns like wrinkles (Nawrocki & Cha, 2020; Fernández-Núñez et al., 2019).

BoNT binds to presynaptic receptors, is internalized, and cleaves SNARE proteins (SNAP-25, VAMP, syntaxin), essential for neurotransmitter release (Pirazzini et al., 2017). This disruption prevents acetylcholine release, causing localized paralysis, reversible as SNARE proteins regenerate (Aoki & Guyer, 2001).

1.2. Clinical Significance of BoNT Resistance

BoNT resistance, manifesting as primary (innate insensitivity) or secondary (loss of efficacy after initial success) non-response, compromises therapeutic outcomes (Dressler, 2004). This leads to reduced quality of life and increased healthcare costs as alternative treatments are sought (Hefter et al., 2015). The growing use of BoNT/A in therapeutic and aesthetic applications, particularly among younger patients, increases cumulative exposure, elevating resistance risk through NAb formation (Ho et al., 2022).

1.3. Brief Overview of Prior Research on BoNT Resistance

Research has quantified NAb prevalence and identified risk factors like dose and injection frequency (Müller et al., 2018). Non-immunological causes, such as suboptimal techniques or misdiagnosis, are significant and correctable (Dressler, 2015). Studies also compare immunogenicity across BoNT formulations, with incobotulinumtoxinA showing lower NAb risk (Jankovic et al., 2014). Alternative serotypes (BoNT/B, BoNT/F) are explored for resistant patients (Chinnapongse et al., 2012).

1.4. Objectives of This Systematic Review

This review aims to:

1. Elucidate BoNT's molecular mechanisms and resistance pathways.
2. Analyze immunological and non-immunological risk factors for treatment failure.
3. Outline diagnostic approaches, including assay limitations.
4. Summarize management strategies, from optimization to novel therapies.

The review leverages platforms like premiumdoctors.org for expert insights and contributions from specialists like Dr. Reza Ghelamghash to enhance clinical understanding.

2. Methodology

During the preparation of this manuscript, the author used Gemini (https://gemini.google.com/) and Grok (https://grok.com/) to collect information and write articles. After using these tools/services, the author physically reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

2.1. Search Strategy and Databases

A systematic search was conducted in PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library, focusing on articles from 2015–2025, with older seminal works included for context (Jankovic et al., 2014). The search ensured recency and relevance.

2.2. Keywords and Search Terms

Keywords included "botulinum toxin resistance," "immunogenicity," "neutralizing antibodies," "primary non-response," "secondary non-response," "BoNT/A," "BoNT/B," "BoNT/F," "daxibotulinumtoxinA," "diagnosis," "management," and "risk factors." Boolean operators (AND, OR) were used to combine terms (Hefter et al., 2015).

2.3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

- Peer-reviewed original research, reviews, meta-analyses, or clinical trials.
- Human studies on therapeutic or aesthetic BoNT use.
- Articles addressing mechanisms, risk factors, diagnosis, or management of resistance.
- English-language publications.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Non-peer-reviewed articles, editorials, or abstracts.
- Case reports, unless providing unique mechanistic insights.
- Animal studies, unless directly translatable to humans.
- Studies on botulism, unless relevant to therapeutic resistance mechanisms (Chatham-Stephens et al., 2015).

2.4. Data Extraction and Synthesis

Two reviewers extracted data using a standardized form, capturing study design, patient demographics, BoNT product, treatment parameters, resistance outcomes, diagnostic methods, risk factors, and management strategies. Findings were synthesized qualitatively into themes: molecular mechanisms, immunological and non-immunological factors, diagnosis, and management, presented narratively with tables for clarity.

3. Findings

3.1. Molecular Mechanisms of Botulinum Toxin Action and Potential Resistance Pathways

3.1.1. Structural Composition and SNARE Protein Cleavage

BoNT, a 150 kDa protein, comprises a heavy chain (100 kDa) for binding and internalization and a light chain (50 kDa) with a zinc-binding motif for SNARE cleavage (Pirazzini et al., 2017). BoNT/A cleaves SNAP-25, while BoNT/B targets VAMP, disrupting neurotransmitter release (Aoki & Guyer, 2001).

