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Reviewer's report:

This is a very interesting paper on the use of silver coated mega-prostheses in the treatment of periprosthetic infection, both hip and knee. Considering the small number of cases and the retrospective feature of the analyses I have some concern:

1) In the text the Authors denote that there were 2 drop-out cases but in the analyses of results they consider all the cases screened (20 for SCG and 14 for NSCG).

2) The tables 2 and 3 are reversed in the table legend;

3) Table 2 (or table 3 in the legend) is not clear: can the Authors better explain how many patients have bacterial associations and which type of association?

4) Considering the development of new antibiotic pre-operative prophylaxis during the years between 1994 and 2014 and the appearance of new bacterial resistance, can the Authors emphasize the use and the different types of antibiotics used as pre-operative prophylaxis and if there were changes in this approach during the 20 years of study?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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