

## Author Response

We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. The reviewer comments are laid out below in italicized font and specific concerns have been numbered. Our response is given in bold font.

(1) Science editor:

*The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.*

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

*I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2023. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.*

**Thank you very much for your valuable comments. According to your relevant requirements, necessary modifications have been made. Please check the manuscript and related attachments.**

Reviewer #1:

*Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)*

*Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)*

*Conclusion: Minor revision*

*Specific Comments to Authors: Dear Author, Congratulations and thanks for submitting the above-mentioned interesting article for publication to World Journal of Clinical Cases. I appreciate you and hope your case to be published. However, some revisions should be considered: 1. It will be more interesting if you have done a literature review. 2. There are several grammatical and editing errors throughout the text. For example (Peniel, replantation....) 3. It is recommended to describe the experience of the surgeons. 4. Define some of the abbreviations, such as RUG 5. The resolution of the figures is not very optimal. A minimum resolution of 300 ppi is recommended. 6. You said that Figure 2 illustrates Color Doppler ultrasonography but really it illustrates operative steps.*

**Dear reviewer, thank you very much for your positive comments and valuable opinions. For the first point, you mentioned that it would be better to conduct a literature review. For this, we have increased the sorting work of the relevant literature on penile injury, especially penile reconstruction. Second, for the abbreviations in the full text, we reviewed and standardized them in detail again. At the same time, according to your suggestion, the chief surgeon of this case report added the patient's operation process to the report. For details, please refer to the description of the operation process section in the article. Regarding the resolution of the displayed images, after inspection, we determined that the original figures illustrated in the manuscript met the publication resolution requirements with a minimum PPI value of 300. Due to the negligence in typesetting and revision, the original ultrasound picture was not posted in time, so we made a modification. We are very sorry about that.**

**We've also made some amendments in this revised version through the English language polishing agency recommended by F6publishing., hoping to meet the requirements for publication. Thank you for your patience and advice!**

Reviewer #2:

*Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)*

*Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)*

*Conclusion: Rejection*

*Specific Comments to Authors: Well presented as a case report. The topic is well known in urological practice. Especially the details of the operation could have been given better. In this way, it becomes difficult to establish a cause-effect relationship. this makes the case report ordinary. Due to low priority not suitable for publication in this journal.*

**We appreciate your comment and valuable time. The patient involved in this case report comes from a remote area in southern Xinjiang, China. Limited by the low level of local medical care, he was transferred to a superior hospital for treatment. To summarize our experience in the treatment of acute penile trauma, we would like not only to present our case report but also share our experience on the evaluation and surgical treatment of such patients, so that more primary urologists could be inspired and educated. Thus, patients could get correct treatment on time. We think this case report has a certain degree of publication value in view of this effect. Thanks again for your advice.**

**In view of your evaluation on scientific quality and language quality, we have made some amendments in this revised version through the English language polishing agency recommended by F6publishing., hoping to meet the requirements for publication.**

Reviewer #3:

*Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)*

*Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)*

*Conclusion: Minor revision*

*Specific Comments to Authors: Nice report. See attached file for comments*

**Dear reviewers, thank you very much for your valuable comments. The relevant modifications**

**have been improved according to your review requirements. At the same time, we polished the revised version through the English language polishing agency recommended by F6publishing. It is hoped that the publication requirements can be met. At the same time, the content of the revised version has been enriched according to the revision comments you made in the attached manuscript. Thank you again for your patience!**

On behalf of all the contributing authors, I would like to express our sincere appreciations of your letter and reviewers' constructive comments. We are really sorry for our careless mistakes. If there are any other modifications we could make, we would like very much to modify them and we really appreciate your help. Thank you very much for your help !