Reviewer's report

Title: On the pathogenesis of penile venous leakage: role of the tunica albuginea

Version: Date: 2 14 February 2007

Reviewer: Richard Berger

Reviewer's report:

General

1. The authors imply that the abnormality in the tunica is the primary problem causing venous leakage. They need to show that the changes described are not the result of leakage and low intracorporal pressures or support why this could not be the case.

The answers to this point was added to the 3rd paragraph on page 6. QUOTING POPULAR OPINION IS NOT SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE. IF THE AUTHORS HAVE EVIDENCE THAT LACK OF USE OR NORMAL PENILE PRESSURES DURING ERECTION DOES NOT LEAD TO ATROPHY OF THE TA, THEY SHOULD QUOTE IT OR PRESENT IT. OTHERWISE, I WOULD JUST MENTION THAT THIS POSSIBILITY CAN NOT BE EXCLUDED.

2. The authors present few figures. These figures are not sufficient for a reviewer to judge the conclusions of the paper. All should be presented for review.

As seen in the Results’ section, we documented the results of the control subjects it by 2 illustrations and those of the patients by another 2 illustrations. When we tried to add another set of illustrations, we found that they are similar to what is presented and do not add much. I ACCEPT THIS.

3. The patients and controls are NOT matched for medical condition. How much sicker were patients? Could this affect results?

The answer to this questions was added to the 2nd paragraph of page 7. I ACCEPT RESPONSE.

4. The location of the biopsies was not stated. Were all from same location in patients and controls? Could this affect results? Does tunica have same histology in all locations?

The answer was added to the 3rd paragraph on page 4. The TA has the same histology except for the inferior aspect. I ACCEPT RESPONSE BUT WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF TA BIOPSY WAS TAKEN FROM EDGE OF OPENING IN FRACTURE.

5. What is authors evidence for subluxation and floppiness? What do they mean?

The evidence for subluxation and flabbiness of the TA was provided by the results of the histological examination of the TA, as had already been mentioned under Results in the 3rd paragraph on page 5. SUBLUXATION AND FLOPPINESS ARE NOT HISTOLOGIC TERMS BUT DESCRIPTIONS OF MOVEMENT AND COMPLIANCE. UNLESS THE AUTHORS HAVE SHOWN THAT THESE CHANGES OCCUR WITH THE HISTOLOGIC FINDINGS THAT THEY DESCRIBE, THEY SHOULD LIMIT THESE PHYSIOLOGIC CLAIMS TO SPECULATION.
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