

Response to Editors:

- Many thanks for your valuable time in critically appraising our work and constructively commenting in improving the current manuscript.
- Apart from responding to the peer reviewers and undergoing editing of the text content, we have added the “Article Highlights” section to the manuscript as you required.
- Next, we also included the section for author contributions and have made the required corrections to the formatting of the tables and figures.
- We have separately attached all of the required files as requested. We have also made improvements in the English writing across the manuscript.
- The references were completed according to the journal’s requirements.

Response to Reviewer:

- **Line 33: Please add the word "Scapholunate" for SLAC**

Line 66: “...secondary to advanced scapholunate collapse (SLAC)...”

- **Line 199: Please change whereas to where**

Line 71: “...4CF seems to show longer survivorship, where PRC seems to provide better wrist motion...”

- **Line 207: please improve the flow of sentence here as it is very confusing to the reader. Maybe mention as " A systematic review of long term outcomes of PRC studies.....**

Line 235: “...A systematic review of long term outcomes of PRC studies, reported on a reoperation rate of 14.3%...”

- **Line 219: What exactly the authors mean by controversial findings?**

Lines 245-246: “...A further subject that was recently explored is the cost-effectiveness of PRC, where findings yield either superior [29, 30] or similar results[31] when compared to 4CF...”

- **Line 230: Can the authors be specific about what type of studies are they referring to here? Can the authors also state some limitations of their study?**

Lines 255-259: “...The current systematic review is a substantial contribution to the understanding and knowledge of 4CF longterm outcomes, as well as an analytical exploration of the limitations of studies (sources of heterogeneity and bias), that provide recommendations for future work...”

- **Line 221: Please revise the sentence here. The word "whereas" doesn't feel appropriate and is confusing.**

Lines 246-248: “...Revision rates, especially during early follow-up, are higher in 4CF among some reports,[21] highlighting impingement of hardware and nonunion as main reasons of revision...”