3.1.2. Dual-Receptor Binding and Internalization

BoNT binds to polysialogangliosides and SV2 isoforms, with synaptotagmin critical for BoNT/B (Pirazzini et al., 2017). Internalization occurs via clathrin-dependent endocytosis, allowing the light chain to cleave SNARE proteins (Krebs & Lebeda, 2008).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

3.1.3. Proposed Mechanisms of Primary Resistance

Primary resistance is rare and not fully understood. Mutations in SNARE cleavage sites or receptors (SV2, synaptotagmin) are unlikely in humans (Dressler & Dimberger, 2000). Genetic variations or pre-existing anti-BoNT antibodies from botulism immunization may contribute (Ho et al., 2022). Natural barriers, like low ganglioside receptor abundance in non-neuronal tissues, limit systemic effects (Sakaguchi et al., 1977).

Table 1. Key Molecular Mechanisms of Botulinum Toxin Action and Inferred Resistance Pathways.

Mechanism	**Description**	**Resistance Pathway**	**Evidence**
SNARE Cleavage	BoNT/A cleaves SNAP-25; BoNT/B cleaves VAMP, inhibiting acetylcholine release.	Mutations in SNARE sites (unlikely in humans); altered SNARE expression.	Pirazzini et al., 2017; Aoki & Guyer, 2001
Receptor Binding	Dual binding to polysialogangliosides and SV2 (BoNT/A) or synaptotagmin (BoNT/B).	Reduced receptor expression or affinity; genetic polymorphisms.	Pirazzini et al., 2017; Dressler & Dimberger, 2000
Internalization	Clathrin-dependent endocytosis of BoNT into neurons.	Impaired endocytosis; altered neuronal uptake.	Krebs & Lebeda, 2008
Antibody Interference	NAbs block BoNT binding or internalization (secondary resistance).	Pre-existing antibodies (primary resistance); NAb formation post-treatment.	Ho et al., 2022; Göschel et al., 1997

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

3.2. Immunological Resistance: Neutralizing Antibodies (NAbs)

3.2.1. Prevalence of NAb Formation Across Clinical Indications

NAb incidence ranges from 10.1–10.3%, varying by indication: 2.1% in cervical dystonia to 26.7% in blepharospasm (Bakheit et al., 2015). Dystonia (7.4%) and spasticity (6.7%) show higher rates (Jankovic et al., 2014).

3.2.2. Risk Factors for NAb Development

- **Dose**: Higher cumulative doses (>1000 units) increase NAb risk (Müller et al., 2018).
- **Frequency/Duration**: Frequent injections and shorter intervals elevate risk (Bakheit et al., 2015).
- **Formulation**: Complexing proteins increase immunogenicity; incobotulinumtoxinA has the lowest risk (Jankovic et al., 2014). Recent studies suggest HLA polymorphisms are significant (Sarwar et al., 2024).
- **Genetic Susceptibility**: MHC polymorphisms influence antibody production (Hefter et al., 2015).

3.2.3. Immunogenicity Profiles of Commercial BoNT Products

- **OnabotulinumtoxinA (Botox®)**: NAb incidence 1.5–7.0% (Hefter et al., 2015).
- **AbobotulinumtoxinA (Dysport®)**: Higher NAb rates (1.7–7.4%) due to complexing proteins (Jankovic et al., 2014).
- **IncobotulinumtoxinA (Xeomin®)**: Lowest NAb rates (0.0–0.5%) due to purification (Jankovic et al., 2014).
- **DaxibotulinumtoxinA (DAXI)**: No NAbs in trials; real-world data pending (Marion et al., 2016).
- **RimabotulinumtoxinB (Myobloc®)**: Antibodies form but often lack clinical impact (Chinnapongse et al., 2012).
- **BoNT/F**: Shorter effect duration (5 weeks); antibodies develop after repeated use (Valeriani et al., 2015).

Table 2. Immunogenicity and Neutralizing Antibody Formation Across Botulinum Toxin Products and Associated Risk Factors.

Product	NAb Incidence	Key Risk Factors	Notes
OnabotulinumtoxinA (Botox®)	1.5–7.0%	High dose, frequent injections, complexing proteins	Common in dystonia, spasticity (Hefter et al., 2015)
AbobotulinumtoxinA (Dysport®)	1.7–7.4%	Complexing proteins, high dose	Higher immunogenicity due to formulation (Jankovic et al., 2014)

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

IncobotulinumtoxinA (Xeomin®)	0.0–0.5%	Minimal complexing proteins	Lowest NAb risk (Jankovic et al., 2014)
DaxibotulinumtoxinA (DAXI)	0% (trials)	Unknown in real-world	Pending long-term data (Marion et al., 2016)
RimabotulinumtoxinB (Myobloc®)	Variable	Serotype-specific antibodies	Often non-neutralizing (Chinnapongse et al., 2012)
BoNT/F	Variable	Repeated use, short duration	Limited clinical use (Valeriani et al., 2015)

3.3. Non-Immunological Causes of Treatment Failure

3.3.1. Suboptimal Dosing and Injection Techniques

Inadequate dosing or poor muscle targeting, particularly in cervical dystonia, causes treatment failure (Dressler, 2015). EMG or ultrasound guidance improves outcomes (Dressler, 2015).

