

Regence

Medical Policy Manual

Surgery, Policy No. 210

Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia Surgical Treatments

Effective: April 1, 2026

Next Review: November 2026

Last Review: February 2026

IMPORTANT REMINDER

Medical Policies are developed to provide guidance for members and providers regarding coverage in accordance with contract terms. Benefit determinations are based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there may be any conflict between the Medical Policy and contract language, the contract language takes precedence.

PLEASE NOTE: Contracts exclude from coverage, among other things, services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers may bill members for services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers are encouraged to inform members before rendering such services that the members are likely to be financially responsible for the cost of these services.

DESCRIPTION

Transurethral water vapor thermal therapy and transurethral waterjet ablation are surgical alternatives to transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. Transperineal laser ablation involves the ultrasound-guided insertion of optical fibers percutaneously into the prostate gland. Laser energy is then delivered, which heats and destroys the hyperplastic tissue.

MEDICAL POLICY CRITERIA

Medically Necessary

- I. Transurethral water vapor thermal therapy may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) when all of the following criteria are met (A. – D.):
 - A. Moderate to severe symptomatic BPH (See Policy Guidelines); and
 - B. Individual is at least 50 years of age; and
 - C. Prostate volume is 30 cc to 80 cc by ultrasound or other radiologic assessment; and

- D. A trial of conservative medical therapy (defined as one month of an alpha blocker, 3 months of a 5-alpha reductase inhibitor, or 3 months of an anticholinergic) for BPH has been unsuccessful, is contraindicated, or is not tolerated (See Policy Guidelines).
- II. Transurethral waterjet ablation (e.g., Aquablation) may be considered **medically necessary** for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) when all of the following criteria are met (A. – C.):
 - A. Moderate to severe BPH (See Policy Guidelines); and
 - B. Prostate volume is 30cc to 150cc by ultrasound or other radiologic assessment; and
 - C. A trial of conservative medical therapy (defined as one month of an alpha blocker, 3 months of a 5-alpha reductase inhibitor, or 3 months of an anticholinergic) for BPH has been unsuccessful, is contraindicated, or is not tolerated (See Policy Guidelines).

Investigational

- III. Transurethral water vapor thermal therapy of the prostate and transurethral waterjet ablation are considered **investigational** when the above criteria are not met.
- IV. Transperineal laser ablation of benign prostatic hyperplasia is considered **investigational**.

NOTE: A summary of the supporting rationale for the policy criteria is at the end of the policy.

POLICY GUIDELINES

BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERPLASIA SEVERITY

The American Urological Association Symptom Index (AUA-SI) is a validated clinical tool for measuring severity of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH).^[1] BPH severity is reported as mild (AUA-SI score of 0 to 7), moderate (8 to 19), and severe (20 to 35). The IPSS is the same as the AUA-SI but includes an additional question regarding impact of symptoms on quality of life.

CONSERVATIVE MEDICAL THERAPY

The medications listed in Table 1 may be used for conservative treatment of BPH.

Table 1. Medications for conservative treatment of BPH

Class	Common Examples
Alpha-1-receptor antagonists	Alfuzosin (Uroxatral, Xatral), doxazosin (Cardura), tamsulosin (Flomax), and terazosin (Hytrin)
5-alpha reductase inhibitors	Finasteride, dutasteride
Anticholinergics	Fesoterodine (Toviaz), tolterodine (Detrol, Detrol LA), oxybutynin (Ditropan, Ditropan XL), darifenacin (Enablex), solifenacin (Vesicare), trospium (Sanctura, Sanctura XR)

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

The information below must be submitted for review to determine whether policy criteria are met. If any of these items are not submitted, it could impact our review and decision outcome.

- History and physical/chart notes
- Conservative treatment provided, if any
 - If options for more conservative management are relatively or absolutely contraindicated, those contraindications should be specified.
 - If options for more conservative management previously have been tried and have been ineffective or not tolerated, clinical information regarding those previous treatments should be provided.
- Relevant imaging (ultrasound, etc) reports documenting prostate volume.

CROSS REFERENCES

1. [Devices for Treatment of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia, Urethral Stricture, and Urethral Stenosis](#), Surgery Policy No. 230

BACKGROUND

Benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) is a diagnosis that describes the enlargement of the prostate often associated with a group of obstructive symptoms, termed lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS). These symptoms include decreased force of stream, hesitancy, straining, incomplete bladder emptying, and nocturia. The enlargement is caused by the proliferation of epithelial and smooth muscle cells in the transition zone of the prostate. Proliferation generally increases with age, and the initiation of BPH likely begins by the age of 30.^[2] According to a multinational survey, 90% of men ages 50-80 experience BPH, although only 11% of men in the study received medical treatment.^[3]

Standard management of BPH includes watchful waiting (active surveillance) in patients not bothered by their symptoms, medical management, surgery, and a number of new minimally invasive therapies. Surgical treatments include transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP), transurethral waterjet ablation (also referred to as robotic waterjet treatment [RWT] or Aquablation), transurethral vaporization, holmium laser enucleation or resection of the prostate, prostatic artery embolization, and prostatectomy. Minimally invasive therapies include transurethral needle ablation of the prostate (TUNA) and transurethral microwave thermotherapy (TUMT), as well as transurethral water vapor thermal therapy.

Transurethral water vapor thermal therapy is a process by which water vapor is created outside of the body and delivered to the prostate with a needle. The treatment is repeated in multiple locations within the prostate. During the procedure, saline irrigation cools and protects the surface of the urethra. The heat from the vapor disrupts cell membranes in the prostate, which leads to cell death and necrosis.

Aquablation cuts tissue by using a pressurized jet of fluid delivered to the prostatic urethra. The American Urological Association does not consider Aquablation to be a minimally invasive treatment because general anesthesia is required.^[4]

Transperineal laser ablation (TPLA) is a minimally invasive surgical intervention to treat BPH. TPLA is distinct from other lasers used for treatment of BPH that are not addressed in this

policy, including HolmiumLaser Enucleation of the Prostate (HoLEP), Green LightPhotoselective Vaporization of the Prostate (PVP) and Thulium Laser Vapo-enucleation (ThuVEP).

REGULATORY STATUS

In 2015, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the Rezūm™ System (NxThera, Inc., acquired by Boston Scientific in 2018) under the 510(k) process for use in relieving symptoms and obstructions, and reducing prostate tissue associated with BPH. It is indicated for men > 50 years of age with a prostate volume >30cm³ and <80cm³. The Rezum System is also indicated for the treatment of prostate with hyperplasia of the central zone and/or a median lobe.

