

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31414

**Title:** Augmented reality: The use of the PicoLinker smart glasses improves wire insertion under fluoroscopy

**Reviewer's code:** 02444729

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-18 15:27

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-06 13:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input 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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Wearable smart glasses are a kind of computer that displays information on a head-mounted display. The authors of this study demonstrated the feasibility of wearable smart glasses in guide wire insertion under fluoroscopy. Under fluoroscopy 3mm guide wires were inserted into Sawbones of femur from the lateral cortex to the femoral head center with and without the wearable glasses where the fluoroscopic images were displayed (10 guide wires each). And the authors concluded that the wearable glasses can improve accuracy and reduce exposure time. This should be due to the fact that the wearable glasses enable surgeon to keep their eyes on the operation field. The authors have tested the insertion of k-wire in saw bones with/without glasses and found a superiority with the glasses. I think it is an interesting and useful instrument for orthopedic surgeons performing trauma surgery and spine MIS surgery. Simple and clear paper.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31414

**Title:** Augmented reality: The use of the PicoLinker smart glasses improves wire insertion under fluoroscopy

**Reviewer's code:** 02444715

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-18 15:27

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-06 23:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

a very interesting paper , need some language improvement , but it is dealing with a future important topic : The use of wearable smart glasses improves wire insertion under fluoroscopy That would be very interesting to many young surgeons

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31414

**Title:** Augmented reality: The use of the PicoLinker smart glasses improves wire insertion under fluoroscopy

**Reviewer's code:** 02444730

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-18 15:27

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-08 01:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study testing a devise "coming from the future". Although it seems to be a "simple paper" I believe it is a useful study. COMMENTS INTRODUCTION. I believe that the authors should add a paragraph including any existing literature [like Chimenti et al. (7)] concerning the use of these devises in orthopaedics.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31414

**Title:** Augmented reality: The use of the PicoLinker smart glasses improves wire insertion under fluoroscopy

**Reviewer's code:** 03068313

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-18 15:27

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-11 08:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

**SUMMARY** The objective of the review was to evaluate the interest of two models of smart glasses as a tool to facilitate / improve wire insertion under fluoroscopy. **GENERAL COMMENTS** Please, use and line(s) number to facilitate referencing. Interesting study, that give objective values to quantify the effect of mixed reality glasses. **SPECIFIC COMMENTS** ? Introduction In title and over the text: could you replace "wearable smart glasses" by mixed reality (MR) glasses. I think this is very important to be specific. Moreover, could you add 2 or 3 sentences to quickly explain the differences between Virtual Reality (VR) vs MR. ? Method According to me, the section "Method" requires important modifications by the authors to be accepted: I've quite important concerns about the method, and more specifically regarding statistics presented in this paper. - Generally speaking, I don't think that you can use statistic significance to conclude because: o Of what I understood, only one operator performed the study; is it correct? If yes, only one operator doesn't accurately demonstrate that results can be extended to any future user. o Did you use/perform any stat method to determine the sample numbers? I am not sure that 10 are enough... - WHAT stat method



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

did you used and WHY? ANOVA? T-tests? Parametric or non parametric? Etc. - At least should you present all limitations, related to both: if not in the section method, then it should be specifically and clearly added in the final discussion. ? Discussion I would move the reasons why you chose PicoLinker rather than Google Glass from the discussion section where it is currently, to the introduction or to the method: according to me it will help the reader to understand why and what you decided to compare what you did. According to me, the fact that PicoLinker is currently available only in Japan decreases the “weight” of your publication. My recommendation would be to determine and add which glasses of similar performance are easily available over the world. Thank you for your paper!