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Title: Knee arthrodesis versus above-the-knee amputation after septic failure of revision total knee arthroplasty: comparison of functional outcome and complication rates.

Aim of the Authors was to report their experience in the treatment of septic failure of total knee arthroplasty performing an accurate comparison between above-knee-amputation (AKA) and modular knee-arthrodesis (MKA). They analysed and compared specific complications, functional outcome and quality of life in 81 (MKA) and 32 (AKA) patients.

The topic is really interesting and actual, and the data reported by the Authors underlines their large experience for the treatment of this challenging infection. I believe that the paper is well executed, absolutely worthy of being published in your journal. The bibliography is complete and well cared for. I have not further objections or comments. I would recommend acceptance as is.

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