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Reviewer's report
Title:
Multiple metastasis of soft tissue visualized by 99mTc MDP scintigraphy: a case report.
Version: 3
Date: 4 July 2014
Reviewer: Vincenzo Tombolini
Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease
Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes
Is the case report authentic?: Yes
Is the case report ethical?: Yes
Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: No
Is this case worth reporting?: Yes
Is the case report persuasive?: Yes
Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes
Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes
Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes
Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes
Comments to authors: No comments.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests: 'I declare that I have no competing interests'

I think we do not have any response to provide to the first reviewer.
Thank you.
Reviewer's report
Title:
Multiple metastasis of soft tissue visualized by 99mTc MDP scintigraphy: a case report.
Version:
3
Date:
30 July 2014
Reviewer:
abdelhamid elgazzar

Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: None

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: No

I really do not know what to answer to this point, since I do not understand why the report is not authentic.

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

I see the point. Please refer to the last paragraph of the discussion.

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:
The manuscript is for an interesting finding that has been reported before. There is no evidence that what was seen in the soft tissue is heterotopic bone formation since it can be dystrophic bone formation which is more commonly associated with neoplastic tissue. The CT scan images did not support the presence of such condition as well as the bone scintigraphy which showed multiple foci of non-specific uptake. Additionally no pathologic confirmation differentiation heterotopic bone formation from dystrophic calcification. Some articles clarifying the difference and discussing the scintigraphic features of heterotopic bone formation and other types of soft tissue calcification and missing from the reference list and could have been useful. An example of such
Please, refer to the last paragraph in the discussion section in the manuscript, and thank you for the precious advices.
Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Declaration of competing interests: I have no conflicts of any kind in this regard and I declare I have no competing interests.