

Photoselective vaporization of the prostate for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia

Tania Stafinski, MSc;^{*} Devidas Menon, PhD, MHSA;^{*} Kevin Harris, RN, MPH;[†] Gary Gray MD, MSc;[‡] Gian Jhangri, MSc^{*}

Abstract

Objective: In recent years, laser treatments have re-emerged as options for treating benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). This paper reviews the safety, efficacy, effectiveness and economics of photoselective vapourization of the prostate (PVP), compared with transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP).

Methods: We conducted a comprehensive literature search to identify 14 studies comparing 80 W PVP and TURP. We then reviewed and pooled these studies.

Results: We identified 12 adverse events or complications; rates were similar in both groups. No PVP patient required a blood transfusion; 5%–11% of TURP patients did. PVP patients had a significantly lower likelihood of clot retention. Collectively, the 14 studies led to the conclusion that PVP is a safe procedure. PVP is favourable to TURP regarding length of hospitalization and catheterization times. There were no meaningful differences in operation times, reoperation rates, peak flow rates, postresidual volumes or quality of life scores. Sexual function and prostate specific antigen value changes were similar. Four economic evaluations of PVP and TURP (from Canada, Switzerland, Australia and the United States) concluded that PVP is less costly per case than TURP. Cost differences are attributable to disposables, capital equipment and hospitalization. Based on our analysis of limited Canadian data, the cost of PVP is estimated to be about one-half that of TURP, even after accounting for start-up costs.

Conclusion: The 80 W PVP laser appears to be a viable treatment for BPH. With the recent regulatory approval of the 120 W High Performance System (HPS), an additional option has become available. Therefore, it is anticipated that PVP will soon be considered part of a physician's repertoire for managing BPH.

CUAJ 2008;2(2):1-25

Introduction

Within the last 5 years, laser technologies have re-emerged as a promising alternative to transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP), which is the current "gold standard" treatment for moderate-to-severe lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) related to benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) (i.e., clinical BPH).¹ Such re-emergence has been primarily attributed to the development and introduction of a new laser technique called photoselective vapourization of the prostate (PVP).² Unlike previous laser therapies for BPH, PVP uses a high-powered potassium-titanyl-phosphate (KTP) laser (i.e., the GreenLight PVP, American Medical Systems Inc.,

Minnetonka, Minnesota) that emits light at a wavelength of 532 nm, which falls within the greenlight spectrum. This wavelength is strongly absorbed by hemoglobin but not by water. Therefore, when it is applied to vascularized prostatic tissue, the laser light becomes instantly absorbed by the blood, quickly vapourizing and removing it, creating a prostate cavity with minimal blood loss, postoperative discomfort and hospital stay.³

In Canada, clinical BPH affects about 25% of men over 50 years old and its prevalence increases with age.⁴ Given its chronic nature and the country's growing aging population, BPH has become recognized as a significant health concern and source of health care expenditures. Awareness of the availability of PVP has generated significant interest among patients, providers and payers, alike.⁵

The purpose of this paper was to review the safety and effectiveness of PVP using the commercially available 80 W KTP laser (Greenlight PV System), compared with TURP, as well as the social and economic considerations involved in providing PVP as part of the publicly funded services for managing BPH.

Methods

Search for relevant studies

We completed a search for any published or unpublished clinical studies or economic analyses of PVP appearing in the English language literature before December 2006. Critical terms used to describe BPH and PVP, along with their likely synonyms (e.g., enlarged prostate, GreenLight PVP, etc.), were identified and combined to form a structured search strategy.

This strategy was subsequently applied to several electronic bibliographic databases to locate relevant published literature. Unpublished or non-peer reviewed information (e.g., conference proceedings, technical papers, government-sponsored reports, etc.) was captured through Internet searches. Key websites were also examined. The electronic search was supplemented by a manual search of the most recent issues of major urological journals and reference lists from retrieved studies. Lastly, 8 specialists (6 in Alberta and 2 in Ontario) were contacted via email or telephone to obtain information on any unpublished or recently completed studies. Corresponding authors of identified studies and urologists who perform PVP and TURP or both were also contacted, along with the manufacturer.

Selection of relevant studies

Compiled citations were reviewed for relevancy in 2 stages by 2 independent reviewers adhering to Cochrane protocol.⁶ First, titles and available abstracts were screened (stage 1). Then, full manuscripts of those deemed potentially relevant were retrieved and assessed using a predefined set of inclusion criteria (stage 2) (Table 1). If doubt over a study's relevancy still remained, further

information was sought from the author (2 cases). Where multiple citations from the same investigators appeared to report on the same patient population, only the most recent one (determined by publication date and, when necessary, correspondence with the author) was included. Any discrepancies between reviewers were resolved through discussion. Reviewer consensus was assessed using kappa statistics and found to be excellent ($\kappa = 0.79$ stage 1 and $\kappa = 0.88$ stage 2).⁷

Synthesis and critical appraisal of selected studies

Information from each study was systematically extracted by 2 reviewers using a standard, pretested data abstraction form containing elements for assessing the purpose, methods (e.g., setting, number of patients, treatment protocol and outcome measures, etc.) and validity of the results (Table 2).⁸ When required, missing data were sought from the corresponding author. Once again, consensus between reviewers was assessed with kappa statistics, with $\kappa = 1.0$ indicating perfect agreement.

The quality of each study was scrutinized by 2 reviewers using validated, published critical appraisal guidelines and levels of evidence scales for clinical studies and economic evaluations.⁹ Agreement between reviewers was excellent ($\kappa = 0.79$).

