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Author's response to reviews:

To the Editorial team

Your e-mail received. Thank you for the precise analysis of the manuscript. Some revisions according to the comments of reviewers was performed and as you asked, detailed description of changes made and responses to comments of reviewers, is enclosed point by point:

¿ Response to comments of the first reviewer (Dr Siroos Mirzaei):

1. (Abstract: Line 4: should be stated: .....interpreted as suspected for bone metastasis). Thanks for the comment and the term was substituted in the text.

2. (Background: Line 1: "functioning" should be removed; Line 2: "can often be helpful" should be replaced by "is of great importance"; Line 4-5: "Certain areas like spinal..." should be removed. Changes were made.

3. (The references 3 and 4 are not applicable for this case report and should be removed. ). As per your request, these references were omitted.

4. (Some discussion regaring the often sources of contamination (urine, parainjection) should be noted.). A common source of contamination results from the intravenous injection of the radioisotope. Contamination may result from injection site dose infiltration, a leaking intravenous tube, or bleeding from the puncture site because of inadequate hemostasis. Also, Urinary contamination is a relatively common finding in WBS .Thanks; the above text and reference 3 were added.

¿ Response to the comments of the first reviewer ( Dr Timothy B Gilbert )

1. (Spell out Technetium, instead of Tc, in its first instance & in abstract.). Thanks, the change was made.

2. (Specifically define which individuals provided written informed consent, i.e.,
the technicians and/or the patients. Both the technicians and the patients.

3. (Review reference formatting for proper style. (e.g., AMA Handbook of Style, etc,...). OK, rechecked.
All authors read and approved the final manuscript. I shall be greatly obliged if you would kindly inform me of your proceedings.

Sincerely yours,

Majid Assadi