

Dear Editor,

We thank the reviewers and editorial team for taking their efforts to improve the article to increase its value for publication. Herewith we submit the revised version of the article addressing the reviewer's comments and the action taken for their valuable suggestions have been mentioned below.

<b>Reviewer 1 Comments</b>	<b>Authors Reply</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
1. "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.	Thanks for the comment. Since this is a retrospective study, we did not have control over the number of subjects involved in the study. We included all cases that met the eligibility criteria.	None
2. Please simplify the contents and figures.	Thank you for the insightful comment. We initially planned to analyse the factors determining the outcome of scaphoid fracture fixation. Since it is a retrospective study, we did not take into account the number of cases that could be possibly involved in the study in first hand and hence resorted to logistic regression but later from the comments of the reviewer and editors with consultation with a statistical expert we have re-run the analysis and performed only correlation analysis due to the paucity of samples included in the analysis.	Abstract – Methods & Results  Main text -Methods & Results
3. Who are the independent investigators?	Thanks for the comment. The primary functional outcome parameter is explicitly mentioned as MMWS in the revised abstract and	Abstract - Methods Main text -Methods

	main text.	
4. What are your primary and secondary outcomes?	Thanks for the comment. We totally agree with the comment and hence we have re-run the analysis appropriately.	Abstract - Methods Main text -Methods
5. 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?	Thanks for the comment. The title of the table has been revised as suggested to convey the intended meaning clearly.	Table II
6. Authors should discuss the heterogeneity.	Tables removed	Tables removed
7. 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.	Thank you for the insightful comment. We initially planned to analyse the factors determining the outcome of scaphoid fracture fixation. Since it is a retrospective study, we did not take into account the number of cases that could be possibly involved in the study in first hand and hence resorted to logistic regression but later from the comments of the reviewer and editors with consultation with a statistical expert we have re-run the analysis and performed only correlation analysis due to the paucity of samples included in the analysis.	Abstract – Methods & Results  Main text -Methods & Results
8. Please give readers details about how to apply the findings of this study into clinical practices.		
<b>Reviewer 2 Comments</b>	<b>Authors Reply</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
1. 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.		
2. 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.		
3. There were few indicators selected in the results and analysis. And it has little reference value for the clinical treatment of RA.		
<b>Reviewer 3 Comments</b>	<b>Authors Reply</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
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.		
<b>Editor Comments</b>	<b>Authors Reply</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
1. The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words	Thank you for the insightful comment. We initially planned to analyse the factors determining the outcome of scaphoid fracture fixation. Since it is a retrospective study, we did not take into account the number of cases that could be possibly involved in the study in first hand and hence resorted to logistic regression but later from the comments of the reviewer and editors with consultation with a statistical expert we have re-run the analysis and performed only correlation analysis due to the paucity of samples included in the analysis.	Abstract – Methods & Results  Main text -Methods & Results
2. The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions		
3. The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor		
4. The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text		