

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 65992

Title: Mixed reality for visualization of orthopedic surgical anatomy

Reviewer's code: 04105454

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-19 16:39

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-19 16:52

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is well written review article concise and to the point yet the conclusion is not optimum no need to redefine because the difference is clear and well known

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 65992

Title: Mixed reality for visualization of orthopedic surgical anatomy

Reviewer's code: 05919963

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRCPC, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-24 18:59

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-07 17:53

Review time: 13 Days and 22 Hours

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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you to the authors for the opportunity to review their editorial, "The role of mixed reality in visualization of orthopedic surgical anatomy." This paper is an editorial, and does not include any original findings. It provides a summary and some questions, but there is not a systematic approach and the depth of literature analysis or critique is superficial. The authors provide a reasonable summary of recent literature on use of either mixed reality, augmented reality, or virtual reality in assisting with surgical accuracy. They also provide good background to focus their discussion on trying to identify the difference between MR and AR. While the paper is well written, it is lacking depth to explain why the difference between MR and AR is important. More detailed discussion regarding the patient outcomes from use of MR/AR would be helpful. Also, instead of listing each of the studies one after another, it would help if the authors could consider grouping their discussion/editorial around what papers are most consistent with the proposed definition of MR, what papers are most consistent with definition of AR, and then provide more detail regarding why distinguishing the two are important. Are the outcomes different? Is there pedagogical or educational literature that suggests one is superior to the other? Overall a good topic and important for future planning in orthopedics.