

Review of: Introducing Virtual Reality in Robot Assisted Minimally Invasive Surgery Team Training

Overall assessment

In general a decent paper with a nice and clear progression throughout the paper. The overall language used is clear and is well written and formally formulated, though with some inconsistencies. The overall goal is clear, but in a few places the line of thought or the argumentation could benefit from some revision or further elaboration.

A good investigation of an area of application of VR, make sure to emphasize the scientific contribution of the work.

General Comments

GC1: The comparisons between surgery styles presented seem to compare only between open surgery and RAMIS. Would it not be more interesting to compare between RAMIS and normal Minimal Invasive Surgery in the cases where it is applicable?

GC2: The switch from the introduction to methods seem somewhat abrupt, maybe it would help with a small clear outline in the end of the introduction of what the work strives to achieve and what the main contributions are.

GC3: The paper in general includes a reasonable amount of figures, which also supports the written text well.

GC4: Make sure to include units on axes, legends etc. in the figures.

GC5: In general the language is clear but occasionally sentences seem incomplete or it could be formulated in a more elegant way. Considering your general style you probably will spot this when you review your article again before hand-in.

Specific Comments

SC1: In regard to the statistics provided about deaths related to RAMIS it is a bit unclear whether the information in the table represents deaths or not and whether the 410 injury reports correspond to the 17.4% of deaths(that occur during operations). Also, what about people who die *after* the operation due to complications caused by the RAMIS?

SC2: In Figure 1 you have a nice caption to each of the subfigures, therefore the text in the subfigures seems redundant. Only put text in the figure if it is very important that it is there as opposed to in the caption.

SC3: In the beginning of the section context study you have a wall of text. Maybe try to break it for better readability.

SC4: Figure 3 is a great way to present the actions that are occurring simultaneously, however, the flow with the blue background is a bit difficult to read.

SC5: In the Section context study a point is made of the importance of and experienced user of RAMIS being present to answer questions. Where any considerations done in regard to how to incorporate that in a VR application (especially in respect to the training at non certified locations)

SC6: The SUS is a more less generally know scale. You can write that you calculate an average score for the participants and that u further more calculate the SUS score in the way that is specified by the developers of the SUS, but explaining it in detail and showing the formula seems a bit redundant. Also, usually the sus score is just provided as a number between 0 and 100, Is there a specific reason why you provide it as a percentage?

SC7: It should be clearer what information you gain from plotting the mean scores of the sus against the age (especially as your age span is so small).