

Review of: "Can we use a biomarker detection algorithm to measure the effectiveness of 14-channel neurofeedback in dyslexia?"

Cynthia Kerson

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Introduction para 8:

This data was should be these data were

& Setarehdan (2020) is incomplete

Data ~~was~~ were taken from the Atiyeh clinic center

They used 19 channels for EEG signals and sampled at 250 Hz. Is it 250 or 256?

Section 2.2:

Can the authors report on the reliability of the TILLS?

The authors mistakenly name EEG data as QEEG data. This should be corrected.

It appears training occurred in 1 or 2 sites, yet 14 were recorded and the authors claim they found improvement in connectivity within those 14 channels. I don't see the outcome from these data and they are very important.

The authors use ROC before spelling it out in section 2.6

Using the RF algorithm, what is the range of scores? These are all very high, but not if the range is 98-100, for example. (Forgive my naivety re RF)

The images were not enlarge-able, so it was hard to critique them.

Fig 13 shows results from sessions 21-100? Were 100 sessions completed at home in the mornings before school? And there was no attrition?