higher rate of urological anomalies within the spectrum and a higher rate of heart, abdomen, skeleton, and joint anomalies outside the spectrum. These might be either important in terms of predictable comorbidity for preparing the primary reconstruction in the newborn or infant period or later in the long-term follow-up. Their clinical relevance suggests considering them before initial operative treatment. As any associated anomalies were present in 48 up to 59% of affected EEC individuals possibly associated anomalies should be evaluated during routine check-up in all EEC patients.
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EDITORIAL COMMENT
The authors present a large Multicenter German Study looking at the association between the exstrophy epispadias complex (EEC) and other congenital anomalies. The database was created from patient’s entering the CURE-net system, which started in 2009. In the prospective group, the authors have identified 73 patients born between the years of 2009 and 2016. They also identified a larger group of 162 patients which they label as a cross-sectional group who were recruited from EEC born between 1948 and 2008. By far the most valuable of the groups is the prospective group which includes the 73 patients starting in 2009.

The authors’ series does point out several intriguing and interesting associations some of which are different from previously published reviews of anomalies associated with the EEC. The first of these would be that exstrophy variants were found in 21% of the current review, which is significantly higher than previously reported. The authors found that associated anomalies outside the EEC were discovered, in 59% of their prospective group including renal anomalies in 18% and genital anomalies other than the epispadias component in 18%. They also pointed out that females in their study group were found to have Mullerian duct abnormalities to a far greater extent than had previously been reported with 65.7% experiencing Mullerian duct abnormalities such as uterine or vaginal duplication obstruction or absence.

Although the authors’ data is compelling, it may not give the full picture due to a lack of mandatory reporting congenital abnormalities through a centralized birth registry in German. The number of pregnancies in which the EEC was discovered and terminated before birth are not documented and no further valid data are available such as other anomalies which might have been present. Although, much of the data is intriguing and thought provoking, I am not entirely sure that it in any way changes our approach to the care of the infant born with EEC. Most of these patients are completely investigated, thus few, if any of the anomalies reported would be inadvertently overlooked.
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AUTHOR REPLY
We greatly appreciate the Editorial Comment on our article “Association Between Exstrophy-Epispidias Complex And Congenital Anomalies: A German Multicenter Study.” Here the question has been raised whether the observations of our study
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