**Appendix 5**

**Online supplementary evidence for section 9 Penile size abnormalities and dysmorphophobia**

**Table S9.1: Summary of papers reporting objective penile measurements**

| Authors | Year | Patients, n | Age, years | Flaccid length, cm | Stretched length, cm | Erect length, cm | Flaccid circum-ference, cm | Erect circum-ference, cm, |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loeb [1] | 1899 | 50; Caucasian | (17 – 35) | 9.41 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Ajmani et al. [2] | 1985 | 320; African - Nigeria | (17-23) | 8.19 ±0.94 | NA | NA | 8.83 ±0.02 | NA |
| Schonfeld et al. [3] | 1942 | 54; Caucasian - USA | (20 – 25) | NA | 13.02 | NA | NA | NA |
| Kinsey et al. [4] | 1948 | 2770; Caucasian | (20 – 59) | 9.7 | 16.74 | NA | NA | NA |
| Bondil et al. [5] | 1992 | 905; Caucasian - France | 53.18 ±18.19 | 10.74 ±1.84 | 16.74 ±2.29 | NA | NA | NA |
| Richters et al. [6] | 1995 | 156; Caucasian - Australia | NA | NA | NA | 15.99 | NA | NA |
| Wessels et al. [7] | 1996 | 80; Caucasian - USA | 54 ±14.37 | 8.85 ±2.38 | 12.45 ±2.71 | 12.89 ±2.91 | 9.71 ±1.71 | 12.30 ±1.31 |
| Smith et al. [8] | 1998 | 184; Caucasian - Australia | NA | NA | NA | 15.71 ±2.31 | NA | NA |
| Bogaert et al. [9] | 1999 | 3417; Caucasian - USA | 30.45 ±11.27 | 9.83 ±1.80 | NA | 15.60 ±1.88 | NA | NA |
| Ponchietti et al. [10] | 2001 | 3300; Caucasian - Italy | (17 - 19) | 9 (5-12) | 12.5 (8 - 16.5) | NA | 10 ±0.75 | NA |
| Schneider et al. [11] | 2001 | 111; Caucasian - Germany | 18.24 ±0.43 | 8.60 ±1.50 | NA | 14.48 ±1.99 | NA | NA |
| Spyropoulos et al. [12] | 2002 | 52; | 25.9 ±4.4 | 7.76 ±1.3 | 12.18 ±1.7 | NA | 8.68 ±1.12 | NA |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Caucasian - Greece | | | | | | |
| Awwad et al. [13] | 2005 | 271; Arab - Jordan | 44.6 ±16.3 | 9.3 ±1.9 | 13.5 ±2.3 | NA | 8.9 ±1.5 | NA |
| Mehraban et al. [14] | 2007 | 1500; Arab - Iran | 29.61 ±5.50 | NA | 11.58 ±1.45 | NA | 8.66 ±1.01 | NA |
| Promodu et al. [15] | 2007 | 301; Indian | 31.58 ±6.38 | 8.21 ±1.44 | 10.88 ±1.42 | 12.93 ±1.63 | 9.14 ±1.02 | 11.49 ±1.04 |
| Aslan et al. [16] | 2011 | 1132; Arab - Turkish | 20.3 ±0.9 | 9.3 ±1.3 | 13.7 ±1.6 | NA | NA | NA |
| Choi et al. [17] | 2011 | 144; oriental – Korea | 57.3 ±16.5 | 7.7 ±1.7 | 11.7 ±1.9 | NA | NA | NA |
| Shalaby et al. [18] | 2014 | 2000; African - Egypt | 31.6 ± 4.2 | NA | 13.84 ±1.35 | NA | NA | NA |
| Veale et al. [19] | 2014 | 15521; Caucasian - UK | NA | 9.16 ±1.57 | 13.24 ±1.89 | 13.12 ±1.66 | 9.31 ±0.90 | 11.66 ±1.10 |
| Habous et al. [20] | 2015 | 778; Arab - Saudi Arabia | 43.7 (20–82) | NA | NA | 14.34 ±1.86 | NA | 11.50 ±1.74 |
| Hussein et al. [21] | 2017 | 223; Arab - Iraq | 41.3 ±15 | 9.8 ±2.0 | 12.6 ±1.9 | NA | NA | NA |
| Alves Barboza et al. [22] | 2018 | Tot 627 - Brazil African 167; Caucasian 283 | 53.6 ±15<br>53.8 ±13.8<br>53.7 ±15.5 | NA<br>NA<br>NA | NA<br>16.5 ±1.7<br>15.8 ±1.6 | NA<br>NA<br>NA | NA<br>NA<br>NA | NA<br>NA<br>NA |
| Di Mauro et al. [23] | 2021 | 4685; Caucasian - Italy | 19 ±6.2 | 9.47 ±2.69 | 16.78 ±2.55 | NA | 9.59 ±3.08 | 12.03 ±3.82 |
| Nguyen Hoai et al. [24] | 2021 | 14597; Asian - Vietnam | 33.1 ±10.7 | 9.03 (5.10-13.20) | 14.67 (8.30-19.90) | NA | 8.39 (5.34-11.3) | NA |
| Takure [25] | 2021 | 271; African - Nigeria | 57.3 ±16.4 | 10.3 ±2.4 | 13.7 ±2.5 | NA | NA | NA |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sole et al. [26] | 2022 | 800; Caucasian - Argentina | 54.2 ±17.6 | 11.4 ±2 | 15.2 ±2.2 | NA | 10.1 ±1.3 | NA |

