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Author's response to reviews:

I am thankful for and appreciate the comments of the two reviewers and the editorial team. I have made modifications to the manuscript as recommended. My response to each reviewer and the editorial team is noted below:

Reviewer #1

1. Please explain in more details how sonourethrography was performed.
Author: more detail of how it was done has now been included in the case presentation section.

2. In the discussion section please report the diagnostic value of sonourethrography (sensitivity, specificity etc.) and whether it has been described before in penile fracture and also underline the main differences with retrograde urethrogram.
Author: These have now been addressed in the discussion section.

Reviewer #2

1. The case is interesting, however I believe the important issue should be if ultrasound can help detecting a possible urethral injury.
Author: This is indeed the important issue and a better focus to it has been made in the discussion section.

2. In the discussion section there should be a more detailed description of the signs that indicate an urethral injury and in which cases it's obligatory for a urethrography to be performed.
Author: This information has now been provided in the discussion section.

3. In the conclusion section there is a comparison between ultrasound and urethrography. Both are different examinations with different indications so they should not be compared. The point that should be stated is when an urethrography is necessary in case of a penile fracture.
Author: This correction has been accepted and modifications made in the
4. The manuscript contains some syntax errors that should be revised by an English-native speaker.
   Author: Effort has been made to correct syntax errors with the aid of an English native speaker.

5. The term urethrogram should be replaced by urethrography
   Author: The term urethrography is now used throughout the text.

The Editorial team

1. Please include the sex of the patient in the abstract
   Author: This has been included.

2. Please replace the header ?Background? with ?Introduction?
   Author: The correction has been made; Introduction has replaced Background.

3. Please replace the term ?man? with ?male? in both the abstract and Case presentation
   Author: This has been done.

4. Please remove any text from figures two and three which may reveal the patient’s identity (e.g. patient’s number, patient’s name, dates, etc)
   Author: Figure 2 and 3 has been edited. The remaining text on the figures refers only to the equipment used (sonogram) and not to the patient. None of the figures submitted reveals the identity of the patient.