Spontaneous extrusion of male genital pearling
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ABSTRACT
Pearling is a practice of inserting small beads beneath the skin of the genitalia. Patients generally underwent this practice believing that this would have made their penis bigger and able to better satisfy their partners during intercourse. Pearling can cause complications. We report a case of spontaneous extrusion of genital pearling exiting in a granuloma of the inner face of the foreskin.

Introduction
Genital pearling (or simply, pearling) is a practice of permanently inserting small beads made of various materials (metal, stainless steel, titanium, plastic, nylon, silicone) beneath the skin of the external genitalia. 1,2 Pearling is also known in medico-legal literature as artificial penile nodules, observed during the external autopsy examination. 3

The purpose of this practice varies according to the different cultures and geographic places. Although it is peculiar in Asian societies, it has become increasingly popular also in Europe. Initially a symbol of prisoners, the implantation of beads beneath the penile skin is often performed with the aim of enhancing sexual performance and partner pleasure during intercourse even if the removal of the implanted objects because of usefulness or complications is after a short time not rarely required. 4

Case presentation
A 35-year-old Romanian male patient, in prison for drugs traffic, asked urological consultation because of a cutaneous lesion in the dorsal aspect of his penis following the spontaneous extrusion of a not collected plastic object which he implanted himself one year before, during the prison stay. He had been encouraged by his fellow inmates to modify his genitalia.

He had been asked urological consultation because of a cutaneous lesion in the dorsal aspect of his penis following the spontaneous extrusion of a not collected plastic object which he implanted himself one year before, during the prison stay. He had been encouraged by his fellow inmates to modify his genitalia. On physical examination a six mm pinky lesion was into the inner face of foreskin evident (Fig. 1), it was painless, relatively hard with the typical aspect of a granuloma. The patient initially asked only for the removal of the scarring lesion, but after in-depth interview, we performed complete circumcision in order to guarantee better functional and esthetical results. The outer face of the prepuce was incised at the level of the coronal sulcus. Then, after retracting the foreskin, the second inner incision was performed about 5mm from the edge of the glans. The skin between the two incision (including the scar lesion) was sharply divided and freed from the dartos layers by electrocautery. The edges of the shaft skin were finally sewn to the new preputial collar using 3-0 absorbable sutures. At one month follow up the patient showed good compliance.

Discussion
We retrospectively reviewed all the cases of male genital pearling come to our attention in the last 10 years of clinical and medico legal activity at our tertiary referral center in Italy. Totally five cases of male genital pearling were reviewed in our casuality, four in clinical and one in medico legal setting. Table 1 summaries some notable findings of male genital pearling of our casuistry.

All the patients had made pearling in order to enhance partner sexual pleasure, one patient (the case presented) had spontaneous pearl extrusion with scarring, two patients willing to remove them and just one patient wanted to maintain it. One case with eight pearls in prepuce extrusion with scarring, two patients willing to remove them and just one patient wanted to maintain it. One case with eight pearls in prepuce extrusion with scarring, two patients willing to remove them and just one patient wanted to maintain it. One case with eight pearls in prepuce extrusion with scarring, two patients willing to remove them and just one patient wanted to maintain it.
The beads may be inserted at different parts of the penis, dorsally (more foreign body is pushed under the penile skin through the small incision) or ventrally. Male genital pearling some notable findings. Table 1

Material | Reason of medical/forensic examination | Conclusion
---|---|---
Plastic | Post-mortem | Autopsy findings
Plastic | Willing to remove it | Removed by circumcision
Silicone | Voiding disorders and pelvic pain | Still carrying
Silicone | Willing to remove them | Surgically excised
Plastic | Scarring after spontaneous extrusion | Circumcision

Fixed beads can cause rupture of condoms and this can be a cause of higher HIV and other sexual disease transmission. Penile edema, infection, scarring, pain during erection, skin erosion are the most frequent complications. Penile pearling can be dangerous also for women causing abrasions and a few days of post-coital vaginal pain. We reported one case of spontaneous pearl extrusion with an evident inner face foreskin granuloma that imposed circumcision. The exeresis of the scar lesion alone would have determined an asymmetry of the preputial skin with a doubtful aesthetic result as well as the risk of scarring defects and consequently phimosis. No similar complication has been still reported.

Conclusions

Pearling appear to be quite rare in our geographical area; Pearling could reveal previous patient experiences as patient imprisonment, actual or previous history of drug abuse or it could be just an expression of dysmorphophobia; Pearling can cause discomfort or more severe complications to the patient who often asks for removal.

The sexual utter uselessness, its risk of complications, should always discourage this practice.
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Table 1

| Age | Prison/years | Drugs abuse | Procedure | Reason of implantation | No. of objects/Size, mm | Material | Reason of medical/forensic examination | Conclusion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39 | Yes/12 | NA | NA | Partner sexual pleasure | 8/7 | Plastic | Post-mortem | Autopsy findings |
| 37 | Yes/5 | No | Self-made | Partner sexual pleasure | 1/8 | Plastic | Willing to remove it | Removed by circumcision |
| 35 | No | No | Self-made | Partner sexual pleasure | 1/10 | Silicone | Voiding disorders and pelvic pain | Still carrying |
| 32 | No | No | Private surgical setting | Partner sexual pleasure | 2/3 | Silicone | Willing to remove them | Surgically excised |
| 35 | Yes/7 | Yes | Self-made | Partner sexual pleasure | 1/NA | Plastic | Scarring after spontaneous extrusion | Circumcision |
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