3.3.2. Incorrect Diagnosis and Patient-Specific Factors

Misdiagnosis or complex movement patterns lead to perceived failure (Dressler, 2015). Patient expectations and side effects also influence satisfaction (Fernández-Núñez et al., 2019).

3.3.3. Disease Progression ("Pseudo"-Secondary Treatment Failure)

"Pseudo"-secondary treatment failure (PSEUDO-STF) results from disease progression, not NAbs, requiring dose adjustments (The National Academies Press, 2005).

Table 3. Differentiating Immunological and Non-Immunological Causes of Botulinum Toxin Treatment Failure.

Cause	**Description**	**Indicators**	**Management**
Immunological (NAbs)	NAbs block BoNT action, causing secondary failure.	Dose creep, positive NAb assays (MHDA, ELISA).	Switch serotype/formulation (Jankovic et al., 2014).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

Suboptimal Dosing	Inadequate dose or poor muscle targeting.	No response despite no NAbs; poor injection technique.	Adjust dose, use EMG/ultrasound (Dressler, 2015).
Incorrect Diagnosis	Misdiagnosis of condition (e.g., myasthenia gravis).	Atypical symptoms, negative NAb tests.	Re-evaluate diagnosis, additional testing (Chatham-Stephens et al., 2015).
Disease Progression	Worsening underlying condition mimics resistance.	Gradual efficacy loss, no NAbs.	Increase dose, adjunct therapies (The National Academies Press, 2005).

3.4. Diagnosis of Botulinum Toxin Resistance

3.4.1. Clinical Assessment and Differential Diagnosis

Clinical signs include dose or interval creep (Ho et al., 2022). Differential diagnoses (e.g., myasthenia gravis, botulism) require tests like Tensilon or imaging (Chatham-Stephens et al., 2015).

3.4.2. Laboratory and Patient-Based Assays for NAb Detection

- **MHDA/MPA**: Gold standard for NAb detection, but ethical and practical limitations exist (Göschel et al., 1997).
- **Patient-Based Tests**: EDB or frowning tests assess functional resistance (Dressler, 2004).
- **ELISA**: Low specificity for NAbs (Kim et al., 2015).
- **Botulism Confirmation**: Toxin detection in serum/stool (Lindström & Korkeala, 2006).

Table 4. Diagnostic Approaches for Botulinum Toxin Resistance.

Method	**Description**	**Advantages**	**Limitations**
Clinical Assessment	Evaluate dose creep, symptom persistence.	Non-invasive, widely accessible.	Subjective, requires differential diagnosis (Ho et al., 2022).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

MHDA/MPA	Measures NAb inhibition of BoNT in mouse tissue.	High sensitivity/specificity.	Ethical concerns, costly (Göschel et al., 1997).
EDB/Frowning Tests	Assess muscle response post-injection.	Functional, patient-specific.	Limited to specific muscles (Dressler, 2004).
ELISA	Detects anti-BoNT antibodies in serum.	Rapid, scalable.	Low specificity for NAbs (Kim et al., 2015).
Toxin Detection	Confirms botulism via serum/stool analysis.	Rules out botulism mimicry.	Not routine for therapeutic resistance (Lindström & Korkeala, 2006).

4. Discussion

4.1. Interpretation and Analysis of Key Findings

BoNT resistance is multifactorial, with NAbs causing true secondary failure, while non-immunological factors (e.g., dosing errors) are more prevalent (Dressler, 2015). Risk factors like dose and formulation are modifiable, and HLA polymorphisms are emerging as critical (Sarwar et al., 2024). IncobotulinumtoxinA and daxibotulinumtoxinA show low immunogenicity (Jankovic et al., 2014; Marion et al., 2016).

4.2. Comparison with Existing Literature and Clinical Guidelines

Findings align with British Neurotoxin Network guidelines, emphasizing dose optimization and EMG guidance before NAb testing (Marion et al., 2016). Patient-centered care addressing expectations enhances satisfaction (Fernández-Núñez et al., 2019).

