

CORRECTION

Open Access



Correction: Comparative analysis of two methods in circumcision: a new disposable device versus classic sleeve technique

Sinan Kılıç^{1*}

Correction to: *BMC Urology* (2024) 24:126
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12894-024-01513-9>

Following publication of the original article [1], Figs. 4 and 5 captions had been interchanged. Caption of Fig. 5 inadvertently give in as caption for Fig. 4 and vice versa. The figure(s) should have appeared as shown below.

The original article has been corrected.

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12894-024-01513-9>.

*Correspondence:

Sinan Kılıç
dr.sinankilic@yahoo.com

¹Department of Pediatric Surgery, Private Gebze Yuzyil Hospital, Clinic of Pediatric Surgery, Gebze, Kocaeli, Turkey



© The Author(s).




Fig. 4 Steps of removing Neo Alis Clamp. **A** One edge of the outer ring is cut with the help of a side cutter. **B** The other edge of the opposite ring is cut. **C** The outer ring is removed from the inner protective cap. **D** The outer ring and the inner ring are completely separated from each other. **E** View of the inner ring after removing the outer ring. **F** The inner ring is removed



Fig. 5 Secondary phimosis occurring after circumcision performed with the sleeve method

Published online: 31 July 2024

References

1. Kiliç S. Comparative analysis of two methods in circumcision: a new disposable device versus classic sleeve technique. *BMC Urol.* 2024;24:126. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12894-024-01513-9>.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.