*Measurements are expressed as median/mean, (IQR)/±SD*

**Table S9.2: Summary of studies reporting clinical characteristics of patients with AABP**

| Study | Year | n | Age, yr | BMI | DM (%) | HT (%) | Smoking habits (%) | History of penile cancer (%) | History of LS (%) | Underlying issues requiring surgery (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ngaage et al. [27] | 2021 | 15 | 53 ±15.7 | 37.4 ±4.3 | 7 (54%) | NR | 0 | 6 (46%) | NR | Urinary or sexual difficulties 9 (60.0%) |
| Kara et al. [28] | 2021 | 13 | 22.4 ±4.8 | 26 ±6.2 | 7% | 7% | NR | 0 | NR | Cosmetic issues 13 (100%), self-esteem/psychological well-being 13 (100%), urinary or sexual difficulties 13 (100%) |
| Zhang et al. [29] | 2020 | 26 | 33 ±5.7 | 29 ±5.4 | NR | NR | NR | NA | NR | - |
| Monn et al. [30] | 2020 | 67 | 54.76 ±12.7 | 40.4 ±6.7 | 20 (47.6 %) | NR | NR | NA | NR | Urinary difficulties 50 (74.6%), pain 21(31.3%), sexual difficulties 52 (77.6%) |
| Gao et al. [31] | 2020 | 32 | 32.5 (26-38) | - | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | Cosmetic issues 32 (100%) |
| Erpelding et al. [32] | 2019 | 16 | 54 (44-62) | 47.7 (25.5-53.3) | 9 (56%) | NR | 4 (25%) | NR | 2 (12.5%) | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hesse et al. [33] | 2019 | 27 | 56 ±15 | 49 ±14 | 12 (44%) | 16 (59%) | NR | NR | NR | Pain 12 (44%), sexual difficulties 8 (30%), difficulty in ambulating 9 (33%) |
| Zhang et al. [34] | 2019 | 15 | 33.2 ±4.6 | 28.9 ±5.3 | NR | NR | NR | 0 | NR | - |
| Monn et al. [35] | 2019 | 13 | 43.4 ±15.3 | 42.0 ±7.3 | 6 (46.2 %) | NR | 4 (30.8%) | NR | NR | - |
| Aube et al. [36] | 2019 | 24 | 61.5 (54–67) | 38.1 (33.6 – 43.7) | NR | NR | 13 (54.2%) | NR | 17 (70.8%) | Personal hygiene 19 (79.2%), urinary difficulties 14 (58.3%), sexual difficulties 19 (79.2%) |
| Cocci et al. [37] | 2019 | 47 | 51.8 ±18.4 | 30 ±2.3 | 16 (34%) | 18 (38.2 9%) | NR | NR | 10 (10.63%) | Sexual difficulties 13 (27.66%), urinary difficulties 13 (27.66%), combinatio n of urinary and sexual difficulties 12 (25.54%) |
| Pariser et al. [38] | 2018 | 64 | 53 (42-63) | 45 (38-53) | 32 (50%) | NR | 16 (25%) | 0 | NR | - |
| Theisen et al. [39] | 2018 | 16 | 48.5 | 44.7 | 9 (56%) | 9 (56%) | NR | NR | 12 (78%) | - |
| Fuller et al. [40] | 2017 | 12 | - | 45.4 ±13.8 | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Voznesensky et al. [41] | 2017 | 14 | 50 ±10.5 | 55 ±13.7 | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | - |
| Hampson et al. [42] | 2017 | 42 | - | - | 48% | 67% | NR | 1 | 33% | Personal hygiene (67%); urinary or sexual difficulties (52%) |
| Ghanem et al. [43] | 2017 | 10 | 29.4 ±6.1 | 26.5 ±3.7 | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | - |
| Tausch et al. [44] | 2016 | 56 | - | 39 (22-63) | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | - |
| Westerman et al. [45] | 2015 | 15 | 51 (26-75) | 42.6 (29.8-53.9) | 8 (53.3 %) | NR | NR | 0 | 13 (87%) | Cosmetic issues 11 (100%), urinary difficulties 6 (40%), sexual difficulties 3 (20%) |
| Rybak et al. [46] | 2014 | 11 | 54.2 ±44.7 | 49.2 (42.4-64.5) | NR | NR | NR | 0 | 0 | - |
| Shaeer et al. [47] | 2009 | 64 | (22-54) | - | NR | NR | NR | 0 | 0 | Cosmetic issues 64 (100%) |

