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Exploration with 18F-FDG PET/CT of New Ways of Determination of Safe Surgical Margins for Soft Tissue Sarcoma Review

I’d like to thank the Authors and the Editorial Board for letting me read and evaluate the paper mentioned above.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

My main criticism is related to the relatively small number of patients. The small number of patients allowed an evaluation of as MFH in 6 cases and leiomyosarcoma in 1 case, therefore, in my personal opinion, the conclusion and the message given has to be restricted to the case presented. The discussion should be re-written considering and high-lighting this critical limitation. The title has to be changed accordingly. It goes without saying that adding new cases (the work stopped in 2009) is the best correction.

Given the experimental appearance of the work, M&M section should be more detailed. In the present form it is largely insufficient. Refer to Radiological literature to understand the level of accuracy and depth reached in the M&M section.

The paper is of interest. I suggest Major Revision before reconsidering the paper.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? No
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? No
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? In part
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No
9. Is the writing acceptable? In part

**Level of interest**: An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English**: Acceptable

**Statistical review**: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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