Synopsis guidelines.

Synopses are meant to help you dissect the papers. You will get better at it and faster at it as the semester goes along.

Synopses should be **short** (At least one of us (instructors) will try to read and briefly comment on all of them the day before class. That could be as many as 3 synopses x number of students (~17) x Min per synopsis (10) ... this number can get very large very fast. (>8 hours!) Clearly, this is an exercise in overview, CLARITY, clean formatting, being succinct! Typically, the whole thing can be ¼ to 2/3 page per synopsis.

Outline format or an hybrid of outline and prose – with a sparing use of bullets - is probably the best way to organize and convey your thoughts, observations succinctly.

Please assemble all of your synopses in one WORD (or pdf) document. Name the document with ENAS880, the number of the class that they pertain to (see syllabus for session #) and your name. Otherwise, we will simply not be able to keep them all straight. (e.g., Morris_ENAS880_Week_2 – but substitute your name for Morris)

Lets try to cover the items below. (Keep in mind, not every synopsis has to have all these elements. We will optimize the synopsis format a bit as time goes on.) In general, please include

(Brief) Title/author

The main **goal** of the work.

The imaging **modality**(ies).

The **tracer** (if PET/SPECT)? Ignore for fMRI

The **drug** (if any);

The **signal** being measured (e.g., “BOLD” is the signal if conventional fMRI).

What **finding**?

  For PET: What was the **calculated endpoint**?

  For fMRI: What was calculated at the first level of analysis

How did they handle multiple comparisons?

What was the **experimental design** (this could be represented graphically - as a timeline with arrows and a bit of explanation for injections, interventions, sampling, breaks etc.)

What **assumptions** did they make?

Did they make any errors either in their design or interpretation? (e.g, was there an **order effect in the design**)?

Were there unintended biases in the design or analysis? (e.g., **were the healthy controls all OLDER than the alcoholics**)?

What questions do you have? What don’t you understand?

What is the next logical question they should ask or experiment they should do (pretend the paper just came out).