In April 2017, the Aquabeam® System (Procept Robotics Corporation) was cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 513(f)(2) (de novo) classification process (DEN170024). The device is intended for the resection and removal of prostate tissue in males suffering from LUTS due to benign prostatic hyperplasia.

In May 2022, the ECHOLASER X4 laser system was cleared for marketing by the FDA under the 510(k) process. The device is indicated for use to necrotize or coagulate soft tissue through interstitial irradiation in medicine and surgery in cardiovascular thoracic surgery (excluding the heart and the vessels in the pericardial sac), dermatology, ear-nose-throat surgery, gastroenterology, general surgery, gynecology, head and neck surgery, plastic surgery, orthopedics, pulmonology, radiology, and urology, at a wavelength of 1064 nm.

EVIDENCE SUMMARY

The primary beneficial outcomes of interest are symptom reduction, measured in various ways, including the International Prostate Symptom Score (IPSS), the benign prostatic impact index (BPHII), and the maximum urinary flow rate (Qmax). Evaluating the safety and effectiveness of transurethral water vapor thermal therapy, Aquablation, and transperineal laser ablation requires randomized comparisons with standard care. These comparisons are necessary to determine whether the benefits of implantable cardiac monitors outweigh any risks and whether they offer advantages over conventional methods with respect to increasing quality of life and decreasing symptoms.

TRANSURETHRAL WATER VAPOR THERMAL THERAPY

Systematic Reviews

Chughtai (2022) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of treatment options for men with moderate-to-severe lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) due to benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH).^[5] This study examined the long-term cost-effectiveness of generic combination therapy (CT), prostatic urethral lift (PUL), water vapor thermal therapy (WVTT), photoselective vaporization of the prostate (PVP), and transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) for the treatment of BPH. The study found that IPSS improvement was highest in TURP and PVP, followed by WVTT. Compared to the other minimally invasive therapies WVTT had the highest quality-adjusted life years (QALY). However, QALYs from WVTT were lower than QALYs from the surgical therapies TURP and PVP.

Another systematic review by Tzeng (2022) reviewed all clinical trials investigating prostatic urethral lift (PUL), water vapor thermal therapy (WVTT), and temporary implantable nitinol device (TIND), with emphasis on clinical efficacy and complications.^[6] Eighteen articles were included in this study. Evidence consisted of few randomized controlled trials, and multiple single-arm prospective and retrospective studies. Among the emerging technologies introduced to treat BPE, the in-office PUL, WVTT, and TIND systems are valuable additions to the current surgical options. WVTT demonstrate acceptable outcomes in terms of functional improvement, retreatment, and complications.

A similar Cochrane network meta-analysis by Franco (2022) included randomized controlled trials assessing the following treatments: convective radiofrequency water vapor thermal therapy (WVTT; or Rezūm); prostatic arterial embolization (PAE); prostatic urethral lift (PUL; or Urolift); temporary implantable nitinol device (TIND); and transurethral microwave thermotherapy (TUMT) compared to transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) or sham surgery.^[7] This study reported that PUL and PAE had the highest likelihood of being the most efficacious for urinary symptoms and quality of life, TUMT for major adverse events, WVTT and TIND for erectile function and PUL for ejaculatory function.

Babar (2022) published a systematic review to evaluate the latest efficacy and safety profile of Rezūm in patients with LUTS secondary to BPH.^[8] Randomized and nonrandomized studies that evaluated urinary outcomes and/or adverse events were deemed eligible. Nineteen studies (N = 1942), published in 25 articles, were included. The study reported an improvement in the International Prostate Symptom Score (IPSS), quality of life (QoL), and maximum urinary flow rate (Qmax) as early as 1 month postoperatively and remained durable for up to 5 years.

A Cochrane systematic review (SR) was reported by Kang in 2020.^[9] The search was limited to parallel-group randomized controlled trials (RCTs), cluster-RCTs, and non-randomized observational prospective studies with concurrent comparison groups, in which men with BPH underwent convective radiofrequency water vapor thermal therapy, another active therapy, or a sham procedure. Only the RCT described below met inclusion criteria. The authors concluded that both urologic symptom scores and quality of life appear to be improved by water vapor thermal therapy, but they were very uncertain about major adverse events and that study limitations and imprecision led to a downgrade of evidence, which ranged from moderate to very low.

Randomized Controlled Trials

A single RCT was identified, with results published in multiple publications through five years of follow-up on a subset of participants.^[10-15] The trial began with a three month randomized phase followed by an uncontrolled, open-label crossover phase. One-hundred and ninety-seven men experiencing lower urinary tract symptoms associated with benign prostatic hyperplasia were randomized 2:1. The active treatment group received water vapor ablation therapy with the Rezūm® System and the control group underwent a control procedure including rigid cystoscopy with simulated active treatment sounds. After three months, 53 of 61 control subjects who met criteria elected to participate in a crossover active treatment study. The International Prostate Symptom Score (IPSS) was 10.8 (standard deviation [SD] = 6.5) and 17.5 (SD = 7.6) in the active therapy and sham groups, respectively ($p < 0.0001$) at three months post-treatment. The peak flow-rate (Qmax) increased significantly more in the treatment group at three months, to 16.1 (SD $\pm$ 7.3), compared with 10.8 (SD = 4) in the sham

group ($p < 0.0001$). Quality of life, as measured by the IPSS-QOL question, was statistically significantly better in the treatment group (2.3; SD = 1.4) than in the sham group (3.5; SD = 1.5; $p < 0.0001$).

In the patients that crossed over to the treatment group after unblinding at three months, improvements in IPSS, IPSS-QOL, and Qmax were all reported to be statistically significant compared to baseline values at 3, 6, 12, 24, 36, and 48 months ($p < 0.0001$). Sexual function scores (IIEF-EF and MSHQ function) remained unchanged at two years, but declined at four years (-7.6% change, $p = 0.0333$ and -14.2% change, $p = 0.0038$, respectively).

Adverse events reported include one treated patient each who experienced nausea, vomiting, and de-novo urinary retention. In addition, among active treatment patients, 17% reported dysuria, 15% reported hematuria, 7% reported urinary frequency, and 7% reported hematospermia. Over five years, the surgical retreatment rate was 4.4% and the medication retreatment rate was 11.1%.

At four years, 45 subjects were excluded from the analysis. Of these, seven were excluded due to use of BPH medication. Additionally, further surgical intervention was performed in six patients. Fifty percent of patients had data included for five-year outcomes. This study is limited by duration of follow-up, with no control group present after three months of follow-up, and a lack of comparison to alternative treatments. Additionally, there was a high loss to follow-up, with data available for the primary outcome at four years from 90 of 197 patients.

