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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Sirs, please excuse me for answering too late but I was absent for a few days.

1. Formatting changes requested. I changed all points you requested, in particular I changed the figures to make them easier to understand.

2. Reviewer #1: The reason why there have been two or more scans in 19 patients was to get experience with the technique in the beginning and in patients with poor scan findings to have a follow up.

The score system is defined in Table 1.

The benefit of the technique for fibula grafts was poor. only one could be save. For eight fibula grafts there was no benefit in this report.

I agree that the images were too complicated to demonstrate the effect of the revision surgery. That is why I changed them.

What you see at 3 hours after injection of Tc-oxidronate is mainly vascularisation of the periosteal layer and intramedullary vessels. I think this is a very important point and I changed the figure legend.

Scintigraphy has the adequate resolution to show the vascularisation of grafts. I changed formatting as requested.

Reviewer #2 Because the patient 10 in Table 2 showed thrombosis to the skin pedicle but normal bone scans with an uncomplicated further clinical course (means false pos clinical oder combined monitoring case) there was no statistical sign that combined monitoring technique would have been superior to the scintigraphy alone. I corrected reference 18.