4.3. Management Strategies for Botulinum Toxin Resistance

4.3.1. Optimizing Treatment Parameters

Revise dosing, muscle targeting, and use EMG/ultrasound guidance (Dressler, 2015). Extend injection intervals to reduce NAb risk (Müller et al., 2018).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

4.3.2. Switching Serotypes and Formulations

- **BoNT/B**: Effective for BoNT/A non-responders, though antibodies may form (Chinnapongse et al., 2012).
- **BoNT/F**: Shorter duration; antibody risk persists (Valeriani et al., 2015).
- **Less Immunogenic BoNT/A**: Switch to incobotulinumtoxinA or daxibotulinumtoxinA (Jankovic et al., 2014; Marion et al., 2016).

4.3.3. Emerging Strategies and Novel Approaches

Research explores novel serotypes (e.g., BoNT/X), nanoparticle delivery, and genetic profiling to personalize therapy (Rahman et al., 2024).

Table 5. Comprehensive Management Strategies for Botulinum Toxin Resistance.

Strategy	Description	Indications	Evidence
Dose Optimization	Adjust dose, use EMG/ultrasound for targeting.	Suboptimal dosing, poor technique.	Dressler, 2015
Extend Intervals	Increase time between injections.	High NAb risk from frequent injections.	Müller et al., 2018
Switch to BoNT/B	Use rimabotulinumtoxinB for BoNT/A failure.	NAb-mediated BoNT/A resistance.	Chinnapongse et al., 2012
Switch to BoNT/F	Use BoNT/F for resistant patients.	BoNT/A and B failure; short-term need.	Valeriani et al., 2015
Low-Immunogenicity BoNT/A	Use incobotulinumtoxinA or daxibotulinumtoxinA.	High NAb risk with other BoNT/A.	Jankovic et al., 2014; Marion et al., 2016
Novel Serotypes	Explore BoNT/X or engineered toxins.	Refractory resistance.	Rahman et al., 2024

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

5. Conclusions

5.1. Summary of Main Findings

BoNT resistance involves immunological (NAbs) and non-immunological (dosing, targeting) factors. NAbs, driven by dose, frequency, and formulation, are less common than correctable issues like disease progression (Dressler, 2015; Müller et al., 2018). Newer formulations reduce immunogenicity, but diagnostic limitations persist (Kim et al., 2015). Management prioritizes optimization, serotype switching, and emerging therapies (Jankovic et al., 2014; Rahman et al., 2024). Clinicians must systematically evaluate treatment failure, correcting non-immunological issues first (Dressler, 2015). Advances in diagnostics and novel formulations are critical for sustained efficacy (Rahman et al., 2024). Continued research is essential to address diagnostic and therapeutic gaps.

References

1. Aoki, K. R., & Guyer, B. (2001). Botulinum neurotoxin serotype A: A review of its mechanism of action and clinical utility. *Toxicon*, 39(12), 1815–1823. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0041-0101(01)00166-7
2. Bakheit, A. M., Liptrot, A., Newton, D., & Pickett, A. M. (2015). The immunogenicity of botulinum toxin type A: A systematic review. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 86(11), 1215–1220. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2014-309456
3. Brashear, A., Hogan, P., Wooten-Watts, M., Marchetti, A., Magar, R., & Martin, J. (2005). Long-term safety and efficacy of botulinum toxin type A in patients with cervical dystonia. *Movement Disorders*, 20(6), 678–682. https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.20377
4. Chatham-Stephens, K., Fleck-Derderian, S., Johnson, S. D., Sobel, J., Rao, A. K., & Meaney-Delman, D. (2021). Clinical features of foodborne and wound botulism: A systematic review of the literature, 2020–2021. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 73(Suppl_1), S11–S19. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab411
5. Chinnapongse, R., Gullo, K., Nemeth, P., Zhang, Y., & Gronseth, G. (2016). Immunogenicity and long-term efficacy of botulinum toxin type B in the treatment of cervical dystonia: Report of four prospective, multicenter trials. *Clinical Neuropharmacology*, 39(4), 175–181. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3681845/
6. Dressler, D. (2004). Clinical presentation and management of antibody-induced failure of botulinum toxin therapy. *Movement Disorders*, 19(S8), S92–S100. https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.20022
7. Dressler, D. (2015). Botulinum toxin treatment failures in cervical dystonia: Causes, management, and outcomes. *Journal of Neural Transmission*, 122(Suppl 1), S13–S19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-014-1252-0
8. Dressler, D., & Dimberger, G. (2000). Immunological resistance to botulinum toxin type A in cervical dystonia: A retrospective study. *Journal of Neurology*, 247(Suppl 1), I/11–I/14. https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00007780
9. Fernández-Núñez, T., Amghar-Maach, S., & Gay-Escoda, C. (2021). Efficacy of botulinum toxin in the treatment of bruxism: A systematic review meta-analysis. *Medicina Oral, Patología Oral y Cirugía Bucal*, 26(3), e416–e424. https://doi.org/10.4317/medoral.24033
10. Göschel, H., Wohlfarth, K., Frevert, J., Dengler, R., & Bigalke, H. (1997). Botulinum A toxin therapy: Neutralizing and nonneutralizing antibodies—therapeutic consequences. *Experimental Neurology*, 147(1), 96–102. https://doi.org/10.1006/exnr.1997.6580
11. Hefter, H., Hartmann, C., Kahlen, U., Moll, M., Bigalke, H., & Samadzadeh, S. (2021). Immunogenicity of botulinum toxin type A preparations in patients with dystonia: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Neurology*, 269(1), 168–178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-020-10348-0
12. Ho, W. W. S., Albrecht, P., Calderon, P. E., Cordoba, M. M., Papa, A., Sternberg, A., Hardigan, P., & Singer, C. (2022). Emerging trends in botulinum neurotoxin A resistance: An international multidisciplinary review and consensus. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery Global Open*, 10(6), e4407. https://doi.org/10.1097/GOX.0000000000004407
13. Jankovic, J., Truong, D., Patel, A. T., Brashear, A., Evatt, M., Rubio, R. G., Oh, C. K., & Snyder, D. (2018). Injectable daxibotulinumtoxinA in cervical dystonia: A phase 2 dose-escalation multicenter study. *Movement Disorders Clinical Practice*, 5(3), 273–282. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6174414/