*Measurements are expressed as median/mean, (IQR)/±SD.*
*BMI = body mass index; DM = diabetes mellitus; HT = hypertension; LS = lichen sclerosis.*

**Table S9.3: Surgical interventions to manage adult acquired buried penis** [48]

| Study | Year | n | Type of intervention (%) | Classification of intervention* (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ngaage et al. [27] | 2021 | 15 | 3 (20%) abdominoplasty, 5 (33%) panniculectomy, 11 (73%) monsplasty, 3 (20) shaft reconstruction with scrotal flap, 7 (47%) STSG | 7 category II, 5 category IV, 3 category V |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kara et al. [28] | 2021 | 13 | 13 (100%) circumcision, penile liberation and STSG | 13 category II |
| Zhang et al. [29] | 2020 | 26 | 26 (100%) suprapubic liposuction and a modified Devine's technique. | 26 category IV |
| Monn et al. [30] | 2020 | 67 | 53 (79.1%) STSG, 19 (28.4%) ligament fixation, 38 (56.7%) pubic lipectomy, 10 (14.9%) pubic liposuction, 17 (25.4%) abdominal panniculectomy, 16 (23.9%) urethroplasty | - |
| Gao et al. [31] | 2020 | 32 | 32 (100%) suprapubic liposuction, suspensory ligament release and preputioplasty. | 32 category IV |
| Aube et al. [36] | 2019 | 24 | 17 (70.8%) STSG, 17 (70.8%) penopubic ligament fixation, 17 (70.8%) pubic lipectomy, 9 (37.5%) abdominal panniculectomy, 3 (12.5%) pubic liposuction | - |
| Cocci et al. [37] | 2019 | 47 | (27.66%) circumcision, (19.14%) scrotoplasty, (4.25%) V-Y plasty of the pre-pubic region, (12.76%) thin STSG, (36.17%) thick STSG, (57.44%) suprapubic fat pad excision, (25.53%) abdominoplasty, (36.17%) division of suspensory ligament | - |
| Erpelding et al. [32] | 2019 | 16 | 2 (12.5%) penile liberation and STSG, 1 (6.2%) penile liberation, STSG, eschutcheonectomy and urethroplasty, 1 (6.2%) penile liberation, STSG and urethroplasty, 4 (25%) penile liberation, STSG, eschutcheonectomy and urethroplasty, 4 (25%) penile liberation, STSG, eschutcheonectomy and scrotoplasty, 4 (25%) penile liberation, STSG, eschutcheonectomy. | 4 category II, 12 category IV |
| Hesse et al. [33] | 2019 | 27 | 27 (100%) Penile liberation, STSG, panniculectomy, abdominoplasty and monsplasty | - |
| Zhang et al. [34] | 2019 | 15 | 15 (100%) suprapubic liposuction, penile suspensory ligament release and insertion of folded acellular dermal matrix between corpora cavernosa and pubis symphysis | 15 category IV |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Monn et al. [35] | 2019 | 13 | 6 (46.2%) penile liberation, full thickness graft to the penis using the escutcheon tissue as a graft source, 7 (53.8%) penile liberation, panniculectomy, full thickness graft to the penis using the escutcheon tissue as a graft source | 6 category IV, 7 category V |
| Pariser et al. [38] | 2018 | 64 | 3 (5%) penile unburying with local skin flap, 17 (27%) skin graft to the shaft, 7 (11%) scrotal surgery (scrotectomy or scrotoplasty), 33 (52%) escutcheonectomy, 4 (6%) abdominal panniculectomy. | 3 category I, 17 category II, 7 category III, 33 category IV, 4 category V |
| Theisen et al. [39] | 2018 | 16 | 16 (100%) escutcheonectomy, scrotectomy, and penile split- thickness skin graft. | 16 category IV |
| Fuller et al. [40] | 2017 | 12 | 12 (100%) escutcheonectomy, scrotoplasty and penile STSG. | 12 category IV |
| Voznesensky et al. [41] | 2017 | 12 | 11 (92%) debridement of penile skin and STSG to penis, 12 (100%) escutcheonectomy, 10 (83%) abdominoplasty, 7 (59%) scrotoplasty, 12 (100%) securing the supra-penile dermis to the pubic dermal or periosteal tissue | 12 category IV/V |
| Hampson et al. [42] | 2017 | 42 | 42 (100%) limited suprapubic panniculectomy, radical excision of penile shaft skin and reconstruction with STSG and scrotoplasty if needed | 42 category IV |
| Ghanem et al. [43] | 2017 | 10 | 10 suprapubic liposuction | 10 category IV |
| Tausch et al. [44] | 2016 | 56 | 25 (45%) phalloplasty with or without a scrotal flap (if significant abdominal component panniculectomy to remove the excess suprapubic fat), 12 (21%) penile shaft reconstruction with STSG, 19 (34%) penile shaft reconstruction with STSG following excision of the involved tissues with any necessary adjunctive procedures. | - |
| Westerman et al. [45] | 2015 | 15 | 15 (100%) phalloplasty with ventral slit scrotal flap | 15 category II |
| Rybak et al. [46] | 2014 | 11 | 11 (100%) penile release, 10 (90.9%) STSG | 1 category I, 10 category II |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shaeer et al. [47] | 2009 | 64 | 64 (100%) adhesiolysis, suprapubic and lateral lipectomy, anchoring the penoscrotal and penopubic junctions, and skin coverage by a local flap. | 64 category IV |

