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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revision:

Results, second to last paragraph: replace sentence "During study period, the ratio (percentage of PET-CT scans/population) was 0.7 and 1.3 (Table 1) (p < 0.0001)." by the following:

"During study period, the ratio (percentage of PET-CT scans/population) was 0.7 and 1.3 (Table 2), and the number of patients with PET/CT exams during the four year period differed significantly between the three counties (p < 0.0001)."

because the numbers 0.7 and 1.3 refer to Table 2, whereas the indicated statistical difference refers to the respective Chi squared test on number of patients with PET/CT exams during the study period versus the 3 counties.

Discretionary revisions:

Table 2, title: replace 470.000 by 470,000
Table 3, title: replace 100.000 by 100,000

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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