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Cover letter

1) Reviewer's report

Title: Successful Replantation of An Amputated Penis: a case report and Literature review.

Version: 1 Date: 1 December 2013

Reviewer: Nikolaos Koliakos

Comments to authors:

This is an interesting report on a rare case of a partial penile amputation that was reimplantated not using a microsurgical technique.

Comment 1: It is quite interesting that the results of this report contradict the literature, where early micro-anastomosis of the supplying vessels is considered essential for obtaining good anatomical, functional and aesthetic results.

Functional results of the procedure should be reported for a longer period than 5 weeks. The notion that the corpus spongiosum plays a role in the blood supply of the penis should be further analyzed.

Response 1: Thank you for your comments pertinent, but I want to clarify that the interest of this case is to present our experience in the management of this partial section of the penis with satisfactory results obtained without the use of macrosurgical technique, which leads us to imagine the possible role of the the corpus spongiosum in the penis vascularisaton.
I also confirm that the patient is still followed in consultation and he keeps anatomical, functional and aesthetic outcome with a decline of 6 months.

Comment 2: Syntax errors of the manuscript should be corrected.

Response 2: all syntax errors will be treated and corrected.

2) Reviewer's report

Title: Successful Replantation of An Amputated Penis: a case report and literature review.

Version: 1 Date: 18 November 2013

Reviewer: Spyridon Kampantais

Comment 1: In my opinion, This case report is quite interesting and unusual. However, English language is not attractive and a professional editing is needed. Add paragraphs in discussion and add a more comprehensive description of the current literature.

Response 1: English language of the manuscript will be reviewed, and all syntax errors will be modified and corrected as requested.

Comment 2: In discussion I really did not understand "Analysis of our case revealed that the cleanly incised injury, with incomplete section of penis involving both corpora cavernosa and respecting the spongy body, with a short duration of cold ischemia was an important factor that influenced the outcome." Why "respecting the spongy body? The urethra was not injured?"
Response 2: the urethra was completely injured but the spongy body was incompletely injured. Which leads us to imagine the possible role of the corpus spongiosum in the penis vascularisation because of satisfactory results obtained with the use of macrosurgical technique.

3) Reviewer's report

Title: Successful Replantation of An Amputated Penis: a case report and literature review.

Version: 1 Date: 22 November 2013

Reviewer: Stavros Deirmentzoglou

Comment 1: What was the interval till his first intercourse?
Response 1: the interval till his first intercourse was five weeks.

Comment 2: An IIEF questionnaire (before and after) or a triplex of the penile vessels would be very interesting to prove the erection.
Response 2: the patient was illiterate, so we have limited to a simplified interrogation to prove a normal erection recovery.

Comment 3: I have prepared a PDF with my proposals on the text results.
Response 3: thank so much for your English support; all English corrections have been applied on the manuscript as requested.