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Hayley Henderson
Editor-in-Chief
BMC Urology

Manuscript revision BURO-D-17-00273R2 "Experience of AMS 700 LGX penile prostheses for preserving penile length in Korea"

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

I deeply appreciated for the comments on our manuscript. We have revised our previous paper based on the comments made by the referee. We hereby submit a copy of the revised paper electronically. We are also sending a revision letter describing our responses to comments of the reviewers in a point-by-point fashion. We would highly appreciate if you could review this paper again for publication in BMC Urology Journal.
Sincerely yours,

Kang Sup Kim, MD, PhD (first author) and Moo Yeon Lee, MD, PhD (corresponding author)
E-mail: prodigy81@catholic.ac.kr
mylee@adamshospital.net

Editor Comments:

1. Quality of Written English

I have only assessed your revisions, and noticed some grammatical errors that need to be corrected - see below. Please do spend time during this revision period to ensure that the spelling and grammar is checked as you will not be given another opportunity to do so. You may wish to consult with a copyediting firm or a colleague whose native language is English to assist.

Page 10 - "Patients were received AMS 700..." should read "Patients received AMS 700..."

Page 10 - "Approximately, Half of patients were received..." should read "Approximately, half of the patients received..."

Page 10 - "30% of patients were received..." should read "30% of patients received..."

Page 10 - "20% of patients were received..." should read "20% of patients received..."

Page 10 - "Patients were indicated to undergo IPP implantation..." should read "Patients underwent IPP implantation..."

Page 13 - "No statistically difference in penile length..." should read "No statistical difference in penile length..."

Following your comment, we revised our manuscripts.

2. Questionnaire

- How did patients complete the questionnaire - was this a face-to-face interview, or were they given a survey to complete independently? Was the questionnaire completed in private in the same setting for each patient, or was this different each time? Thinking ahead to the discussion,
would the patients answers be affected by stress etc.? Please update the methods and discussion to specify.

When patients visit outpatient, they complete questionnaire in private before seeing urologist. Because urologist did not involve completing questionnaire, we think that patients answers not be affected by stress. We inserted “When patients visit outpatient, they complete questionnaire in private before meeting andrologist.” in the methods.

- Did patients know why they were being asked to complete this questionnaire? If this was administered as part of the research design, then consent should have been obtained from each patient. This point is very important as it deals with research ethics, so we ask that you provide as much detail here as possible.

We routinely take questionnaire from patients before and after surgery for evaluating sexual function. We explained this to the patients. So, patients agreed to complete questionnaire. It is not need to obtain informed consent from patients owing to retrospective research design.

- In the Results section, you state that 32 patients did not answer all of the questionnaire. Do you mean that they partially completed the questionnaire? If the questionnaires were not usable, please make expand this section to make this clear in the text.

Some patients did not answer all of questionnaire and some patients completed partially the questionnaire. We did not include this data in this study. We inserted “We did not include this incomplete questionnaire in the present study.” in the result section.

- In the Discussion section, you should mention the reasons why some patients did not complete the questionnaire, if known. This information is useful to other researchers looking to conduct similar research.

We did not know the exact reasons why some patients did not complete the questionnaire. We assume that patients did not complete the questionnaire because it was annoying.

3. Sample size

How did you decide upon your sample size for this study? Was this given any consideration before the study commenced? Was a sample size calculation performed? If no, you should include this information in the Methods section in the section related to statistical reporting.
Further discussion about any possible limitations of the sample size (if this may not have been sufficient) should be acknowledged in the Discussion section.

After reviewing patients’ medical records, patients who underwent AMS 700 LGX between October 2014 and April 2016 and completed the questionnaire were included this study and these patients are sample size. Because this study designed retrospectively, it is not needed to calculate sample size. We inserted “Since present study designed retrospectively, it is not needed to calculate sample size.” in the methods part.

4. Retrospective vs. Prospective

Based on the methodology, it appears that this study was in fact prospective and not retrospective. A retrospective study is where you analyze data that is already available to the researcher via hospital records or databases, and patients are not enrolled in real-time to participate in the study. As part of this study, it sounds like participants were prospectively enrolled and a questionnaire was administered as part of the study protocol, and the patients were followed over time. Please can you confirm that you have understood the study design correctly and that your research was indeed retrospective. If the questionnaire is administered to every one of your patients before surgery as part of routine standard practice, then please confirm.

Above mentioned, we routinely receive questionnaire from patients before and after surgery for evaluating sexual function. So, this study is retrospective.

We highly appreciate your invaluable comments.

Reviewer reports:

Ranjith Ramasamy (Reviewer 1):

Aside from some small grammatical corrections, the study is ready for publication. Thank you for your research!

Following your comment, our manuscript is edited by editage company.

We highly appreciate your invaluable comments.