Reviewer's report

Title: The functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) procedure as experienced by healthy participants and stroke patients

Version: 1 Date: 14 October 2008

Reviewer: Iris Eshed

Reviewer's report:

The study present results of a questionnaire presented to 70 healthy study participants and 20 post CVA patients all after undergoing fMRI.

The questionnaire contained 8 several questions regarding the subjects convenience and personal perception of their MRI experience.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The study question though mildly interesting is well presented within the introduction.

2. Methods:

a. What is the basic for building the questionnaire as it is?

• The first 2 questions regard the research setting and not the patients' perception of the MRI experience.

• The 3rd - 5th and the 8th question are the ones regarding the patient' MRI personal experience. More detailed questions could have been asked.

• The place of the 5th - 7th questions in the questionnaire is not clear. Why did the authors choose to include them and how they imply on the patients' perception is not explained not in the methods or in the discussion.

• How was the questionnaire presented? Did the patients" fill it themselves or was it posed and filled by the researchers?

b. Patients:

• The healthy cohorts' age is only approximate. The authors have no knowledge on all patients age and no statistical SD is given.

• The age range of the 20 patients is not given at all.

• No gender is described, while o course it has implication on the questionnaire analysis and the discussion.

• The authors mention in few words that some of the participating cohort have already undergone MRI before. This has of course implication on the questionnaire analysis and needs to be detailed.

c. MRI procedure:

• No time range and average total duration of the MRI procedure is given.
3. Results and discussion:
   a. The presentation of the results in this way is not clear. The results presentation is not concise. A summarizing table would have helped.
   b. Discussion is not satisfactory. The authors mainly discuss their assumptions on the results but do not relate to other works previously done on the subject. No validation of the authors' assumption is given based on previous work.
   c. The difference between the two groups is not discussed.
   d. Correlation between patients demographics (i.e. Age, gender) to the results is not discussed.
   e. Not all questions were answered. Why? The authors do not discuss that altogether and not correlate that to the acceptable response rate in the literature.
   f. The authors need to correlate between answers in one question to another. For example the questions that complain on a long procedure also perceived it as most disturbing, etc…
   g. I see no reason for putting the questions on the head moving in the questionnaire. But since they were done, the authors should regard and discuss it. For example: was there any correlation between the way the patients describe their head movement to the MRI images perceived? If not it could be all subjective feelings.

4. Conclusions:
   a. The conclusions has no sound basic from the discussion. They infer the patients felt comfortable though a high percentage descried uneasy sensations. They find no difference between the two groups though no comparison was performed and so forth.
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