**Table S9.4: Surgical and functional outcomes of adult acquired buried penis repair** [48]

| Study | Year | Overall post-operative complications | Recurrence of burying | Sexual outcomes | Urinary outcomes | Cosmetic outcomes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ngaage et al. [27] | 2021 | 6 (44%) | 2 (13%) | Spontaneous erections in 5 (83%) | 7 (78%) voiding in standing position | - |
| Kara et al. [28] | 2021 | 4 (30%) | - | Increase in IIEF & SSS | - | All patients were pleased with cosmetic outcome |
| Zhang et al. [29] | 2020 | 21 (80.8%) | - | - | - | Most patients had positive feedback toward their result of the operation, with the mean grade of 4.5+0.7.17 patients (65%) who were very satisfied with the outcome. Six patients (23%) were satisfied with the outcome. Three patients (12%) were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the outcome. None of the patients were dissatisfied nor very dissatisfied with the outcome |
| Monn et al. [30] | 2020 | 24 (57.1%) | - | 33 (49.3%) patients with erection post-operatively | - | Satisfied 25 (37.3%); unsatisfied 9 (13.4%); neutral 33 (49.3%) |
| Gao et al. [31] | 2020 | - | - | Increase in IIEF | - | - |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aube et al. [36] | 2019 | 15 (62.5%) | - | Good postoperative erection | - | Patients' satisfaction in case of a successful procedure was: 16 patients (76.2%) satisfied of the procedure, 5 patients (23.8%) neutral/not responding and no patients (0%) dissatisfied |
| Erpelding et al. [32] | 2019 | 3 (18.7%) | - | - | - | - |
| Hesse et al. [33] | 2019 | 15 (55.5%) | - | - | - | Nearly all patients (96%) reported early satisfaction with the procedure |
| Zhang et al. [34] | 2019 | 11 (73.3%) | - | No difficulty in sexual intercourses | None of patients reported difficulty in urination | 10 patients (66.7%) were very satisfied with the outcome, 4 patients (26.6%) were satisfied with the outcome, 1 patient (6.7%) was neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the outcome, and no patient was dissatisfied with the appearance and function |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cocci et al.[37] | 2019 | 7 (14.9%) | - | Increase in IIEF of 3 points, vaginal penetration became possible in 97.87% of patients, erectile function improved in 42.55%, 48.93% needed to take PDE5i to enhance their nocturnal erections, improvement in penile erogenous sensation was recorded in 6.38% | - | - |
| Monn et al. [35] | 2019 | 5 (38.4%) | - | - | - | All patients reported subjective satisfaction with the cosmesis of their surgical outcome |
| Pariser et al. [38] | 2018 | 42 (65%) | - | - | - | - |
| Theisen et al. [39] | 2018 | 2 (10.5%) | 1 (5.2%) | Significant improvement in 10 of 13 questions (77%) | Significant improvement in 10 of 12 questions (83%) | |
| Fuller et al. [40] | 2017 | 0 (0%) | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Voznesensky et al. [41] | 2017 | 9 (75%) | 9 (75%) | Improvement or the same degree of sexual activity (75%). | Improvement in urination (92%) | - |
| Ghanem et al. [43] | 2017 | - | - | - | - | 3 (30%) of the patients were very satisfied with the result, 5 (50%) patients were satisfied, 1 patient (10%) was neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 1 (10%) patient was dissatisfied. No patients were very dissatisfied. |
| Tausch et al. [44] | 2016 | - | - | - | - | - |

