

Reviewer Name:	Rui M Torres
Review Date:	2022-12-02 09:22
Specific Comments To Authors:	General comments: The study aims to highlight the recent advances in managing PJIs following knee arthroplasty surgery and discuss in depth the two-stage revision method. The document reviewing the treatment of periprosthetic joint infection in the knee demonstrates a good level of expertise of the authors in this field as well as a good scientific level. The article is well written and easy to read. No spelling errors are found in the article and authors had into account the guidelines of the journal. For this reason, I understand that it is ready for publication, due to its interest and scientific quality. Therefore, I would like to congratulate the authors.
Scientific Quality:	Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality:	Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion:	Accept (General priority)
Answer:	Thank you for the comments

Reviewer Name:	Anonymous
Review Date:	2022-11-07 09:05
Specific Comments To Authors:	Dear authors, thank you for the effort in describing in details the two-stage revision process. PJI is an important topic and more research about the subject is needed. I have really liked the clear exposition of the problem and how you have divided the different steps, the only problem is that this study doesn't add any new data or finding to the current body of evidence on PJI's treatment.
Scientific Quality:	Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality:	Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion:

Accept (General priority)

Answer:

Thank you for the comments. The purpose of this manuscript was to highlight the recent advances in managing PJIs following knee arthroplasty surgery and discuss in depth the two-stage revision method. We have provided an example from our experience supporting the current practice of managing this challenging problem and we agree that the body of new data is evolving but with slow advances mainly in the diagnostic side of managing PJIs.