



Biofilm review highlights need for new research

Rutul D. Patel^{1^}, Martin S. Gross²

¹Montefiore Medical Center Department of Urology, Bronx, NY, USA; ²Section of Urology, Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, NH, USA

Correspondence to: Martin S. Gross. Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, 1 Medical Center Dr., Lebanon, NH 03756, USA.

Email: martin.s.gross@gmail.com.

Comment on: Leong JY, Capella CE, D'Amico MJ, et al. A scoping review of penile implant biofilms-what do we know and what remains unknown? *Transl Androl Urol* 2022;11:1210-21.

Submitted Aug 23, 2022. Accepted for publication Sep 09, 2022.

doi: 10.21037/tau-22-568

View this article at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-22-568>

This paper provides an excellent review of previous literature regarding penile implant biofilms (1). Leong *et al.* astutely describe the shift in microbes responsible for biofilm formation in the era of antibiotic-coated implants from skin flora to more diverse and virulent organisms. Given the limited literature available, the authors also outline how urologists can replicate strategies used in other surgical fields to prevent biofilm formation (2).

Infection remains the most feared complication of penile implants for both patients and surgeons. With that in mind, perhaps the most notable aspect of this scoping review is how few studies met inclusion criteria. Of the 11 studies the authors included, only 3 explicitly reported the number of biofilms identified. The remaining 8 simply mentioned culturing biofilms if present. This thorough analysis of the available literature should ultimately serve as a clarion call for more robust studies on this subject.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was commissioned by the editorial office, *Translational Andrology and Urology*.

The article did not undergo external peer review.

Conflicts of Interest: Both authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at <https://tau.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/tau-22-568/coif>). MSG reports that they are a consultant for Coloplast. RDP has no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

References

1. Leong JY, Capella CE, D'Amico MJ, et al. A scoping

[^] ORCID: 0000-0003-4664-981X.

review of penile implant biofilms-what do we know and what remains unknown? *Transl Androl Urol* 2022;11:1210-21.

2. Isguven S, Chung PH, Machado P, et al. Minimizing Penile Prosthesis Implant Infection: What Can We Learn From Orthopedic Surgery? *Urology* 2020;146:6-14.

Cite this article as: Patel RD, Gross MS. Biofilm review highlights need for new research. *Transl Androl Urol* 2022;11(9):1224-1225. doi: 10.21037/tau-22-568