

POINT-BY-POINT ANSWER

We first of all like to thank the Editors and the Reviewers for the great opportunity to revise the article, giving us the opportunity to ameliorate its overall scientific quality. We newly checked for the English quality: the entire article was revised by a native speaker working in our University. Moreover, the text has been revised using the Grammarly System, showing a good quality in the use of unique words (29%), rare words (41%), word length (5.5), and sentence length (18.7). We here report a point-by-point answer to all the concerns moved by the Reviewers.

Reviewer #1

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Lai et al performed a meta-analysis regarding the effect of donor and recipient gender match on the graft survival. I have some comments.

1. Metanalysis in the title is meta-analysis?

Response: We agree with the Reviewer: we modified the title accordingly.

2. Please describe the limitations of the present study in the discussion section.

Response: we added a part at the end of the Discussion reporting the shortcomings of the present analysis.

Reviewer #2

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

what are the limitations of this review like sample size follow up of data reviewed ...etc

Response: in accordance with the comments of both the Reviewers, we added a part at the end of the Discussion reporting the shortcomings of the present analysis.