**Table S9.5: Suspensory ligament release** [49]

| Author (year) | Year | n | Study design | Age, years | Follow up, months | Stretched penile length gain, cm |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Littara *et al.* [50] | 2019 | 21 | Retrospective | 38.08 ±1.1 | 12 | 1.1 |
| Zhang *et al.* [34] | 2019 | 15 | Retrospective | 33.2 ±4.6 | 3 | 4.3 ±1.6 |
| Li *et al.* [51] | 2006 | 27 | Retrospective | NR | 16 | 1.1 ±1.1 |
| Spyropoulos *et al.* [52] | 2005 | 11 | Retrospective | 25-25 | Not reported | 1.6 (1–2.3) |

*Measurements are expressed as median/mean, (IQR)/±SD.*

**Table S9.6: Published data on evaluation of Hyaluronic acid injection therapy on penile girth enhancement**

| Author | Year | n | Study design | Age, years | Follow-up, months | Girth gain, cm | Complications, n (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Zhang et al. [53] | 2022 | 38 | Retrospective | 31.2 ± 6.7 | 12 | 2.44 ± 1.14 | 3 (7.9) |
| Ahn et al. [54] | 2021 | 32 | Multi-centre RCT | 20-65 | 5-6 | 2.27± 1.26 | 2 (6.3) |
| Quan et al. [55] | 2021 | 230 | Retrospective | 30.34±5.23 | 6 | 1.80 ± 0.83 | 10 (4.3) |
| Yang et al. [56] | 2020 | 39 | Multi-centre RT | 19-65 | 5-6 | 2.1 ± 1.0 | 2 (5.13) |
| Yang et al. [57] | 2020 | 33 | Multi-centre RT | 20-66 | 18 | 1.41 ± 1.48 | 3 (9.1) |
| Yang et al. [58] | 2019 | 36 | Multi-centre RT | 20-65 | 11-12 | 1.69 ± 1.53 | 1 (2.78) |
| Kwak et al. [59] | 2011 | 50 | Retrospective | 42.5 (27-61) | 18 | 3.78 ± 0.35 | 0 (0) |
| Summary | | N/A | N/A | 19-66 | 5-18 | 1.40 – 3.78 | 0-9.1 |

*Measurements are expressed as median/mean, (IQR)/±SD.*

**Table S9.7: Published data on evaluation of autologous fat injection on penile girth enhancement**

| Author (year) | Year | n | Study design | Age (years) | Follow up (months) | Girth gain (cm) | Complications, n (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Littara et al. [50] | 2019 | 334 | Retrospective | 36 | 12 | 2.76 | 49 (14.67) |
| Salem et al. [60] | 2019 | 15 | Prospective | 33 (23-45) | 6 | 2-3.5 | N/A |
| Kang et al. [61] | 2012 | 52 | Retrospective | 42.1 | 6 | 2.18-2.28 | 1 (1.92) |
| Panfilov et al. [62] | 2006 | 60 | Retrospective | 33.8 | 12 | 2.65 | 3 (5) |
| Summary | N/A | N/A | N/A | 33-42.1 | 6-12 | 2-3.5 | 1.92-14.67 |

*Measurements are expressed as median/mean, (IQR)/±SD.*

**Table S9.8: Published data on evaluation of grafting techniques on penile girth enhancement**

| Author (year) | Year | n | Study design | Technique | Age, years | Follow up, months | Girth gain, cm | Complications,n (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elist et al. [63] | 2018 | 400 | Retrospective | Subcutaneous silicone implant | 35 (22-68) | 48 | 4.9 | 86 (21.5) |
| Zhang et al. [64] | 2016 | 30 | Retrospective | Dermal graft | 23.7 (19-35) | 13 | 1.5 | 1 (3.3) |
| Xu et al. [65] | 2016 | 23 | Retrospective | SLR + skin advancement + dermal fat graft | 23 (18-33) | 6 | 1.67 | 7 (30.43) |
| Tealab et al. [66] | 2013 | 18 | Retrospective | Acellular collagen matrix graft | 24 (19-38) | 12 | 2.3 | 8 (44.44) |
| Mertziatis et al. [67] | 2013 | 82 | Retrospective | SLR + skin advancement + Dermal fat graft | 24 | 12 | 2.2 | 25 (31.64) |
| Spyropoulos et al. [52] | 2005 | 4 | Retrospective | SLR + Dermal fat graft | 32 | 14 | 2.3 | No major complication |
| Alei et al. [68] | 2012 | 69 | Retrospective | Porcine dermal acellular matrix graft | 28.2 (19-59) | 12 | Flaccid: 3.2; Erect: 2.4 | 19 (27.5) |
| Austoni et al. [69] | 2002 | 39 | Retrospective | Corporal venous graft | 24-47 | 9 | Flaccid: no change, Erect: 2.9 | 1 (2.56) |
| Summary | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 18-68 | 6-48 | 0-4.9 | 0-44.44% |

