

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your positive review of our article.

Reviewer 2 and Science Editor

We appreciate your comments but are mostly surprised by the low English score. One of the authors of the manuscript, Dr. Bernaus-Johnson, is a native English speaker. Furthermore, we ran the article through one of the tools recommended by your journal (www.aje.com), and our paper scored above the 87th percentile of papers submitted to the American Journal Experts website. Their impression was that our paper was well written and did not need language editing. Even so, we have made a new revision which we hope will be more to your liking. We would be glad if you could please indicate any further specific language edits that need to be addressed.

On the other hand, we would also like to point out your comments on the article:

1. Although we agree with the reviewer on the theoretical usefulness of joint aspiration before the second stage of revision surgery (in patients with a cement spacer **in place**), our results agree with most of the literature presented on the low sensitivity of such a test and therefore we cannot recommend this procedure.
2. Regarding the rate of positive cultures during the second stage procedure (5 out of 41 patients), these results are similar to current literature. Moreover, this low rate of positivity is an indirect indicator of an accurate two-stage replacement surgical protocol.
3. Comparing the failure rate in culture-positive and culture-negative patients was not the aim of this study. It is, however, a very interesting idea for another paper, but as we mentioned, the aim of our study was

only to evaluate the usefulness of joint aspiration before the second stage of revision surgery.

Company Editor in Chief

We welcome your feedback on our article. The low rating in English surprised us as one of the authors is a native English speaker (Dr. Bernaus-Johnson). We used one of the tools recommended in the mentioned link (<https://www.wignet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>) and our paper scored above the 87th percentile of papers submitted to the American Journal Experts. They conclude that our paper is well written and no language editing is necessary. However, we have revised the language for a better understanding of the manuscript.

We have fixed the format problems with the images and the table.