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Dear Editorial board,

Please accept my updated manuscript that addresses the comments from both reviewers. I have ensured that it complies to the format that is required for publication in BMC Urology. I have also attached a point-by-point response (below) to the reviewers comments to try and ease the process of re-review.

If there are any further comments or queries or indeed formatting points that need rectifying I would be more than happy to make the appropriate alterations. Many thanks for the forwarding the reviewers comments and allowing me the opportunity to alter the manuscript appropriately,

Kind Regards

Satish Maddineni
Reviewer 1:
Paul K Hegarty

- In response to the question regarding table 5: The IIEF control group is all patients in the study reporting on sexual function prior to macroscopic evidence or symptoms from penile cancer. The study group is all those reporting on sexual function 12 months post-op. The table has been modified to try and make this point a little clearer.

- With regards the correlation between outcome measures used in the studies: The manuscript has been modified to address this issue and also the allied issue of the sensitivity of any of these questionnaires in relation to penile cancer.

- Regarding the question of BPH patients being used as a control: This issue has been addressed in the manuscript and the manuscript has been modified as suggested by the reviewer to comment on the appropriateness/inappropriateness of this group as a comparative cohort.

Reviewer 2:
Luca Incrocci

- In response to the comments regarding the selection process: The reviewer makes a very valid point regarding the selection procedure effecting the conclusions that can be drawn. However, in this study there were very limited articles in the available literature that addressed the quality of life, sexual function or psychological well being of penile cancer sufferers. Therefore, all articles that addressed these features were included in the review. Some articles were excluded due to the factors stated in the manuscript i.e. non-english, case reports, editorial comments, reviews etc. Therefore the results section has been amended to try and rectify the reasons for exclusion of some articles from this review.

- The studies are named in the text and the numbering system has been removed as suggested by the reviewer.

- The grade of the studies (Oxford classification) has been added to the manuscript as suggested.