

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7817

**Title:** Techniques and Accuracy of Thoracolumbar Pedicle Screw Placement

**Reviewer code:** 00501331

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-03 11:27

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-05 00:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a review concerning accuracy of pedicle screw placement in thoraco-lumbar spine surgery. Congrats to this well written and structured article, I recommend for publication. In my opinion only a remark towards transcutaneous pedicle screw placement and minimal invasive techniques is missing.

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7817

**Title:** Techniques and Accuracy of Thoracolumbar Pedicle Screw Placement

**Reviewer code:** 00467045

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-03 11:27

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-23 13:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a well-written review paper presenting a good overview of pedicle screw placement techniques including studies reporting accuracy rates using the different techniques. The paper will be of interest to readers of the WJO. I have only minor revisions and comments for the authors. 1) p 5, Paragraph 1: The 'C' in 'class III' and 'class II' should be capitalised. Also, elsewhere in the paper where a class or grade is used e.g. p 8 'Grade 0'. 2) p 6, Paragraph 1: Can the authors please change 'navigation' to stereotactic navigation.' 3) The authors state that in the Gertzbein scale (p 8) the breach distance grades are assigned in multiples of 2 mm. From where is this distance measured from? 4) Throughout the paper the authors of the manuscript have made reference to previous papers e.g. Youkilis et al. (p 8). It would be better to say 'Youkilis and colleagues' or something similar so it does not appear that both Harvard and Oxford referencing styles are being used in the paper. 5) p 11, Paragraph 3: Do the authors mean 'pedicle axis' where they say 'pedicle vector?' 6) p 12, last paragraph: The 65% and 95.1% do not match with the percentages in Table 3. The authors also state that the lowest accuracies were associated with the mid-thoracic spine; however, this is not clear from the data Table 3 e.g. the first two studies with the lowest accuracy involve the lower and mid-to-lower T-spine, but some of the other studies with high percentages include the mid T-spine. Is the year of any significance e.g. improved techniques in the free-hand method? 7) p 12, Paragraph 3: In the previous studies using the free-hand technique, was the experience of the surgeon reported? If so, it would be useful to include this information in Table 3. 8) p 13, Paragraph 2: For the radiation exposure in the free-hand technique, are the authors referring to the pre-surgical CT scans? 9) p 14, Paragraph 2: The word 'However' or similar would be better than the phrase 'In truth'. Also, the section 'In the most recent study, the study's authors...' is confusing. 10) p 23, last paragraph: On



## **Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

---

Line 5, please remove the comma after 'patient-by-patent basis'. 11) Figures 2 and 3: The labels are difficult to read; can the authors please re-annotate them to make them clearer and change the figure captions accordingly i.e. 'modified from...' Also, do the authors have copyright permission to use these figures?

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7817

**Title:** Techniques and Accuracy of Thoracolumbar Pedicle Screw Placement

**Reviewer code:** 00467030

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-03 11:27

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-28 10:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The is a well-written review paper, which would be valuable to be documented in the literature. The only comment is that it would need minor language editing before publication