

Feedback on Version 2

- Overall a improvement in some areas compared to v1, with a better opening and funnel to the challenge
- The latter parts of the introduction could use some revision, where I think the last paragraph starting with “**Objective:**” could be woven into the second paragraph or how it is presented in v1
- The third paragraph in the introduction might actually be better suited as the opening in the Methods section, giving a natural flow from the end of the introduction where 4D-MRI is mentioned, to give a better context what 4D-MRIs are, and what they are used for in this study
- I liked how the data was presented, it is concise and credible with statistical parameters present.
- Some clarification into how, and why the locations for the measurements were chosen is missing
- The results are presented in a concise and credible manner. However, some revision might be needed for a simpler presentation. Especially in the first paragraph
- The conclusion is straight forward and feel concise and credible, and put into simple terms

Exercise 4.2: OCAR

Feels like a typical OCAR structure, and quite well put together. The opening connects well with the challenge, and already in the first paragraph the scope of the study is clear. It is clear, concise and also spark some curiosity.

The *Action* could however need some revision, as mentioned in the comments I think one of the paragraphs regarding 4D-MRI is better suited in the Methods section and that the last paragraph might be better in v1

The results is overall well presented, feels credible and concise. However, might need some revision to make some things more clear as seen in the notes

Exercise 5.2: Opening

The opening paragraph is very strong, as mentioned. Liked the analogy with a plumber, which helped with understanding

Exercise 6.2: Funnel

The funnel from opening to the challenge feels natural, and I feel that the first paragraph captures this quite well.