Nonrandomized Studies

Law (2024) prospectively compared transurethral WVTT with PUL in 148 patients with BPH from a single institution.^[16] The intervention was determined by patient choice. After two years, PUL was associated with a higher rate of reoperations than WVTT ($p = 0.010$). However, patients undergoing transurethral WVTT had more complications including urinary tract infections ($p < 0.001$) and hematuria ($p = 0.022$). There were no significant differences in Clavien-Dindo Grade 3-5 complications, IPSS scores, quality of life score, or peak velocity flow. The authors concluded that clinical outcomes were similar between WVTT and PUL, but complication rates were higher with WVTT.

Lim (2025) utilized electronic health records to retrospectively compare transurethral WVTT ($n = 3320$) with PUL ($n = 3320$) in patients with BPH.^[17] Similar to Law (2024) there were more reinterventions with PUL and more complications with transurethral WVTT. At three years, the reintervention rate for PUL was higher than WVTT ($p = 0.0049$), and this difference was maintained at five years ($p = 0.0003$). WVTT was associated with significantly higher rates of complications, including hematuria, dysuria, urinary retention, and fever. The authors concluded that WVTT has a more durable therapeutic effect, but the higher complication rate must be factored in clinical decision-making.

Garden (2021) published a retrospective analysis of Rezūm outcomes in men with prostates ≥ 80 cc (large prostate group; $n = 36$) versus < 80 cc (small prostate group; $n = 168$).^[18] For individuals with large prostates, there were significant improvements in Qmax and post-void residual volume (PVR) postoperatively ($p = 0.039$ and $p = 0.009$, respectively), but no changes in AUA-Symptom Score (AUA-SS) or Sexual Health Inventory for Men (SHIM) were reported ($p = 0.29$ and $p = 0.825$, respectively). For men with prostates < 80 cc, the study reported improved PVR (89.51 to 62.72, $p = 0.027$) and AUA-SS (16.59 to 11.21, $p = 0.003$), but not in Qmax (9.47 to 10.90, $p = 0.187$). Passing trial void (large prostate 94.44%, small prostate

93.45%), postoperative UTI (large prostate 19.44%, small prostate 10.12%), ED visits (large prostate 22.22%, small prostate 17.86%), readmissions (large prostate 8.33%, small prostate 4.76%), and retreatment (large prostate 8.33%, small prostate 4.76%) were not significantly different between groups. Mean days to foley removal (large prostate 9, small prostate 5.71, $p=0.003$) and urosepsis rates (large prostate 5.56%, small prostate 0.00%, $p=0.002$) were significantly different between groups. No Clavien grade $\geq$ III complications were reported.

Bole (2020) reported a retrospective analysis of Rezūm for large prostates.^[19] A total of 182 patients were identified as having undergone Rezūm, 25.8% of whom had prostate volume over 80cc. In this group, mean prostate volume was 119 cc and 55.3% were catheter dependent. AUA-SS improved from 22 pre-treatment to 13.4 following Rezūm ($p=0.04$). The improvement in peak flow rate was also statistically significant (7.7 to 12.7 mL/second; $p=0.002$).

Alegorides (2020) reported outcomes of 62 men with BPH treated with convective radiofrequency water vapor thermal therapy.^[20] The IPSS decreased significantly from baseline at six months post-treatment, and the decrease persisted at one year (12-point decrease, $p<0.001$). Also at one year, the QoL score decreased by 3.2 points ($p<0.001$), the Qmax improved by 6mL/s ($p<0.001$), and there was a 2.1% rate of surgical retreatment. No serious side effects ($>$ Clavien II) and no cases of de novo erectile dysfunction were reported.

McVary (2020) reported on a retrospective case series of water vapor thermal therapy for nonneurogenic complete urinary retention associated with BPH.^[21] A total of 38 men with complete urinary retention and catheter-dependence were treated with water vapor thermal therapy using the Rezūm™ System. Of the 37 men available for follow-up, 26 voided spontaneously and were catheter free at a median of 26 days (range 4 to 65) following the procedure. Median follow-up for the catheter-free patients was 15.8 months. Adverse events included dysuria ($n=5$), gross hematuria ($n=4$), and UTIs in patients with indwelling catheters ($n=2$).

Mollengard (2018) published a retrospective review of 129 patients with BPH who underwent Rezūm. Minimum follow-up was four months. IPSS, and Qmax improved from baseline at the 91-180 day follow-up (18.3 to 6.9 and 10.5 to 16.8 mL/s, respectively; $p<0.001$). PVR also significantly improved over that time span (108.0 to 73.1, $p=0.005$). The most commonly reported adverse events were urinary tract infections (17%) and transient urinary retention (14%).

Darson (2017) reported the results of a case series of 131 patients treated with transurethral convective radiofrequency water-vapor thermal therapy with LUTS associated with BPH.^[22] Not all values were reported for all patients at all time-points. Statistical significance of changes from baseline was determined using a longitudinal general estimation-equation model using an exchangeable working correlation structure, which takes into account the correlation within a subject over time. IPSS at baseline, three to six months, and 12 months was 19.9 (SD = 6.7), 9.8 (SD = 6.9), and 10.1 (SD = 7.2). The three to six- and 12-month values were significantly lower than baseline ($p<0.001$). Qmax values at baseline, three to six, and 12 months were 8.7 (SD = 4.7), 11.6 (SD = 7.7), and 10 (SD = 5). The three- to six-month value was significantly different from baseline, but the 12-month value was not ($p=0.04$ and $p=0.4$, respectively). Improvement in IPSS-QOL scores from baseline to three-month follow-up was statistically significant, from 4.3 (SD = 1.2) to 2.3 (SD = 1.5; $p<0.0001$), and this statistically significant improvement was maintained at the 12-month follow-up. Urinary frequency, urgency,

frequency and urgency, hematuria and nocturia were reported in less or equal to 4% of patients.

Dixon (2015 and 2016) reported the results of a case series in two publications.^[23, 24] A total of 65 men at or above the age of 45 experiencing LUTS secondary to BPH received convective radiofrequency thermal therapy. Results were gathered as self-administered questionnaires as well as measurements taken at scheduled follow-up visits over the following two years. Not all values were reported for all patients at all time-points. Statistical differences were calculated using a paired Student's *t*-test for each measure. IPSS at one, three, 12, and 24 months was 14.8 (SD = 8.4), 8.3 (SD = 5.8), 9.2 (SD = 6.5), and 9.6 (SD = 6.5), respectively. All values were significantly improved compared to baseline (21.7 SD = 5.5; $p < 0.001$). Qmax at one, three, 12, and 24 months was 9.9 (SD = 3.9), 12.8, 12.7 (SD = 6.3), and 12 (SD = 6.2). These values were also values were significantly improved compared to baseline (7.9 SD $\pm$ 3.2; $p < 0.001$ except 24 months, where $p = 0.001$). Improvement in IPSS-QOL scores from baseline to each time point reported were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). Adverse events reported were hematuria (14%), UTIs (20%), dysuria (22%), and urinary urgency (20%). All were mild to moderate transient events and 75% were reported within the first 30 days.