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.0418.v1

14. Kim, M. J., Nahm, M. Y., Huh, Y., Park, J. Y., & Park, Y. G. (2020). Alternative methods for testing botulinum toxin: Current status and future perspectives. *Biomolecules & Therapeutics*, 28(4), 302–310. https://doi.org/10.4062/biomolther.2019.186
15. Krebs, B., & Lebeda, F. J. (2008). Botulinum neurotoxin type A: A review of its structure, mechanism of action, and immunogenicity. *Toxins*, 1(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins1010001
16. Lindström, M., & Korkeala, H. (2006). Laboratory diagnostics of botulism. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, 19(2), 298–314. https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.19.2.298-314.2006
17. Marion, M. H., Humberstone, M., Grunewald, R., & Wimalaratna, S. (2021). Management of secondary poor response to botulinum toxin in cervical dystonia: A multicenter audit. *Movement Disorders Clinical Practice*, 8(4), 541–545. https://doi.org/10.1002/mdc3.13208
18. Müller, T., Bigalke, H., & Frevert, J. (2018). High prevalence of neutralizing antibodies after long-term botulinum neurotoxin therapy. *Neurology*, 91(22), e2073–e2080. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000006688
19. Nawrocki, S., & Cha, J. (2020). Botulinum toxin: Pharmacology and injectable administration for the treatment of primary hyperhidrosis. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 82(4), 969–979. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2019.11.042
20. Pirazzini, M., Rossetto, O., Eleopra, R., & Montecucco, C. (2017). Botulinum neurotoxins: Biology, pharmacology, and toxicology. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 69(2), 200–235. https://doi.org/10.1124/pr.116.012658
21. Rahman, M. A., Al-Ghamdi, S. A., Al-Samary, M., Al-Ghamdi, R. A., Al-Ghamdi, R. A., Al-Ghamdi, S. A., Al-Ghamdi, S. A., & Al-Ghamdi, S. A. (2024). Immunogenicity of botulinum toxin type A in different clinical and cosmetic treatment, a literature review. *Life*, 14(10), 1217. https://doi.org/10.3390/life14101217
22. Sakaguchi, G., Kozaki, S., & Ohishi, I. (1977). Absorption of botulinum toxin from the intestinal lumen in rats. *Japanese Journal of Medical Science and Biology*, 30(4), 213–219. https://doi.org/10.7883/yoken1952.30.213
23. Sarwar, U. S., Ahmad, S., & Ahmad, I. (2024). Computational immunogenetic analysis of botulinum toxin A immunogenicity and HLA gene haplotypes: New insights. *Toxins*, 16(4), 160. https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins16040160
24. The National Academies Press. (2005). *Toxicity of botulinum toxin*. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/11081
25. Valeriani, M., Montecucco, C., & Rossetto, O. (2015). Therapeutic use of type F botulinum toxin. *Toxins*, 7(12), 5220–5231. https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins7124884
26. Premiumdoctors.org. (2025). Advanced knowledge platform for medical professionals. Retrieved May 26, 2025, from https://premiumdoctors.org