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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate the opportunity to re-review the paper “PET-CT in sub-arctic region of Norway 2010-2013. At the edge of what is possible?” by Norum et al.

I think the authors’ revisions have greatly enhanced the manuscript. The rebuttal letter clearly addresses issues and concerns raised in the primary review. I acknowledge and respect the authors wishes to abstain from including more clinical data and keep the focus on demographics. As such, I still find the subject and aim of the article of interest to a broader audience.

Minor Essential Revisions

Background, 2nd paragraph, penultimate sentence: The sentence “published a future need” is (still) a bit clumsy – it is not the future need which was published, but rather a report on or a statement regarding the future need. According to the rebuttal letter this sentence should have been rewritten, but it seems unchanged.

Methods, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence, last word: I suggest using “to” instead of “on”.

Methods (Data included), 2nd paragraph, last sentence + table 2 and table 3: Please use commas instead of punctuation marks for separation of thousands (e.g. 73,649 should read 73,649).

Discussion, 1st paragraph: “calculated 1,475” and “calculated 1504”. It seems a word is missing (“as”?)

Discussion, 8th paragraph: “lymphnode” should read “lymph node”

Discussion, 10th paragraph: “In example” should read “for example”

Discussion, 10th paragraph: Is the square brackets around the explanation of quantitative parameters intentional?

Discussion, 10th paragraph: The sentence beginning with “Kaplan-Meier…” the word “significant” should read “significantly”. Furthermore, I would suggest rewriting “having lesser” as “with lower values”

Discussion, penultimate paragraph: I think “access” should read “assess”?

Discussion, last paragraph: “in example” should read “for example”
Reference 5: “Holm Vilstrup M” should read “Vilstrup MH”
Reference 22: The authors are underlined.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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