Section Summary

The evidence regarding transurethral water vapor thermal therapy of the prostate for the treatment of BPH includes systematic reviews, one RCT, two case series, and a non-randomized studies. These studies report clinically significant improvements in several measures of urinary symptoms and quality of life. Limitations of the published evidence include limited comparative follow-up and lack of studies with no industry associations. Despite the limitations, water vapor thermal therapy appears to improve urologic symptom scores and quality of life.

TRANSURETHRAL WATERJET ABLATION (AQUABLATION)

Systematic Reviews

Van Kollenburg (2023) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 10 RCTs in order to compare treatments for LUTS to each other and to TURP.^[25] The treatments included Aquablation, prostatic urethral lift, prostatic artery embolization, convective water vapor thermal treatment and temporary implantable nitinol device (TIND). The review found that overall aquablation was most comparable to TURP. Of the treatment alternatives to TURP Aquablation was associated with the greatest improvement in Qmax at both 3- and 12-months follow-up (mean difference 0.80; 95%CI: -4.25, 5.88). However, TURP improved Qmax scores better than the other treatments. Aquablation was also comparable to TURP for post void residual improvement. There were no significant differences between TURP and the other treatments for IPSS or Quality of Life scores. Overall adverse events were more likely with TURP, but Aquablation was associated with a two times higher incidence of urine retention compared to the other treatments. The authors note the available evidence from RCTs is heterogeneous and of low certainty but concluded that Aquablation is the most effective of the alternative therapies for LUTS included in the review.

Randomized Controlled Trials

Aquablation for treatment of BPH has been assessed in one RCT, known as WATER (Waterjet Ablation Therapy for Endoscopic Resection of Prostate Tissue; NCT02505919).^[26] WATER

was a noninferiority trial comparing Aquablation with TURP in 181 participants at 17 sites in four countries. Participants were men ages 45 to 80 years with moderate-to-severe LUTS, defined as IPSS 10 score greater than or equal to 12, and prostate size between 30 and 80 cc. There were 65 participants in the Aquablation group and 116 in the TURP group. The primary efficacy endpoint was the difference between groups in the change in IPSS at six months, and the primary safety end point was the development of Clavien-Dindo persistent grade 1, or 2 or higher operative complications at three months. Primary endpoint results were reported by Gilling in 2018,^[26] 12-month results in Gilling (2019),^[27] and three-year results in Gilling (2020).^[28] Additionally, a synthesis of the trial results up to 12 months was reported in a Cochrane systematic review conducted by Hwang (2019).^[29]

WATER trial results at 12 months, as summarized in the Cochrane review, are shown in Table 1. The reviewers assessed the certainty of the evidence for each outcome using the GRADE approach.^[29] The reviewers concluded that up to 12 months, Aquablation likely results in a similar improvement in urologic symptom scores to TURP and may result in similar quality of life when compared to TURP. They also concluded that Aquablation may result in little to no difference in major adverse events but considered the evidence for this finding very low certainty due to study limitations and imprecision of estimates.

Table 1. WATER Trial Results at 12 months (Adapted from Hwang [2019])

Outcome at 12 months	N Analyzed	Mean Difference (95% CI)	Certainty of the Evidence (Reason for downgrading)
IPSS	174	-0.6 (-2.51 to 2.39)	Moderate (study limitations)
IPSS QoL	174	0.27 (-0.024 to 0.78)	Low (imprecision)
Major adverse events	181	15 fewer per 1000 (-64 to 116) RR 0.84 (0.31 to 2.26)	Very low (high risk of performance bias, unclear risk of reporting bias, wide confidence interval crosses assumed threshold of minimal clinically important difference)
Retreatment	181	10 more per 1000 (13 fewer to 228 more) RR 1.68 (0.18 to 15.83)	Very low (imprecision and high risk of performance and attrition bias)
Erectile function	64	2.31 (-0.63 to 5.25)	Very low (imprecision and high risk of performance and attrition bias)
Ejaculatory function	121	2.57 (0.6 to 4.53)	Very low (imprecision: confidence interval crosses assumed threshold of minimal clinically important difference, high risk of performance and attrition bias)

Source: adapted from Hwang (2019). RR: relative risk; WATER: Waterjet Ablation Therapy for Endoscopic Resection of Prostate Tissue

On the primary efficacy outcome, Aquablation was noninferior to TURP. At six months, mean IPSS decreased from baseline by 16.9 points for Aquablation and 15.1 points for TURP (mean difference 1.8 points; $p < 0.0001$ for noninferiority and $p = 0.1347$ for superiority). The primary safety endpoint rate was lower in the Aquablation group compared to the TURP group (26% vs 42%, $p = 0.0149$). The rate of grade 2 and greater events was similar in the two groups (20% for Aquablation and 23% for TURP; $p = 0.3038$).

Gilling (2020) reported WATER trial results at three years (Table 2).^[28] Improvements in symptoms and quality of life were maintained through three years in both treatment groups, and the rate of serious adverse events did not differ between groups any time point.

Table 2. WATER Trial Results at 3 Years

Treatment	Mean IPSS reduction at 3 years	Mean % reduction in IPSS at 3 years	Improvement at least 5 points from baseline at 3 years	IPSS QoL improvement at 3 years	Qmax (mL/s)	Retreatment Rate at 3 years	Serious Adverse Events Subjects (%)
Aquablation	14.4 (6.8)	64%	78%	3.2 (1.8)	11.6	5/116 (4.3%)	0 to 3 months: 7 (6.0%) 3 months to 1 year: 5 (4.3%) 1 to 2 years: 8 (6.9%) 2 to 3 years: 4 (3.4%)
TURP	13.9 (8.6)	61%	82%	3.2 (1.7)	8.2	1/65 (1.5%)	0 to 3 months: 04 (6.2%) 3 months to 1 year: 5 (7.7%) 1 to 2 years: 2 (3.1%) 2 to 3 years: 1 (1.5%)
Difference	0.6 (-3.3 to 2.2)	3%	4%	0	3.3 (-0.5 to 7.1)	2.8%	
p-value	0.6848	NS	NS	0.7845	0.0848	0.4219	NS at any time point

