

Review of: "What is it like to be Out-of-Body? Phenomenal accounts of experiencers"

Haijun Duan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors,

In this manuscript, by using a classical qualitative Content Analysis approach to investigate the Out-of-Body experiences of 13 participants, authors aimed to know more about the perceptual and mental phenomenological experience when OB. As the author mentioned in the article, previous out-of-body researches were limited to participants with their brains damaged or having only a single OBE. While this article obtained the first-person OBEs' accounts from those with multiple incidences of such experiences. By comparison, the topic of current study is more interesting and meaningful. Overall, the authors found that the OBEs reported positive feelings, a consciousness status characterized by a high level of self-awareness without self-boundaries, and the ability to perceive information with almost all modalities, living in a timeless dimension.

However, I would still like to put up some minor concerns.

(1) In introduction, the authors introduced the limitations of previous studies in detail. I hope the author can elaborate the significance of this research comparing with previous ones.

(2) The method and result part of the current study is too simple. The author analyzed the reports of 13 participants from nine aspects. In my opinion, the results of this analysis are insufficient, but like a brief summary of the reports of the 13 participants. It is suggested to find other methods to further analyze the data and supplement some further results.

(3) In the discussion part, the author did not discuss the research results in depth, but pay more attention to the previous experimental researches. It is suggested that the discussion part focus more on the results of current study and related supportive evidence.

(4) Limitations of the current study is omitted from the discussion part. I hope authors can summarize the limitations and make some future prospect.

The current study is rich in content and significant in both theory and practice. I suggest this manuscript be accepted for publication after major revision.