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Reviewer's report:

Dr. Demirbas and colleagues submit a retrospective report on 57 patient patients with testicular torsion in attempt to demonstrate the reliability of manual detorsion. There were 3 cohorts: 1. successful manual detorsion alone (n=20), 2. failed detorsion and emergent orchiopexy (n=28). The authors state that manual detorsion was successful in 76% of cases.

The goal of the study is laudable, as a non-surgical technique for testicular torsion could theoretically increase the testicular salvage rate; however, I have major concerns regarding the methodology of this study.

1. The authors state that the diagnosis of testicular torsion was made on the basis of decreased or no arterial flow on doppler ultrasound. My concern is that is patient's with decreased flow were included, these may not truly be patients with torsion, which would lead to overestimating the therapeutic benefit of manual detorsion. What was the break down of patients with decreased vs absent flow on ultrasound?

2. The break down of the groups seems arbitrary. Group 2 contains both patients that had attempted detorsion followed by orchiopexy and those that proceed straight to orchiopexy without attempted detorsion. Group 3 appears to consist exclusively of patients where manual detorsion was not attempted? if this is so, why include them in this study on detorsion? I would propose limiting this study only to those patients where manual detorsion was attempted, and breaking the patients down those where the maneuver was successful vs those where it was not.

3. what was the timing of the post-manual detorsion doppler ultrasound? this needs to be explicit.

Without a clear answer to the above questions, my fear is that this type of study may lead to abandoning the gold standard of surgical exploration by practitioners who are not studying this question on protocol.
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