AE: adverse events; BPH: benign prostatic hyperplasia Impact Index; IIEF: International Index of Erectile Function; IPSS: International Prostate Symptom Score; MSHQ-ED Male Sexual Health Questionnaire-Erectile Dysfunction; NR: not reported; NS: not significant; Qmax: peak urinary flow; QoL: quality of life; RCT: randomized controlled trial; WATER: Waterjet Ablation Therapy for Endoscopic Resection of Prostate Tissue

Oumedjbeur (2023) published five-year outcomes of the WATER trial in the subgroup of men with prostate volumes 50-80mL.^[30] The differences in IPSS scores in which Aquablation showed greater improvement than TURP were maintained at five years ($P=0.020$); however, the improvement in Qmax and QoL seen at three years did not remain consistent. There was no change in ejaculatory function with Aquablation at five years, but TURP was associated with a decline in MSHQ-EjD scores at all follow-up time points ($p=0.0095$). Aquablation was associated with a lower rate of medical and surgical retreatment for LUTS than TURP at 5 years (3.2% vs. 17.6%). The occurrence of serious adverse events was not significantly different between the two treatments ($p>0.05$). The authors concluded that Aquablation is superior to TURP for prostates 50-80mL. The study was limited by a significant difference in prostate size at baseline, however a sensitivity analysis found no change in IPSS measures when controlling for baseline prostate size.

There were limitations of the WATER trial in outcomes, blinding, and selective reporting. Adverse events occurring after one year were not adjudicated by the clinical events committee. Although patients and outcome assessors were blinded, baseline evaluation and study surgeons were not blinded. Additionally, secondary outcomes were not prespecified.

WATER II was a prospective clinical trial that investigated whether Aquablation is effective for people with larger prostate volumes than were included in the WATER trial. WATER II enrolled 101 men from 16 study sites who had prostate volumes of 80 to 150mL. Bhojani (2023) published 5-year outcomes from the WATER II trial, reporting on 60 subjects who completed their 60-month visit.^[31] Study attrition was directly linked to the COVID-19 pandemic for about half of the participants who were not available at five years. Study outcomes included IPSS scores, which showed significant improvement at 5-years compared to baseline ($p < 0.001$). There was also significant improvement in mean Qmax, which increased from 8.6 to 17.1 mL/s at five years ($p < 0.001$). However, six (6%) of patients were prescribed medication for BPH and an additional 3% had surgical retreatment for LUTS. The majority of these interventions occurred in the initial three years after Aquablation, suggesting stabilization may have occurred. Limitations include the single-arm design of the study.

Nonrandomized studies

Several nonrandomized, single-arm studies have been performed, primarily with small sample sizes and short follow-up. Outcomes from prospective studies with over 100 participants and 12 months or longer follow-up are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. Nonrandomized Studies of Aquablation

Study	Study Design	n	Mean prostate volume (range) mL	Follow-up	Urinary/QOL outcomes	Ejaculatory/Sexual function	Adverse Events
Bach (2020) ^[32]	prospective, multicenter, single-arm, open-label, international clinical trial	178	59.3 (20–148)	12 months	IPSS (21.6 at baseline to 6.5 at 12 months) and Qmax (10 cc/s at baseline to 20.8 cc/s at 12 months) significantly at 12 months ($p < 0.0001$ for both)	No significant change from baseline in any MSHQ measure except Male Sexual Health Questionnaire bother score at 12 months ($p = 0.0025$).	36 Clavien-Dindo grade 2 or higher events. Primarily injection and bleeding
Desai (2020) ^[33]	prospective case series	101	107 (80–150)	2 years	Mean IPSS (23.2 at baseline to 5.8 at 2 years, $p < 0.0001$) and IPSS quality of life (4.6 at baseline to 1.1 at 2 years, $p < 0.0001$) improved significantly at the two-year follow-up	Not reported	29% within 1 month

Section summary

The evidence for transurethral waterjet ablation, (Aquablation) includes a systematic review of ten RCTs that found Aquablation is similar to TURP. Evidence from published five-year outcomes of the pivotal RCT, the WATER trial, demonstrate sustained improvement in IPSS

scores with Aquablation compared to TURP in people with prostate volumes of 50-80mL. A non-randomized study included men with prostate volumes up to 150mL, who therefore have limited treatment options, found improved IPSS scores and mean Qmax at five years compared to baseline. Limitations of the published evidence include incomplete blinding and baseline differences in prostate sizes. Despite these limitations, Aquablation is associated with sustained symptom improvement compared to TURP, and with symptom improvement in cases of larger prostate volumes that are not suitable for TURP.

TRANSPERINEAL LASER ABLATION

Systematic Reviews

Pires (2026) published a systematic review and meta-analysis of TPLA outcomes for treatment of LUTS/BPH.^[34] The review included 17 studies involving 777 participants. Three studies were RCTs and 14 were cohort studies. Pooled analysis found Qmax improvement after TPLA at three months ($p<0.001$), with continuing improvement at six and 12 months ($p<0.001$; $p<0.001$). IPAA scores were also significantly improved at all time points up to 12 months ($p<0.001$). In studies that analyzed ejaculatory function using the Male Sexual Health Questionnaire – Ejaculatory Dysfunction (MSHQ-EjD), significant improvement was seen after three and six months ($p<0.002$; $p<0.001$). However, studies that used the International Index of Erectile Dysfunction (IIEF-5) found no significant differences in erectile function twelve months after TPLA ($p=0.363$). When compared to TURP, there was no significant difference in treatment effectiveness based on IPSS scores ($p=0.369$), but TPLA was associated with improved sexual function (MSHQ-EjD; $p=0.023$). Of the 14 studies that reported complication rates, the most common were acute urinary retention, urinary tract infection, hematuria, and prostatic abscess. Study limitations include that most included research was not comparative, which limits the certainty of the evidence. The authors concluded there is need for additional high-quality studies with longer follow-up times to evaluate TPLA.

Randomized studies

Pacini (2025) published a randomized trial that compared the efficacy of transperineal laser ablation (TPLA) to WVT in 80 people with LUTS/BPH.^[35] Baseline prostate and transitional zone volumes were noted to be higher in the TPLA group. TPLA was associated with significantly higher IPSS improvement at three months ($p=0.03$), and at six months ($p=0.007$). Median quality of life scores were significantly better for TPLA at three months ($p=0.002$) but the difference was not sustained ($p=0.68$ at six months). The authors concluded that both treatments are safe and effective, but symptom improvement may occur more quickly with TPLA than WVT. Limitations of the study include small sample size and short follow-up time.

