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This a retrospective study whose purpose was to report the results of all Implantable Penile Prosthesis (IPP) surgeries with the AMS 700 LGX performed by a single surgeon over a 1.5 year period (N=342). Outcomes were assessed by having participants fill out the International Index of Erectile Function (IIEF) at 3, 6, and 12 months postoperatively, and by recording penile length preoperatively, at 6, and at 12 months postoperatively. Additionally, all complications were recorded. They found that IIEF scores were significantly improved, length was significantly increased, and recorded a single wound infection and 10 mechanical failures.

The results of this study are consistent with prior studies demonstrating that though some patients have perceived decrease in erection size, when objectively measure, there is no decrease following IPP. Particularly for the AMS 700 LGX, prior research by negro et. al. has already demonstrated improved IIEF, no loss of penile length, and low complication rates. This study has a significantly larger sample size, but lacks novelty. Furthermore, the study points out that no validated survey has been developed for evaluating patients after IPP but makes conclusions regarding patient's satisfaction with the procedure nonetheless.

1. The paper includes all patients who underwent AMS 700 LGX IPP from 10/14 - 4/16, did any patients receive other implants? It would be interesting to know the ratio of patients who together with their urologists chose this device?

2. The paper says "No funding was obtained for this study," but do you have any conflicts of interest to disclose, for example, sponsored dinners or trips from AMS?

3. In the first paragraph you write, "Therefore, if patients are frustrated postoperatively with their penile length, daily inflation of the penile prosthesis is recommended to these patients for producing corporal expansion, followed by surgical replacement with a longer cylinder [2]", however the citation does not related to this.

4. It appears to me that there would likely be a bias for the surgeon of record to measure a larger penile length post-operatively, were any steps taken to decrease this bias?
5. Were the results of the IIEF scores, and the Penile length scores on a normal distribution? It would be good to see that date. Otherwise a student's t test is difficult to interpret. If the results were not on a normal distribution an ANOVA could be performed.

6. Did you measure patient's subjective belief about the change in penile length? It would be interesting to know if they continued to believe their penile length was decreasing.

7. Your infection rate was less than .33%. That is very impressive! Do you use a no touch technique?
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