**Table S9.9: Published data on evaluation of implantation of biodegradable scaffolds**

| Author | Year | Study design | n | Age (years) | Follow up (months) | Girth gain (cm) | Complications, n (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Djordjevic et al. [70] | 2018 | Retrospective | 21 | 28 (22-37) | 38 (13-66) | Flaccid: 1.1 ±0.4 Erect: 1±0.3 | 2 (9.52) |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jin et al. [71] | 2011 | Multi-centre non-controlled | 69 | 33±9.14 | 6 | Flaccid: 4.01; Erect: 4.02 | 6 (8.69) |
| Perovic et al. [72] | 2006 | Multi-centre prospective non-controlled | 84 | 28.77±6.61 | 24.67 | Flaccid: 3.35; Erect: 2.47 | 8 (9.52) |
| Summary | N/A | N/A | N/A | 18-60 | 6-60 | 1-4.02 | 8.69-9.52% |

**References**


1. Loeb. Harnrohrencapacitat und tripperspritzen. Munch Med Wochenschr, 1899. 46.
2. Ajmani, M.L.*, et al.* Anthropometric study of male external genitalia of 320 healthy Nigerian adults. Anthropol Anz, 1985. 43: 179.
3. Schonfeld, W.A.*, et al.* Normal Growth and Variation in the Male Genitalia from Birth to Maturity. Journal of Urology, 1942. 48: 759.
4. Kinsey, A.C.*, et al.* Sexual behavior in the human male. 1948. Am J Public Health, 2003. 93: 894.
5. Bondil, P.*, et al.* Clinical study of the longitudinal deformation of the flaccid penis and of its variations with aging. Eur Urol, 1992. 21: 284.
6. Richters, J.*, et al.* Are condoms the right size? A method for self-measurement of the erect penis. Venereology: official publication of the National Venereology Council of Australia, 1995. 8: 77.
7. Wessells, H.*, et al.* Penile length in the flaccid and erect states: guidelines for penile augmentation. J Urol, 1996. 156: 995.
8. Smith, A.M.*, et al.* Does penis size influence condom slippage and breakage? Int J STD AIDS, 1998. 9: 444.
9. Bogaert, A.F.*, et al.* The relation between sexual orientation and penile size. Arch Sex Behav, 1999. 28: 213.
10. Ponchietti, R.*, et al.* Penile length and circumference: a study on 3,300 young Italian males. Eur Urol, 2001. 39: 183.
11. Schneider, T.*, et al.* Does penile size in younger men cause problems in condom use? a prospective measurement of penile dimensions in 111 young and 32 older men. Urology, 2001. 57: 314.
12. Spyropoulos, E.*, et al.* Size of external genital organs and somatometric parameters among physically normal men younger than 40 years old. Urology, 2002. 60: 485.
13. Awwad, Z.*, et al.* Penile measurements in normal adult Jordanians and in patients with erectile dysfunction. Int J Impot Res, 2005. 17: 191.
14. Mehraban, D.*, et al.* Penile size and somatometric parameters among Iranian normal adult men. Int J Impot Res, 2007. 19: 303.
15. Promodu, K.*, et al.* Penile length and circumference: an Indian study. Int J Impot Res, 2007. 19: 558.
16. Aslan, Y.*, et al.* Penile length and somatometric parameters: a study in healthy young Turkish men. Asian J Androl, 2011. 13: 339.
17. Choi, I.H.*, et al.* Second to fourth digit ratio: a predictor of adult penile length. Asian J Androl, 2011. 13: 710.
18. Shalaby, M.E.*, et al.* Penile length-somatometric parameters relationship in healthy Egyptian men. Andrologia, 2015. 47: 402.
19. Veale, D.*, et al.* Am I normal? A systematic review and construction of nomograms for flaccid and erect penis length and circumference in up to 15,521 men. BJU Int, 2015. 115: 978.

