Nephro-Urology Monthly
Volume 15 · Issue 1 · e134095

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Effect of Spinal Anesthesia on Penile Length and Erectile Function in Patients Underwent Endoscopic Urological Surgeries: A Double-Blinded Randomized Clinical Trial

Farzad Allameh, Seyedmohamad Hosseininia, Ali Khoshnamak, Fatemeh Sodeifian, Houman Teymourian

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
10 Dec 2022	10 Apr 2023	29 Apr 2023	10.5812/numonthly-134095

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission Referee 1 2
2 Revision 1 Referee 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

1 comment · 13 Mar 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 13 Mar 2023

This research examines the impact of spinal anesthesia on penile length changes and transitory erectile dysfunction. A total of 73 patients undergoing endoscopic urological procedures were included, with 36 receiving general anesthesia and 37 receiving spinal anesthesia. There was no significant difference in penile length between the SA and GA groups before and two weeks after surgery. Individuals having spinal anesthesia may suffer acute erectile impairment one month following surgery; however, erectile dysfunction is brief, and normal sexual function returns three months after surgery, as found by the authors.

1. The setting of the study has not been explained in detail.
2. What are the strengths of this study compared to the other similar articles?
3. What would you recommend for future studies?

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear EIC

Thanks for your valuable reviewer comments and here are authors' comments on esteemed reviewers' question:

1. Setting was explained in detail in the article that is resubmitted.

2. There are no or at least few literatures about this issue, our study is a randomized clinical trial that has been done with this sample size that is unique in its kind.

3. The major limitation of this study was small sample size which could affect the findings. In current study, duration of surgeries was short; therefore, lower dose of anesthetic agents was required. These finding could be different in long-lasting surgeries that require higher levels of anesthetic agents.

Another limitation of current study was age of enrolled patients. Major number of patients were young and younger patients generally experience mild ED compared to older patients, though the result could differ in older patients who may experience sever ED. IIEF-5 questionnaire measures the erectile function over the 6 months and no longer; however, it was the only standardized available questionnaire validated in Persian language.

So studies with larger sample size in variety of patients age and more follow up time is recommended by the authors.

Best regards

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 16 Apr 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 16 Apr 2023

Dear Authors,
Thank you very much for the revisions.
Best regards