

	Global	NLF	ML
	N=70	N=63	N=56
Sex:			
Female	63 (90.0%)	57 (90.5%)	49 (87.5%)
Male	7 (10.0%)	6 (9.5%)	7 (12.5%)
Age (years)	50.13 (8.01)	49.38 (7.91)	52.04 (6.94)
Origin (White)	70 (100.0%)	63 (100.0%)	56 (100.0%)
Phototype:			
II	24 (34.3%)	22 (34.9%)	20 (35.7%)
III	35 (50.0%)	30 (47.6%)	26 (46.4%)
IV	11 (15.7%)	11 (17.5%)	10 (17.9%)
NLF= Nasolabia	al folds		
ML= Marionette	lines		

l			Number (%)	
	Endpoints	Global	NLF	ML
		N=70	N=63	N=56
	Primary endpoint	0= (0= (00))	,	,
	GAIS responder rate (investigator evaluation) at M3	67 (97.10%)	/	/
	Secondary endpoints			
	GAIS responder rate (investigator evalu		04 (400 000()	50 (00 450()
	At M1 (before touch-up)	/	61 (100.00%)	53 (98.15%)
	At M3	/	62 (100.00%)	(/
	At M6	/	58 (98.31%)	` ,
	At M9	/	60 (98.36%)	49 (90.74%)
	GAIS responder rate (subjects' evaluation	on):		
	At M1 (before touch-up)		56 (91.80%)	50 (94.34%)
	At M3		59 (95.16%)	52 (94.55%)
	At M6		59 (98.33%)	52 (96.30%)
	At M9		58 (95.08%)	50 (94.34%)
	Proportion of subject with at least 1 WS	RS grade of improv	ement from baselin	ne (investigator
	live evaluation): At M1 (before touch-up)	/	27 (44%)	/
	At M3	,	33 (53%)	,
	At M6	/	31 (53%)	/
	At M9	,	31 (51%)	,
	Dran artists of subject with at least 4 WCC)C d :		(blind avaluation
	Proportion of subject with at least 1 WSR on photographs):	so grade of improve	ement from baseline	(biind evaluation
	At M1 (before touch-up)	/	20 (32.8%)	/
	At M3	,	22 (35.5%)	,
itcome	At M6	,	16 (28.1%)	,
asures:	At M9	,	15 (24.6%)	/
	Proportion of subject with at least 1 MLG	S grade of improve	ement from baseline	(investigator live
	evaluation):	- g		(g
	At M1 (before touch-up)	/	/	29 (54%)
	At M3	/	/	31 (56%)
	At M6	/	/	29 (54%)
	At M9	/	/	27 (51%)
	Proportion of subject with at least 1 MLG	S grade of improve	ement from baseline	(blind evaluation
	on photographs): At M1 (before touch-up)	/	/	5 (9.3%)
	At M3	,		7 (12.7%)
	At M6	,	,	2 (3.7%)
	At M9	,	,	2 (3.7%)
	NLF= Nasolabial folds		•	(*** **/
	ML= Marionette lines			