In 2023, Bertolo conducted a randomized controlled trial examining the reliability of transperineal interstitial laser ablation (TPLA) of the prostate to transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP).^[36] Patients with an indication for surgical treatment for benign prostatic obstruction were recruited for this study. A total of 51 patients were enrolled (26 TPLA, 25 TURP) in the study. The primary study outcome was ejaculatory function one month post treatment, and secondary outcomes included pain VAS scores, sexual function, International Prostate Symptom Score, quality of life score, and maximum urinary flow rate at 1-6 months. No differences in pain VAS scores and sexual function were found between groups. Ejaculatory function decreased in the TURP group while it was unmodified in the TPLA group. Absence of antegrade ejaculation was reported in 1 patient in the TPLA group compared to 18 patients in the TURP group. Both treatments improved maximum urinary flow rate. Overall,

these findings indicate that transperineal interstitial laser ablation may help preserve ejaculatory function and provide relief from benign prostatic obstruction. Additional research is needed with more participants and a longer duration follow-up to better determine the impacts on patient health outcomes.

In 2023, Canat published a prospective, randomized-controlled study examining the first-year results of transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) and transperineal laser ablation (TPLA).^[37] Preoperative and first-year International Prostate Symptom Score, International Erectile Dysfunction Index, Male Sexual Health Questionnaire-Ejaculatory Dysfunction, Quality of Life, peak urinary flow rate, prostate volume, and postvoid residual were examined among 50 patients (25 TPLA, 25 TURP). Peak urinary flow rate was improved in both groups but was significantly better in the TURP group ($P < 0.01$). Both groups also significantly improved IPSS and postvoid residual scores at 1 year ($p < 0.01$). Other results were not significantly different by group. These results indicate that the TPLA symptomatic effect without sacrificing ejaculatory functions are comparable to TURP. Further research is needed to determine if this method provides additional benefits to TURP, as well as investigating potential adverse events.

Nonrandomized studies

De Rienzo (2021) reported a prospective case series of TPLA for benign prostatic obstruction (BPO), with prostate volumes $> 100\text{mL}$.^[38] A total of 21 men with average prostate volume of $43.5 \pm 8.5\text{ mL}$ were treated. All patients but one discontinued medical therapy by one month. Improvements were reported at one month and six months in Qmax (one month $+3.4 \pm 5.7\text{ mL/s}$; $p < 0.01$; six months $+4.7 \pm 6.0\text{ mL/s}$; $p < 0.01$) and IPSS (one month -5.6 ± 7.0 ; $p < 0.01$; six months -13.1 ± 4.7 ; $p < 0.01$). The ejaculatory function was preserved as the MSHQ-EjD increased ($p < 0.05$). One complication was reported (a prostatic abscess, treated with transperineal drainage and antibiotic).

Manenti (2021) reported results of 44 patients treated with TPLA.^[39] At 3, 6, and 12 months, outcomes were analyzed for urodynamic parameters (Qmax and PVR), sexual function (IIEF5), ejaculation function (MSHQ-EjD), symptoms and quality of life evaluation (IPSS and I-QoL). Five of 44 patients (11.3%) had urinary blockage due to clots and required re-catheterisation for 2 weeks. The overall adverse event rate was 7%. At the 12-month of follow-up, all patients reported a decrease in LUTS. Mean IPSS was 6.2 ± 3.8 and mean I-QoL was 2.1 ± 1.1 . According to uroflowmetry, mean Qmax was $16.2 \pm 4.9\text{ mL/s}$ and a PVR of $18.8 \pm 8.5\text{ mL}$ (all mean $\pm$ standard deviation).

Frego (2021) reported on 22 consecutive patients treated with TPLA for LUTS.^[40] Complications included urinary retention in three of twenty-two patients (13.6%) and urinary tract infection in two patients (9.1%). Median prostate volume significantly decreased at 3, 6, and 12 months, (-21.3% , -29% , and -41% , respectively). Median IPSS was 8 (-63.6%), 5 (-74%), and 6 (-75%) at 3, 6, and 12 months, respectively, and median QoL score was 1 in all the scheduled timepoints of follow-up. The median postoperative Qmax improved at 3, 6, and 12 months improved ($+57.8\%$, $+98\%$, and $+115.8\%$, respectively). Ejaculatory function was reported to be preserved in 21 out of 22 patients (95.5%).

Cai (2022) also reported on 22 patients treated with TPLA for BPH. No complications were reported. After six months, significant improvements were reported in average IPSS (pretreatment 22.7 ± 5.3 ; posttreatment 9.1 ± 3.2 , $p < 0.001$), QoL (pretreatment 4.9 ± 1.7 ; posttreatment 2.3 ± 1.3 , $p < 0.001$), Qmax (pretreatment 8.5 ± 3.0 ; posttreatment 15.2 ± 4.8

mL/s, $p < 0.001$), PVR (pretreatment 78.7 ± 58.8 ; posttreatment 30.3 ± 34.2 , $p < 0.05$), and mean prostate volume (pretreatment 70.8 ± 23.8 ; posttreatment 54.7 ± 20.9 mL, $p < 0.05$).

Pacella (2020) reported a retrospective case series with outcomes at 6 and 12 months post-transperineal laser ablation.^[41] A total of 160 patients were evaluated at six months and 86 patients at 12 months. Grade I complications occurred in 7/160 (4.3%) and grade III occurred in 1/160 (0.6%) patients. At six months, International Prostate Symptoms (IPSS) improved from 22.5 ± 5.1 to 7.7 ± 3.3 ($p < 0.001$), post-void residual urine volume (PVR) from 89.5 ± 84.6 to 27.2 ± 44.5 ml ($p < 0.001$), maximum urinary flow rate (Qmax) from 8.0 ± 3.8 to 14.3 ± 3.9 ml/s ($p < 0.001$), quality of life (QoL) from 4.5 ± 1.1 to 1.8 ± 1.0 ($p < 0.001$), and volume from 75.0 ± 32.4 to 60.3 ± 24.5 ml ($p < 0.001$). At 12 months, IPSS improved from 22.5 ± 4.5 to 7.0 ± 2.9 ($p < 0.001$), PVR from 71.7 ± 93.9 to 17.8 ± 51.0 ml ($p < 0.001$), Qmax from 8.6 ± 5.2 to 15.0 ± 4.0 ml/s ($p < 0.001$), QoL from 4.2 ± 0.6 to 1.6 ± 0.9 ($p < 0.001$), volume from 87.9 ± 31.6 to 58.8 ± 22.9 ml ($p < 0.001$).

