



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10496

Title: Pre-Fabricated Radial Forearm Phalloplasty with Cadaveric Bone Graft

Reviewer code: 02878096

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-04-04 08:37

Date reviewed: 2014-04-06 13:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1.Good described case report. 2.Photos are excellent except last one, and new one in better resolution and quality is recommended. 3. One more photo with appearance of surviving phallus is recommended, too.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10496

Title: Pre-Fabricated Radial Forearm Phalloplasty with Cadaveric Bone Graft

Reviewer code: 02896083

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-04-04 08:37

Date reviewed: 2014-04-11 21:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors Although the manuscript is well written and the cosmetic result of the phalloplasty is excellent, the use of bone or cartilage graft to guarantee rigidity is now obsolete. This is because the graft progressively is desorbed and is prone to fracture. Furthermore, concealing a phallus with a bone graft becomes challenging. This is why implantation of a penile prosthesis is now advocated as the solution of choice to guarantee rigidity in a neophallus (although infection rate can be as high as 20% and up to 50% of patients will require revision within 4 years- Hoebeke et al). With kind regards



ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10496

Title: Pre-Fabricated Radial Forearm Phalloplasty with Cadaveric Bone Graft

Reviewer code: 01498365

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-04-04 08:37

Date reviewed: 2014-04-28 01:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I consider phalloplasty as one of the hardest surgical procedure in reconstructive surgery. Compliments for the interesting report and hope you will continue to experience such a challenging surgery. The paper is well structured and with a proper language. IN my opinino the main limit is the lack of use on validated questionnaires to asses patients sexual function and satisfaction.If you have data I would report to give more power to your results. This is an experimental techhnique. Did you request an ethical commettee approval? YOu should report it. Why do you perform in a single stage procedure the glans recunstruction according to Norfolk? I think this increase the risk of ischemia. I would discuss further why do you prefer a bon graft than a penile prosthesis implantation. WHat are the advantages? I personally think that PPI is nowadays the gold standards giving the best outcomes. THank you for reporting the complication. UNfortunately flap ischemia and urethral fistula are quite common in this kind of surgery.