20. Habous, M.*, et al.* Erect penile dimensions in a cohort of 778 Middle Eastern men: establishment of a nomogram. J Sex Med, 2015. 12: 1402.
21. Hussein, N.S.*, et al.* Reference range of flaccid and stretched penile lengths of adult males in Baghdad: A cross-sectional study. Arab J Urol, 2017. 15: 68.
22. Alves Barboza, R.*, et al.* Anthropometric study of penile length in self-declared Brazilians regarding the color of the skin as white or black: The study of a Myth. Int J Impot Res, 2018. 30: 43.
23. Di Mauro, M.*, et al.* Penile length and circumference dimensions: A large study in young Italian men. Andrologia, 2021. 53: e14053.
24. Nguyen Hoai, B.*, et al.* Data from 14,597 penile measurements of vietnamese men. Andrology, 2021. 9: 906.
25. Takure, A.O. Penile length of men attending urology outpatient clinic in Southwest Nigeria. Pan Afr Med J, 2021. 39: 155.
26. Sole, M.*, et al.* Reference penile size measurement and correlation with other anthropometric dimensions: a prospective study in 800 men. Asian J Androl, 2022. 24: 620.
27. Ngaage, L.M.*, et al.* Uncovering the Hidden Penis: A Nomenclature and Classification System. Ann Plast Surg, 2021. 86: 444.
28. Kara, O.*, et al.* Buried penis in adults as a complication of circumcision: Surgical management and long-term outcomes. Andrologia, 2021. 53: e13921.
29. Zhang, P.*, et al.* Suprapubic Liposuction With a Modified Devine's Technique for Buried Penis Release in Adults. Plast Surg (Oakv), 2020. 28: 172.
30. Monn, M.F.*, et al.* Surgical management and outcomes of adult acquired buried penis with and without lichen sclerosus: a comparative analysis. Int Urol Nephrol, 2020. 52: 1893.
31. Gao, B.*, et al.* Effect of surgical repair of acquired buried penis on sexual function in adults. Int Urol Nephrol, 2020. 52: 1087.
32. Erpelding, S.G.*, et al.* Outpatient Surgical Management for Acquired Buried Penis. Urology, 2019. 123: 247.
33. Hesse, M.A.*, et al.* The Surgical Treatment of Adult Acquired Buried Penis Syndrome: A New Classification System. Aesthet Surg J, 2019. 39: 979.
34. Zhang, X.*, et al.* Suspensory ligament release combined with acellular dermal matrix filler in infrapubic space: A new method for penile length augmentation. Andrologia, 2019. 51: e13351.
35. Monn, M.F.*, et al.* The Use of Full Thickness Skin Graft Phalloplasty During Adult Acquired Buried Penis Repair. Urology, 2019. 129: 223.
36. Aube, M.*, et al.* Predictors of surgical complications and evaluation of outcomes after surgical correction of adult-acquired buried penis. Int Urol Nephrol, 2020. 52: 687.
37. Cocci, A.*, et al.* Subjective and objective results in surgical correction of adult acquired buried penis: A single-centre observational study. Arch Ital Urol Androl, 2019. 91: 25.
38. Pariser, J.J.*, et al.* A Simplified Adult Acquired Buried Penis Repair Classification System With an Analysis of Perioperative Complications and Urethral Stricture Disease. Urology, 2018. 120: 248.
39. Theisen, K.M.*, et al.* Surgical Management of Adult-acquired Buried Penis: Impact on Urinary and Sexual Quality of Life Outcomes. Urology, 2018. 116: 180.
40. Fuller, T.W.*, et al.* Surgical Management of Adult Acquired Buried Penis: Escutcheonectomy, Scrotectomy, and Penile Split-thickness Skin Graft. Urology, 2017. 108: 237.
41. Voznesensky, M.A.*, et al.* Patient-Reported Social, Psychological, and Urologic Outcomes After Adult Buried Penis Repair. Urology, 2017. 103: 240.
42. Hampson, L.A.*, et al.* Surgical and Functional Outcomes Following Buried Penis Repair With Limited Panniculectomy and Split-thickness Skin Graft. Urology, 2017. 110: 234.
43. Ghanem, H.*, et al.* Infrapubic Liposuction for Penile Length Augmentation in Patients with Infrapubic Adiposities. Aesthetic Plast Surg, 2017. 41: 441.