Section Summary

The evidence for transperineal laser ablation includes two small RCTs that do not consistently demonstrate superior symptom improvement compared to TURP. Non-randomized studies show that TPLA may improve BPH symptoms compared to baseline measures. No guidelines recommend TPLA. Therefore, the evidence is insufficient to determine that TPLA results in an improvement in net health outcomes compared to other treatments for BPH.

PRACTICE GUIDELINE SUMMARY

American Urological Association

The American Urological Association (AUA) published an evidence-based clinical practice guideline in 2021 which was amended in 2023. The Management of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia/ Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms: AUA Guideline includes the following recommendations:^[42]

- WVT [water vapor thermal therapy] should be considered as a treatment option for patients with LUTS/BPH provided prostate volume 30-80cc. (Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)
- WVT may be offered as a treatment option to eligible patients who desire preservation of erectile and ejaculatory function. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)
- Robotic waterjet treatment (RWT) may be offered as a treatment option to patients with LUTS/BPH provided prostate volume 30-80cc. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

A conditional recommendation is described as:

- Balance between Benefits & Risks/Burdens unclear
- Alternative strategies may be equally reasonable
- Better evidence likely to change confidence

SUMMARY

It appears that transurethral water vapor thermal therapy and transurethral waterjet ablation (Aquablation) of the prostate improve urinary symptoms for some people with benign prostatic hyperplasia. In addition, clinical practice guidelines based on evidence recommend transurethral water vapor thermal therapy and transurethral waterjet ablation of the prostate for certain individuals with benign prostatic hyperplasia. Therefore, transurethral water vapor thermal therapy and transurethral waterjet ablation of the prostate may be considered medically necessary when criteria are met. In all other situations, there is not enough evidence to show that transurethral water vapor thermal therapy or transurethral waterjet ablation of the prostate improves health outcomes. Therefore, transurethral water vapor thermal therapy and transurethral waterjet ablation of the prostate are considered investigational when criteria are not met.

There is not enough research to show that transperineal laser ablation improves health outcomes or symptoms for people with benign prostatic hyperplasia. In addition, no clinical guidelines based on evidence recommend transperineal laser ablation for benign prostatic hyperplasia. Therefore, transperineal laser ablation is considered investigational.

REFERENCES

1. Barry MJ, Fowler FJ, Jr., O'Leary M P, et al. The American Urological Association Symptom Index for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *The Journal of urology*. 2017;197(2s):S189-s97. PMID: 28012747
2. Berry SJ, Coffey DS, Walsh PC, et al. The development of human benign prostatic hyperplasia with age. *The Journal of urology*. 1984;132(3):474-9. PMID: 6206240
3. Rosen R, Altwein J, Boyle P, et al. Lower urinary tract symptoms and male sexual dysfunction: the multinational survey of the aging male (MSAM-7). *Eur Urol*. 2003;44(6):637-49. PMID: 14644114
4. Foster HE, Dahm P, Kohler TS, et al. Surgical Management of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Attributed to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: AUA Guideline Amendment 2019. *The Journal of urology*. 2019;202(3):592-98. PMID: 31059668
5. Chughtai B, Rojanasart S, Neeser K, et al. A comprehensive analysis of clinical, quality of life, and cost-effectiveness outcomes of key treatment options for benign prostatic hyperplasia. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(4):e0266824. PMID: 35427376
6. Tzeng M, Basourakos SP, Lewicki PJ, et al. New Endoscopic In-office Surgical Therapies for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: A Systematic Review. *Eur Urol Focus*. 2022;8(2):522-31. PMID: 33663982
7. Franco JVA, Jung JH, Imamura M, et al. Minimally invasive treatments for benign prostatic hyperplasia: a Cochrane network meta-analysis. *BJU Int*. 2022;130(2):142-56. PMID: 34820997
8. Babar M, Loloi J, Tang K, et al. Emerging outcomes of water vapor thermal therapy (Rezüm) in a broad range of patients with lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia: A systematic review. *Low Urin Tract Symptoms*. 2022;14(3):140-54. PMID: 35233955

9. Kang TW, Jung JH, Hwang EC, et al. Convective radiofrequency water vapour thermal therapy for lower urinary tract symptoms in men with benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2020;3(3):Cd013251. PMID: 32212174
10. McVary KT, Roehrborn CG. Three-Year Outcomes of the Prospective, Randomized Controlled Rezum System Study: Convective Radiofrequency Thermal Therapy for Treatment of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Due to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *Urology*. 2018;111:1-9. PMID: 29122620
11. McVary KT, Gange SN, Gittelman MC, et al. Erectile and Ejaculatory Function Preserved With Convective Water Vapor Energy Treatment of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: Randomized Controlled Study. *The journal of sexual medicine*. 2016;13(6):924-33. PMID: 27129767
12. McVary KT, Gange SN, Gittelman MC, et al. Minimally Invasive Prostate Convective Water Vapor Energy Ablation: A Multicenter, Randomized, Controlled Study for the Treatment of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *The Journal of urology*. 2016;195(5):1529-38. PMID: 26614889
13. Roehrborn CG, Gange SN, Gittelman MC, et al. Convective Thermal Therapy: Durable 2-Year Results of Randomized Controlled and Prospective Crossover Studies for Treatment of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Due to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *The Journal of urology*. 2017;197(6):1507-16. PMID: 27993667
14. McVary KT, Rogers T, Roehrborn CG. Rezum Water Vapor Thermal Therapy for Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Associated With Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: 4-Year Results From Randomized Controlled Study. *Urology*. 2019;126:171-79. PMID: 30677455
15. McVary KT, Gittelman MC, Goldberg KA, et al. Final 5-Year Outcomes of the Multicenter Randomized Sham-Controlled Trial of a Water Vapor Thermal Therapy for Treatment of Moderate to Severe Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *The Journal of urology*. 2021;206(3):715-24. PMID: 33872051
16. Law YXT, Chen WJK, Shen L, et al. Convective Water Vapor Energy Ablation (Rezum®) Versus Prostatic Urethral Lift (Urolift®): A 2-Year Prospective Study. *J Endourol*. 2024;38(12):1387-94. PMID: 39302046
17. Lim CY, Lai CC, Tsai YW. Comparison of Durability Between Rezum Water Vapor Therapy and UroLift in Treating Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: A Multicenter Propensity Score-Matched Analysis. *Cureus*. 2025;17(3):e80914. PMID: 40125525
18. Garden EB, Shukla D, Ravivarapu KT, et al. Rezum therapy for patients with large prostates (≥ 80 g): initial clinical experience and postoperative outcomes. *World J Urol*. 2021;1-8. PMID: 33392646
19. Bole R, Gopalakrishna A, Kuang R, et al. Comparative Postoperative Outcomes of Rezūm Prostate Ablation in Patients with Large Versus Small Glands. *J Endourol*. 2020;34(7):778-81. PMID: 32408768
20. Alegorides C, Fourmarier M, Eghazarian C, et al. Treatment of benign prostate hyperplasia using the Rezum® water vapor therapy system: Results at one year. *Prog Urol*. 2020. PMID: 32826195
21. McVary KT, Holland B, Beahrs JR. Water vapor thermal therapy to alleviate catheter-dependent urinary retention secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis*. 2019;10.1038/s41391-019-0187-5. PMID: 31740738
22. Darson MF, Alexander EE, Schiffman ZJ, et al. Procedural techniques and multicenter postmarket experience using minimally invasive convective radiofrequency thermal therapy with Rezum system for treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms due to benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Res Rep Urol*. 2017;9:159-68. PMID: 28861405

