Dear Prof. Dennis A Bloomfield, Prof. Sandro Vento and reviewer (03728338):

Thank you very much for your hard review work and support comments. We have carefully checked the manuscript, and would like to re-submit it again. The response to your comments is listed below.

We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in your journal.

What's more, for your information Jiajie Fang and Pengfei Li contributed equally to this study. The corresponding, authors Liping Xie and Hui Lu contributed equally to the work.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely, Hui Lu M.D.

Department of Orthopedics, The First Affiliated Hospital, School of Medcine, ZheJiang University. Huilu@zju.edu.cn

Liping Xie, M.D.

Department of Urology, The First Affiliated Hospital, School of Medicine, Zhejiang University. xielp@zju.edu.cn

Reply to Reviewer (03728338): The authors describe a patient with scrotal and penile avulsion treated with VAC, artificial dermis and STSG. The authors state that this type of injury is extremely rare and conclude that this combination can successfully treat such patients. A thorough literature review confirms the above statements. Astonishingly, I could not find any publication, describing this combination for such injuries, although artificial dermis, skin grafting and VAC therapy are well-established reconstructive modalities. The manuscript is well-written and delivers a clear message. The patient received the best possible therapy. For all these reasons I consider the manuscript worth publishing. I congratulate the authors on the good work, especially on the explanation why they applied this combination (lines 177-179), leaving no space for comments that skin graft alone could be adequate. These are basics, that, unfortunately, most physicians practicing plastic surgery have not understood.

Some minor revisions: - Too much subheadings in the case presentation section. They could be omitted. However, this depends on the journal's policy.

Answer: The subheadings were set according to the guidelines of the journal.

- Line 179: Rewritte the sentence to avoid the term bad. The two-staged procedure to avoid complications is a „must".

Answer: We replaced the term “bad” by “imperfect”. (see page 9, line 213)

- The literature can be enriched to include papers presenting the use of the combination for penile reconstruction in general (eg. Pieptu 2014 etc). After all it makes no difference whether the defect is a result of avulsion or burns or tumor excision, since no free flaps are implemented.

Answer: We enriched the literature regarding defects resulted of different reasons. (see Table 1)

- Postoperative figures after stich removal will be helpful.

Answer: We added the requested figure. (see Figure 4)