	Number (%)			
	NLF ML			
Endpoints	N=	-63	N:	=56
	Left side	Right side	Left side	Right side
GAIS scores (investigator evalua	ition)			
At M1 (before touch-up)				
Very much improved	24 (39.34%)	22 (36.07%)	19 (35.19%)	18 (33.33%)
Much improved	20 (32.79%)	25 (40.98%)	17 (31.48%)	14 (25.93%)
Improved	17 (27.87%)	14 (22.95%)	17 (31.48%)	21 (38.89%)
No change	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.85%)	1 (1.85%)
Worse	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
At M3				
Very much improved	35 (56.45%)	33 (53.23%)	29 (52.73%)	26 (47.27%)
Much improved	21 (33.87%)	23 (37.10%)	14 (25.45%)	15 (27.27%)
Improved	6 (9.68%)	6 (9.68%)	10 (18.18%)	13 (23.64%)
No change	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.64%)	1 (1.82%)
Worse	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
At M6				
Very much improved	25 (42.37%)	30 (50.85%)	20 (37.04%)	19 (35.19%)
Much improved	22 (37.29%)	20 (33.90%)	13 (24.07%)	14 (25.93%)
Improved	12 (20.34%)	8 (13.56%)	18 (33.33%)	20 (37.04%)
No change	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.69%)	3 (5.56%)	1 (1.85%)
Worse	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
At M9	, ,	,	, ,	,
Very much improved	25 (40.98%)	28 (45.90%)	18 (33.33%)	22 (40.74%)
Much improved	18 (29.51%)	19 (31.15%)	12 (22.22%)	11 (20.37%)
Improved	17 (27.87%)	13 (21.31%)	19 (35.19%)	18 (33.33%)
No change	1 (1.64%)	1 (1.64%)	4 (7.41%)	3 (5.56%)
Worse	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.85%)	0 (0.00%)
110.00	0 (0.0070)	(0.0070)	. (1.0070)	0 (0.0070)
GAIS scores (subjects' evaluatio	n):	1	1	
At M1 (before touch-up)		ĺ		
Very much improved	25 (40.98%)	30 (49.18%)	20 (37.04%)	22 (41.51%)
Much improved	18 (29.51%)	16 (26.23%)	24 (44.44%)	23 (43.40%)
Improved	14 (22.95%)	13 (21.31%)	7 (12.96%)	7 (13.21%)
No change	3 (4.92%)	2 (3.28%)	2 (3.70%)	1 (1.89%)
Worse	1 (1.64%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.85%)	0 (0.00%)
At M3	1 (1.0170)	0 (0.0070)	1 (1.0070)	0 (0.0070)
Very much improved	28 (45.16%)	31 (50.00%)	18 (32.73%)	25 (45.45%)
Much improved	20 (32.26%)	18 (29.03%)	21 (38.18%)	20 (36.36%)
Improved	11 (17.74%)	11 (17.74%)	14 (25.45%)	8 (14.55%)
No change	3 (4.84%)	2 (3.23%)	2 (3.64%)	2 (3.64%)
Worse			2 (3.64%) 0 (0.00%)	2 (3.64%) 0 (0.00%)
At M6	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
	29 (46 670/)	22 (52 220/)	17 (21 400/\	22 (40 740/)
Very much improved	28 (46.67%)	32 (53.33%)	17 (31.48%)	22 (40.74%)
Much improved	24 (40.00%)	23 (38.33%)	25 (46.30%)	23 (42.59%)
Improved	7 (11.67%)	4 (6.67%)	10 (18.52%)	7 (12.96%)
No change	1 (1.67%)	1 (1.67%)	2 (3.70%)	2 (3.70%)
Worse	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
At M9	00 (00 700)	00 (47 5 :::)	45 (07 700)	00 (44 = 121)
Very much improved	20 (32.79%)	29 (47.54%)	15 (27.78%)	22 (41.51%)
Much improved	28 (45.90%)	24 (39.34%)	20 (37.04%)	19 (35.85%)
Improved	10 (16.39%)	6 (9.84%)	15 (27.78%)	12 (22.64%)
No change	3 (4.92%)	2 (3.28%)	4 (7.41%)	0 (0.00%)
Worse	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
NLF= Nasolabial folds				

Adverse		Number (%)
events		Global
	Summary of reported AEs	N=70
	Proportion of subjects:	
	with at least one ADE	20 (29%)
	with at least one AE	44 (63%)
	with at least one SADE	0 (0%)
	with at least one SAE	0 (0%)
	System Organ Class (SOC) :	
	Eye disorders	1 (1%)
	Gastrointestinal disorders	2 (3%)
	General disorders and administration site conditions	23 (33%)
	Immune system disorders	1 (1%)
	Infections and infestations	17 (24%)
	Injury, poisoning and procedural complications	2 (3%)
	Musculoskeletal and connective tissue disorders	4 (6%)
	Nervous system disorders	15 (21%)
	Reproductive system and breast disorders	2 (3%)
	Respiratory, thoracic and mediastinal disorders	2 (3%)