Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

September 30, 2013

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (manuscript number: 5367. Manuscript name: 5367 – edited.doc).

Title: Dynamic 18F-Fluorodeoxyglucose PET/CT in hibernoma: enhanced tracer uptake mimicking liposarcoma

Authors: Christos Sachpekidis, Safwan Roumia, Matthias Schwarzbach, Antonia Dimitrakopoulou-Strauss

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5367

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

Reviewer 00227564

1. 'only minor typographic mistakes at the case study page 4. Change figures 3,4 at ", which is related to cell viability (Figures 3,4) (3). " to Figure 3,4. Also at "0.269 respectively (FIgurs 3,4). " correct it to figure 3,4'.

Corrected as indicated by the reviewer.

Reviewer 00227360

1. 'This is an interesting case report for Hibernomas with detailed study of dPET/CT.

Please add a short legend for each figure.'

Figure legends added as indicated by the reviewer.

Reviewer 00289422

1. 'The figure 2 is missing (image of the left upper arm). It seems that what is named as fig. 2 is in fact the figure one'.

Corrected as indicated by the reviewer.

2. 'It should be clarified why these patients needed the PET examination. What was the indication? Would the results change the therapeutic decision or the surgical procedure?'

Indication for PET/CT scanning provided in page 4 (in red letters): *'The main indication for the referral of the patients for PET/CT was the metabolic/functional characterization of these masses, so that further information regarding their dignity would be derived. Moreover, whole body evaluation for potential metastases before treatment was another indication for the PET/CT scan.'*

3. 'How the biopsy was performed? Was it CT guided?'

The biopsy was CT-guided (added on page 5 – red letters).

4. 'What are the main differences between lipomas, hibernomas and liposarcomas (concerning histopathology and imaging)?'

The main differences (histopathologic and imaging) between hibernomas, lipomas and liposarcomas are presented in page 6 (in red letters: *'Lipomas, the most common… and pleomorphic liposarcomas (high grade)* [9].') and in page 7 (in red letters: '*Lipomas appear on CT*

identical to… in inhomogeneous attenuation (CT) and signal intensity (MRI) [11]).

5. 'In the discussion part all the possible pitfalls of the FDG-PET in the lipomatous tumors should be discussed (false positives, false negatives) and emphasized.'

This question is interesting, however it cannot be covered within this case report. This topic is discussed in more detailed in another paper of our group (please see reference 5).

6. 'Could other metabolites or radiotracers (not glucose) be more specific in lipomatous tumors?'

Information regarding other radiotracers presented on page 8 (in red letters: *Except* ^{18}*F-FDG, other PET radiotracers have… however the results were not tumor-specific* [20].).

7. 'It would be better if the authors could provide the MR images of the patients.'

Unfortunately, it was not possible to get the corresponding external MRI for the patient with the

retroperitoneal hibernoma.

Editor

We changed the title, added a running title and a core tip, and corrected the references according to your instructions. All the text changes that the reviewers asked are written in red letters. We added the PMIDs for the references as well as the DOIs (where available). One reference is not indexed by PubMed (reference 4) thus we send you attached the first page of the full reference (under the file name reference 4) together with the format for answering reviewers.

Thank you again for the possibility to publish our manuscript in the *World Journal of Radiology*.

Sincerely yours,

Christos Sachpekidis, MD
Medical PET Group-Biological Imaging,
Clinical Cooperation Unit Nuclear Medicine,
German Cancer Research Center,
Heidelberg, 69115 Germany
E-mail: christos_saxpe@yahoo.gr