23. Dixon CM, Cedano ER, Pacik D, et al. Two-year results after convective radiofrequency water vapor thermal therapy of symptomatic benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Res Rep Urol*. 2016;8:207-16. PMID: 27921028
24. Dixon C, Cedano ER, Pacik D, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Rezum System Water Vapor Treatment for Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *Urology*. 2015;86(5):1042-7. PMID: 26216644
25. van Kollenburg RAA, van Riel L, de Bruin DM, et al. Novel minimally invasive treatments for lower urinary tract symptoms: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Int Braz J Urol*. 2023;49(4):411-27. PMID: 37267609
26. Gilling P, Barber N, Bidair M, et al. WATER: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Controlled Trial of Aquablation(®) vs Transurethral Resection of the Prostate in Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *The Journal of urology*. 2018;199(5):1252-61. PMID: 29360529
27. Gilling PJ, Barber N, Bidair M, et al. Randomized Controlled Trial of Aquablation versus Transurethral Resection of the Prostate in Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: One-year Outcomes. *Urology*. 2019;125:169-73. PMID: 30552937
28. Gilling P, Barber N, Bidair M, et al. Three-year outcomes after Aquablation therapy compared to TURP: results from a blinded randomized trial. *Can J Urol*. 2020;27(1):10072-79. PMID: 32065861
29. Hwang EC, Jung JH, Borofsky M, et al. Aquablation of the prostate for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms in men with benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;2(2):Cd013143. PMID: 30759311
30. Oumedjbeur K, Corsi NJ, Bouhadana D, et al. Aquablation versus TURP: 5-year outcomes of the WATER randomized clinical trial for prostate volumes 50-80 mL. *Can J Urol*. 2023;30(5):11650-58. PMID: 37838991
31. Bhojani N, Bidair M, Kramolowsky E, et al. Aquablation Therapy in Large Prostates (80-150 mL) for Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Due to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: Final WATER II 5-Year Clinical Trial Results. *The Journal of urology*. 2023;210(1):143-53. PMID: 37115632
32. Bach T, Gilling P, El Hajj A, et al. First Multi-Center All-Comers Study for the Aquablation Procedure. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(2). PMID: 32102329
33. Desai M, Bidair M, Bhojani N, et al. Aquablation for benign prostatic hyperplasia in large prostates (80-150 cc): 2-year results. *Can J Urol*. 2020;27(2):10147-53. PMID: 32333733
34. Pires IZ, Gobbo M, Fujimura AY, Jr., et al. Transperineal Laser Ablation for Treatment of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms in Benign Prostate Enlargement: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Int Braz J Urol*. 2026;52(2). PMID: 41576182
35. Pacini M, Zucchi A, Salonia A, et al. Short term results after minimally invasive treatments for benign prostatic enlargement: the first randomized trial comparing transperineal laser ablation and water vapor ablation. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis*. 2025;28(4):978-84. PMID: 40281201
36. Bertolo R, Iacovelli V, Cipriani C, et al. Ejaculatory function following transperineal laser ablation vs TURP for benign prostatic obstruction: a randomized trial. *BJU Int*. 2023;132(1):100-08. PMID: 36917033
37. Canat HL, Gurbuz C, Bozkurt M. Transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) versus transperineal laser ablation (TPLA) due to benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH): prospective and comparative study. *Int Urol Nephrol*. 2023;55(11):2747-52. PMID: 37498422

38. de Rienzo G, Lorusso A, Minafra P, et al. Transperineal interstitial laser ablation of the prostate, a novel option for minimally invasive treatment of benign prostatic obstruction. *Eur Urol.* 2021;80(1):95-103. PMID: 32868137
39. Manenti G, Perretta T, Calcagni A, et al. 3-T MRI and clinical validation of ultrasound-guided transperineal laser ablation of benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Eur Radiol Exp.* 2021;5(1):41. PMID: 34532768
40. Frego N, Saita A, Casale P, et al. Feasibility, safety, and efficacy of ultrasound-guided transperineal laser ablation for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia: a single institutional experience. *World J Urol.* 2021;39(10):3867-73. PMID: 33811512
41. Pacella CM, Patelli G, Iapicca G, et al. Transperineal laser ablation for percutaneous treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia: a feasibility study. Results at 6 and 12 months from a retrospective multi-centric study. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis.* 2020;23(2):356-63. PMID: 31827239
42. Sandhu JS, Bixler BR, Dahm P, et al. Management of Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Attributed to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH): AUA Guideline Amendment 2023. *The Journal of urology.* 2024;211(1):11-19. PMID: 37706750

CODES

Codes	Number	Description
CPT	0421T	Transurethral waterjet ablation of prostate, including control of post-operative bleeding, including ultrasound guidance, complete (vasectomy, meatotomy, cystourethroscopy, urethral calibration and/or dilation, and internal urethrotomy are included when performed) (Deleted 01/01/2026)
	0714T	Transperineal laser ablation of benign prostatic hyperplasia, including imaging guidance; prostate volume less than 50 mL
	0867T	Transperineal laser ablation of benign prostatic hyperplasia, including imaging guidance; prostate volume greater or equal to 50 mL
	52597	Transurethral robotic-assisted waterjet resection of prostate, including intraoperative planning, ultrasound guidance, control of postoperative bleeding, complete, including vasectomy, meatotomy, cystourethroscopy, urethral calibration and/or dilation, and internal urethrotomy, when performed
	53854	Transurethral destruction of prostate tissue; by radiofrequency generated water vapor thermotherapy
	53899	Unlisted procedure, urinary system
HCPCS	C2596	Probe, image-guided, robotic, waterjet ablation

Date of Origin: December 2018