



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com <http://www.wjgnet.com>

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8642

Title: Recent developments in optimal experimental designs for functional MRI

Reviewer code: 02673096

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-12-31 21:33

Date reviewed: 2014-01-20 13:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input 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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good review to survey experimental designs for functional magnetic resonance imaging experiments.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8642

Title: Recent developments in optimal experimental designs for functional MRI

Reviewer code: 01569646

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-12-31 21:33

Date reviewed: 2014-01-23 04:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is quite a technical review. Unfortunately I did not see the practical application of separating the estimation of the HRF function from detection of brain activations, and I could not see how estimation of the HRF helps to make inferences about duration of brain activation. Quotation from the paper are below to emphasize my point. "In the fMRI literature, dual models are commonly considered for two popular study objectives, namely the detection of brain activations (or detection) and the estimation of the HRF (or estimation)." I am not aware of any studies that endeavour to estimate the HRF function without also attempting to detection brain activations. Estimation of the HRF function is carried out to attempt to detect brain activations without being restricted by assumptions about the shape of the HRF. HRF estimation and detection do not seem to be two separable objectives. In other words, detection involves detection of brain activations when the HRF shape is assumed, and estimation involves detection of brain activation when the HRF shape is not assumed. That is, Equation 1 should be considered a special case of Equation 2, where the shape of the HDR is assumed in Equation 1 only. "The estimation of the HRF helps to make inference about some characteristics of the underlying neuronal activity such as the response time to each brief stimulus or the duration of brain activation[14]." Since neuronal activity takes place on the scale of 50 or 100 ms events, and the HRF takes place on the scale of 5-10 seconds, it seems very unlikely that the HRF can be used to make inferences about duration of brain activation. "Here, T_ISI is the pre-specified inter-stimulus interval (e.g., 4 seconds) that is greater than the presentation duration of each stimulus." Why must the ISI be greater than the presentation duration of the stimulus? This is not always the case. Some designs use a combination of short and long ISIs (see Serences Neuroimage



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com <http://www.wjgnet.com>

2004;21:1690-1700). "The i th element of d corresponds to time $(i - 1)T_{ISI}$, and time 0 may be synchronized to the first valid MRI scan." Why does an element of d , which represents a stimulus, correspond to the time of an ISI? Say ISI is 4 seconds. The 12th element of d corresponds to time $(12-1)*4 = 44$. This is not clear an example is needed.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8642

Title: Recent developments in optimal experimental designs for functional MRI

Reviewer code: 02158063

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-12-31 21:33

Date reviewed: 2014-03-06 14:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input 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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review article introduces recent experimental designs for fMRI and the authors proposes a new optimal design based on their previous work. The article is well written and I think it is suited to the readership of the journal.