

Peer Review File

Article Information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-21-239>

Reviewer A

I congratulate the authors on an interesting and well-written manuscript to which I only have three comments.

1) Five authors are a lot for one patient. Purists in my department would never accept more than one author on a one-patient case report. I could hesitantly accept 2 in this case because of the literature review for which the younger author may need supervision from an experienced colleague, but five is way too many in my opinion. The majority of authors could be moved to the acknowledgement section.

Reply 1: Thank you for your proper comments.

We, all authors, agree your opinion that there are many authors in case report. However, the first author of this case report is a urology resident. This case report was reviewed by searching several different papers, so the first author had to be reviewed and provided by two urologists. Pathology information was added, and 1 pathologist was included. Considering this situation, 5 authors consider it to be an acceptable range.

Changes in the text: N/A

2) In the running head, please remove "in real-world"

Reply 2: Thank you for your comments.

The authors used the word "in the real world" to emphasize real clinical experience. However, there were unnecessary uses and when removed, the sentences felt much more natural and neat.

Changes in the text: Deleted the word from line 15 on page 1.

3) In the conclusion, please remove "in real-world"

Reply 3: Thank you for your comment.

For the same reason as above, I modified it according to your advice.

Changes in the text: Deleted the word from line 203 on page 12.

Reviewer B

This is certainly a rare case.

Nguyen et al has already recently published a systematic review on this topic and therefore this article doesn't provide any additional information that has not already been previously published.

Reply 1: Thank you for your important comment.

This paper¹ I read the most while writing this case report inspired us a lot. The main difference is that the data has been updated since 2016 and the review focuses on benign diseases. Unlike the review journal, this case report goes into detail from the doctor's office to the operation and follow-up procedures.

Changes in the text: N/A

1. Nguyen, A. H., Smith, M. L., Maranda, E. L. et al.: Clinical Features and Treatment of Penile Schwannoma: A Systematic Review. Clin Genitourin Cancer, **14**: 198, 2016

It may be more suited to a local journal in Korea as the abstract points out this is only the second case in Korea.

Reply 2: Thank you for your comment.

The second case in Korea is a sentence written to emphasize its rarity. However, this sentence is considered unnecessary. What the authors would like to argue is a summary of rare cases and how to deal with these rare cases for clinicians.

Changes in the text: Deleted the sentence.

I don't think you need to stress the difference between your case and the previous published case so much in the abstract.

Reply 3: Thank you for your proper comment.

I tried to describe the difference from the previous case report, but as you pointed out, it seems that too much has been put into the abstract. This can be a factor that makes the point of this article difficult for readers to read or misunderstand. This sentence has been deleted.

Changes in the text: Deleted the sentence from line 66 on page 4.

The abstract can be more concise so that you can include some information from your literature review and that can also be worked into the conclusion of the abstract rather than generic conclusions.

Reply 4: Thank you very much for your comment.

The abstract should contain the information from this paper concisely. The previous abstract had so many generic sentences that it was not possible to include all the information in this paper. The format of the abstract has been changed and the content of the review has been added. The changed abstract can provide more information to readers who only view the abstract.

Changes in the text: The abstract structure has changed. The highlighted parts was added.

The article itself needs more references. Some statements are not backed up with references which are easy to find from the papers you are citing.

E.g. page 6 89-90, the sentence on the NF-2 gene needs a reference; page 6 93 the overall incidence needs a reference, etc...

Reply 5: Thank you for your important comment.

To help you find the information, I've added a decent reference to the inadequate citation. Thanks again for the point.

Changes in the text: Add references Line 86, 89, and 90 Page 5

When you say it is important to differentiate hemangioma vs schwannomas. Does it change the management decision to surgically resect it if the patient is symptomatic. Similarly what evidence do you have to suggest that MRI is better than USS in this regard. Is there a reference you can use to support this.

Reply 6: Thank you for your comment.

First, there is no significant difference between hemangiomas and schwannomas in that they both undergo surgical resection. However, if it was a hemangioma, the hemangiomas and the corpus cavernosum connectivity had to be investigated, and there were plans to completely repair the corpus cavernosum so as not to affect the patient's erection.

Second, a reference was added due to lack of reference to the claim.

Changes in the text: Add reference Line 166 Page 9

The discussion can be more concise and scientific in writing style.

E.g. It is recommended to have a perfect resection. (?achieve negative margin, what is the definition of a perfect resection, not saying that it is incorrect but can be clearer in terms of what you recommend.)

Reply 7: Thank you very much for your appropriate comment.

Inaccurate and indefinite expressions make it difficult for the reader to understand. I changed it to a clearer sentence.

Changes in the text: Line 180 Page 9

The five-year survival rate is excellent. (?what is the 5 year survival rate, and reference to back it up)

Reply 8: Thank you for your comment.

1. Nguyen AH, Smith ML, Maranda EL, et al. Clinical Features and Treatment of Penile Schwannoma: A Systematic Review. Clin Genitourin Cancer 2016;14:198-202.

In above the reference and in the review we, authors, investigated, no patients who were pathologically confirmed as benign schwannomas died due to this disease. However, the term 5-year survival rate seems to be a logical leap. Therefore, I deleted this sentence.

Changes in the text: Deleted the sentence
