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Reviewer’s report:

MINOR REVISIONS:

The characteristics of the diverse devices employed in this study can be determinant to the overall results. The PET only device is probably inferior to the PET/CT device. As 19 out of 24 patients were performed with PET only + CT devices don’t the authors think that the results can be improved with the current PET/CT devices (as it is partially suggested at the end of chapter 4??

With the results gathered in Table 2 it is advisable to use 68Ga DOTATOC/ATE in bone and subcutaneous tissue lesions only??

In this sense, I believe that authors, with this great experience must include a complete recommendation of a diagnostic algorhytm by including PET/CT.

On the other hand, the references section has a lot of mistakes. Please review all citations and provide them in journal style (normally Vancouver citation style)

The figures are all with old PET device. Could the authors provide a good example with a PET/CT device in order to show the image quality improvement of this study??
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