

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Biological Chemistry

Manuscript NO: 66556

Title: Remission was not maintained over 2-years with Hematopoietic Stem Cell

Transplantation for Rheumatoid Arthritis : Systematic Review with Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 05920149

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-30 12:32

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-05 07:17

Review time: 5 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No



### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, concerns and prospects of HSCT in the treatment of RA were put forward. Meanwhile, the pathogenesis of RA, advantages and disadvantages of HSCT in the treatment of RA and the mechanism of recurrence after transplantation were discussed comprehensively. However, several points need further justification. There are given below: 1. It is worth noting that the rationality of HSCT in the treatment of RA lies in the pathogenesis of RA autoimmunity and its therapeutic response to immunosuppressant. However, for the reconstruction of cellular immunity, it takes 1 to 2 years for T lymphocytes to return to normal. During this period, it is more convincing to pay attention to whether the remission of clinical symptoms of patients is effective or not, and to list the comparison with patients using traditional treatment methods. 2. For the outcome evaluation, i suggest that definite the main outcome and secondary outcome. 3. The source of heterogeneity and stability of the pooled results are suggested to be explored by meta-regression. 4. For the methodological quality and risk of bias assessment, i recommend the Cochrane Collaboration's tool for visualization. 5. In the second paragraph of Functional Outcome, figure 4 should be changed to figure 3. In the third paragraph of Functional Outcome, figure 5 should be changed to figure 4.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Biological Chemistry

Manuscript NO: 66556

Title: Remission was not maintained over 2-years with Hematopoietic Stem Cell

Transplantation for Rheumatoid Arthritis : Systematic Review with Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 05402972

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-06 00:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-06 13:45

**Review time:** 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [Y] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ Y] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Meta-analysis of RA is valuable and helpful for the treatment and prognosis of RA.However, the number of analytical documents included in this paper was few, which was not convinced for the treatment results of HSC. At the same time, the Introduction of the paper was not fully explained of RA, and the effect of existing treatment methods is not mentioned. There were few indicators selected in the results and analysis. And it has little reference value for the clinical treatment of RA.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Biological Chemistry

Manuscript NO: 66556

Title: Remission was not maintained over 2-years with Hematopoietic Stem Cell

Transplantation for Rheumatoid Arthritis : Systematic Review with Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02922422

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-31 23:35

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-08 01:22

**Review time:** 7 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for opportunity for reviewing this paper "Remission was not maintained over 2 years with Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation for Rheumatoid Arthritis: A Meta-analysis from Systematic Review of Literature". The study designs and methods used are basically appropriate, and the interpretations of the results are reasonable. However, some issues should be explained more. 1.Please simplify the contents and figures. 2. Who are the independent investigators? 3. What are your primary and secondary outcomes? 4.It will be better to show kappa for the selection and data extraction. Please show the data of kappa of agreement during the systematic searches. How disagreements were solved during the systematic search among two independent reviewers? 5. Authors should discuss the heterogeneity. 6. Please make the data for this study publicly available, possibly through the Open Science Framework (osf.io). Items to include: list of excluded studies, commands for statistical analysis, spreadsheets or data used for the meta-analyses, etc. Making data publicly available will promote the reproducibility of the review and is best practices for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. 7.Please give readers details about how to apply the findings of this study into clinical practices. Totally, I would like to congratulate the authors for the enthusiasm invested in this study. However, the manuscript does not reach the level of quality required for publication as original article without major revision in World Journal of Stem Cells.



# **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

Name of journal: World Journal of Biological Chemistry

Manuscript NO: 66556

**Title:** Remission was not maintained over 2-years with Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation for Rheumatoid Arthritis : Systematic Review with Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 05402972

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-30

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-01 01:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-01 01:50

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



With the rising resistance to the traditional disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs and targeted biological therapy, the authors have done this systematic review of literature and meta-analysis to evaluate the role of hematopoietic stem cell therapy in the management spectrum of rheumatoid arthritis and found that the literature on the effectiveness of the intervention is encouraging with significant improvement till 2-years post therapy. And they have explored into the ambiguity in the current treatment methods in hematopoietic stem cell therapy that needs further exploration with large clinical trials with longer follow-up are to be conducted to optimize the results out of this treatment modality. The paper will be of interest to the readership of the journal.



### **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

Name of journal: World Journal of Biological Chemistry Manuscript NO: 66556 Title: Remission was not maintained over 2-years with Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation for Rheumatoid Arthritis : Systematic Review with Meta-analysis Reviewer's code: 02922422 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD Professional title: Associate Professor, Director Reviewer's Country/Territory: China Author's Country/Territory: India Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-30 Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-02 00:32 Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-13 02:38 Pariary times 11 Days and 2 Hours

**Review time:** 11 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



I am pleased to accept the revised version.