EDITORIAL COMMENT

This is a nonrandomized report on comparing 2 penile plication surgeries for penile curvature disorders. The majority of the patients are for congenital curvature but there were 127 patients with Peyronie’s disease, almost equally divided to have undergone modified Nesbit corporoplasty or 16 dot plication technique. The results are from 3 institutions and thus more than 1 surgeon’s results are presented. Selection criteria for how assignment to either surgical procedure was done is lacking so selection bias is possible. It is well-presented and represents a significant number of patients and evaluation measures are comprehensive. It is a valuable contribution to the literature. A previous review article on plication procedures for Peyronie’s disease lists 8 previously reported comparative studies and the authors of this paper include only 2 in their discussion section.” In the discussion the authors mentioned a theoretical advantage for “penile lengthening” as regards to loss of penile length. I would contend that most honest studies for grafting procedures have reported significant loss of penile length. We should eliminate the common categories mentioned in many reports of “penile shortening” versus “penile lengthening” procedures for correction of penile curvature. In fact, even with treatment of erectile dysfunction penile shortening is often a postoperative complaint by the patient.
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