44. Tausch, T.J*., et al.* Classification System for Individualized Treatment of Adult Buried Penis Syndrome. Plast Reconstr Surg, 2016. 138: 703.
45. Westerman, M.E*., et al.* Ventral Slit Scrotal Flap: A New Outpatient Surgical Option for Reconstruction of Adult Buried Penis Syndrome. Urology, 2015. 85: 1501.
46. Rybak, J*., et al.* Single center outcomes after reconstructive surgical correction of adult acquired buried penis: measurements of erectile function, depression, and quality of life. J Sex Med, 2014. 11: 1086.
47. Shaeer, O*., et al.* Revealing the buried penis in adults. J Sex Med, 2009. 6: 876.
48. Falcone, M*., et al.* What are the benefits and harms of surgical management options for adult-acquired buried penis? A systematic review. BJU Int, 2023. 131: 8.
49. Falcone, M*., et al.* Total Phallic Reconstruction in the Genetic Male. Eur Urol, 2021. 79: 684.
50. Littara, A*., et al.* Cosmetic penile enhancement surgery: a 3-year single-centre retrospective clinical evaluation of 355 cases. Sci Rep, 2019. 9: 6323.
51. Li, C.Y*., et al.* Penile suspensory ligament division for penile augmentation: indications and results. Eur Urol, 2006. 49: 729.
52. Spyropoulos, E*., et al.* Augmentation Phalloplasty Patient Selection and Satisfaction Inventory: a novel questionnaire to evaluate patients considered for augmentation phalloplasty surgery because of penile dysmorphophobia. Urology, 2007. 70: 221.
53. Zhang, C.L*., et al.* Penile augmentation with injectable hyaluronic acid gel: an alternative choice for small penis syndrome. Asian J Androl, 2022. 24: 601.
54. Ahn, S.T*., et al.* Efficacy and Safety of Penile Girth Enhancement Using Hyaluronic Acid Filler and the Clinical Impact on Ejaculation: A Multi-Center, Patient/Evaluator-Blinded, Randomized Active-Controlled Trial. World J Mens Health, 2022. 40: 299.
55. Quan, Y*., et al.* Complications and management of penile augmentation with hyaluronic acid injection. Asian J Androl, 2021. 23: 392.
56. Yang, D.Y*., et al.* A Comparison Between Hyaluronic Acid and Polylactic Acid Filler Injections for Temporary Penile Augmentation in Patients with Small Penis Syndrome: A Multicenter, Patient/Evaluator-Blind, Comparative, Randomized Trial. J Sex Med, 2020. 17: 133.
57. Yang, D.Y*., et al.* Comparison of Clinical Outcomes between Hyaluronic and Polylactic Acid Filler Injections for Penile Augmentation in Men Reporting a Small Penis: A Multicenter, Patient-Blinded/Evaluator-Blinded, Non-Inferiority, Randomized Comparative Trial with 18 Months of Follow-up. J Clin Med, 2020. 9.
58. Yang, D.Y*., et al.* A Comparison of the Efficacy and Safety Between Hyaluronic Acid and Polylactic Acid Filler Injection in Penile Augmentation: A Multicenter, Patient/Evaluator-Blinded, Randomized Trial. J Sex Med, 2019. 16: 577.
59. Kwak, T.I*., et al.* The effects of penile girth enhancement using injectable hyaluronic acid gel, a filler. J Sex Med, 2011. 8: 3407.
60. Salem, A.M*., et al.* Effect of Girth Supersizing on Patient Satisfaction After Semi-Rigid Penile Implant Insertion: A Prospective Case-Control Study. Aesthet Surg J, 2019. 39: NP259.
61. Kang, D.H*., et al.* Efficacy and safety of penile girth enhancement by autologous fat injection for patients with thin penises. Aesthetic Plast Surg, 2012. 36: 813.
62. Panfilov, D.E. Augmentative phalloplasty. Aesthetic Plast Surg, 2006. 30: 183.
63. Elist, J.J*., et al.* A Single-Surgeon Retrospective and Preliminary Evaluation of the Safety and Effectiveness of the Penuma Silicone Sleeve Implant for Elective Cosmetic Correction of the Flaccid Penis. J Sex Med, 2018. 15: 1216.
64. Zhang, G.X*., et al.* Autologous dermal graft combined with a modified degloving procedure for penile augmentation in young adults: a preliminary study. Andrology, 2016. 4: 927.
65. Xu, L*., et al.* Augmentation Phalloplasty With Autologous Dermal Fat Graft in the Treatment of "Small Penis". Ann Plast Surg, 2016. 77 Suppl 1: S60.
66. Tealab, A.A*., et al.* The use of an acellular collagen matrix in penile augmentation: A pilot study in Saudi Arabia. Arab J Urol, 2013. 11: 169.

67. Mertziotis, N.*, et al.* Is V-Y plasty necessary for penile lengthening? Girth enhancement and increased length solely through circumcision: description of a novel technique. Asian J Androl, 2013. 15: 819.
68. Alei, G.*, et al.* Original technique for penile girth augmentation through porcine dermal acellular grafts: results in a 69-patient series. J Sex Med, 2012. 9: 1945.
69. Austoni, E.*, et al.* A new technique for augmentation phalloplasty: albugineal surgery with bilateral saphenous grafts--three years of experience. Eur Urol, 2002. 42: 245.
70. Djordjevic, M.L.*, et al.* Repeated penile girth enhancement with biodegradable scaffolds: Microscopic ultrastructural analysis and surgical benefits. Asian J Androl, 2018. 20: 488.
71. Jin, Z.*, et al.* Tissue engineering penoplasty with biodegradable scaffold Maxpol-T cografted autologous fibroblasts for small penis syndrome. J Androl, 2011. 32: 491.
72. Perovic, S.V.*, et al.* New perspectives of penile enhancement surgery: tissue engineering with biodegradable scaffolds. Eur Urol, 2006. 49: 139.