

Review of: "Outcomes of Rezum Water Vapor Therapy for Benign Prostate Obstruction with One-Year Follow-Up: Largest Real-World Data from Türkiye"

Franco Bergamaschi¹

¹ AUSL di Reggio Emilia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors are presenting retrospective results using Rezum treatment in 71 patients with BOO. They should be commended for their efforts to share with the scientific community their experience with one of the novel therapies for BPH and BOO, but some concepts or parts of their article may be stressed.

1) In the Introduction, they refer to the MIST (minimally invasive surgical treatment), which is particularly appreciated because they generally require minimal anesthesia. Why did they do 77% of their patients under general anesthesia? It could be helpful to provide an explanation for why this occurred.

2) There is no mention of the IIEF questionnaire or any investigation into ejaculation in the outcome measures paragraph.

3) In the "Study Design and Patients," the authors write "these individuals opted for Rezum therapy as their selected treatment approach," but more down they write in the thermal treatment procedure paragraph, "for blinding purposes, a surgical drape prevented subjects from visualizing the device and treating physician." In my opinion, this is a little controversial. Can the authors explain better? If patients know well the treatment planned, how are they blinded in relation to the treatment?

4) Inclusion and exclusion criteria might be in "Study Design and Patients," not in the "Patient Follow-up."

5) Patients were evaluated at 3 and 12 months after Rezum. Have the authors collected data at 6 months of follow-up? Knowing what happens after 6 months could be really interesting for a new therapy recently introduced in the clinical armamentarium.

6) The authors quote 3 tables that I don't see in the manuscript,

7) In my opinion, it could be better to correlate the outcome measure results to the different classes of prostate weight, median lobe or not, indwelling catheter or not, and the density of injections or vapor lesions done.

8) The results regarding ejaculation in patients who underwent Rezum are reported in the discussion instead of the results paragraph. It might be really interesting to discuss the ejaculation results of the only four studies available (quoted, but not reported). The authors write "two patients experienced retrograde or anejaculation, and two patients reported a decrease in ejaculation volume following Rezum." I suggest to the authors that they try to go into detail because it happened. This is

one of the crucial items to discuss: more men become old suffering from symptomatic BOO, and they ask, don't lose ejaculation. Is Rezum a reliable treatment to propose to them?