Table 1. Criteria for including studies in the review

Parameter	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Study design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Randomized or controlled (e.g., pseudorandomized or quasi-randomized) trials Nonrandomized clinical trials Retrospective, prospective or concurrent cohort studies Case or clinical series 	
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients diagnosed with moderate–severe LUTS attributable to BPH who require surgical intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diagnosis of prostate cancer
Interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PVP with 80 W KTP laser (Greenlight PV system) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PVP with 40 W or 60 W KTP lasers
Comparators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TURP (not required) 	
Outcomes		
Primary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in peak urinary flow rate Decrease in postvoid residual volume Decrease (i.e., improvement) in IPPS or AUA score Decrease (i.e., improvement) in IPPS Quality of Life score 	
Secondary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in prostate volume 	
Operative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating time Length of hospital stay Length of catheterization Blood transfusion 	

LUTS = lower urinary tract symptoms; BPH = benign prostatic hyperplasia; PVP = photoselective vapourization of the prostate; PV = photoselective vapourization; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate; IPPS = International Prostate Symptom Severity; AUA = American Urological Association.

Data analysis

Results from individual clinical studies were combined through meta-analyses to generate summary estimates for each outcome of interest. For dichotomous data (e.g., adverse events) pooled relative risks and 95% confidence intervals were calculated. For continuous data (e.g., peak urinary flow), mean differences and 95% confidence intervals were pooled and a weighted mean difference was calculated. All statistical analyses were conducted in accordance with intention-to-treat principles (i.e., patients were analyzed in the groups to which they were originally allocated regardless of whether or not they received the assigned treatment).

Prior to pooling data, effect sizes among studies were tested for heterogeneity using the χ^2 statistic for heterogeneity set at a significance level of $p < 0.1$. Only data considered to be sufficiently homogeneous were pooled.

Results from included economic studies were summarized in tabular form and analyzed qualitatively, noting trends or patterns in findings reported across studies.

Development of economic model comparing TURP with PVP in Alberta

Findings from the review of clinical and economic evidence were used to construct an economic model comparing PVP with TURP in Alberta.

Information on direct and indirect medical costs for TURP and PVP was collected from published literature, Alberta Health and Wellness (for TURP), the manufacturer (for PVP) and hospitals in Ontario where PVP is currently being performed.

Results

Fifty-four discrete citations were initially identified, 14 of which met the selection criteria: 12 case series, 1 randomized controlled trial (PVP 38 patients, TURP 38 patients) and 1 multicentred cohort study (PVP 64 patients, TURP 37 patients).¹⁰⁻²³ Collectively, they represented a total of 1376 PVP procedures.

Overall description of included studies

The 14 studies selected for inclusion in the review are summarized in Table 3. Across included studies, patients' age ranged from 44 to 95 years and prostate sizes varied from small (17 mL) to large (336 mL). Most studies followed patients for either 6 months^{10,16,18,20,21} or 12 months.^{11-15,19,22} Only 1 study monitored patients beyond 1 year, reporting outcomes at 24 months.²³ All but 1 of the studies examined the safety of PVP, noting adverse events and complications that occurred intraoperatively or within the early postoperative period. All of the studies assessed the efficacy of PVP in a similar way — through maximum or peak urinary flow rate, postvoid residual volume and IPSS/AUA-SI

Table 2. Summary of elements composing the data abstraction form

Parameter	Description of information collected
Study design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting • Method of randomization, allocation concealment and blinding, where appropriate • Funding sources
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of patients recruited, randomized or assigned to treatment groups (i.e., PVP or TURP) and included in subsequent analyses • No. of patients censored (owing to incomplete follow-up or loss to follow-up) • Maximum length of follow-up • Patient inclusion and exclusion criteria along with the distribution of patients by age, prostate size, comorbidities and severity of symptoms
Interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual no. of patients who underwent treatment in each group • Any protocol violations • Proportion of patients in each treatment group who completed treatment as planned • Information on any further therapy received
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in peak urinary flow rate, postvoiding residual volume, IPSS or AUA symptom score, IPSS Quality of Life score and prostate volume • Operating time, length of hospital stay, length of catheterization and adverse events

PVP = photoselective vapourization of the prostate; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate; IPSS = International Prostate Symptom Severity; AUA = American Urological Association.

Table 3. Summary of included studies

Study	Methods	Patients	Intervention	Outcomes	Study quality*
Comparative studies Bachmann ¹⁰	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bicentre cohort study Prospective 2 hospitals in Switzerland (all TURPs performed at 1 centre; all PVPs performed at other centre) Recruitment at each centre: consecutive Switzerland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 101 patients Mean age: 70.16 yr Age range: not specified <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum urinary flow rate ≤ 15 mL/s or postvoid residual volume > 100 mL IPSS score > 7 <p>Exclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Neurogenic bladder disorder Urethral stricture Postvoid residual volume > 400 mL Acute or chronic urinary retention Indwelling catheter 	<p>PVP†</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) 64 patients Mean age: 71 yr Age range: not provided Surgeon experience: 4 surgeons, 2 experienced and 2 inexperienced <p>TURP†</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard technique (no special modifications) 37 patients Mean age: 71 yr Age range: not provided Surgeon experience: 3 surgeons, each had performed > 200 TURPs prior to study 	<p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: discharge, 1 mo, 3 mo and 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum urinary flow rate Postvoiding residual volume IPSS score IPSS QoL score <p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 1 mo, 3 mo and 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Prostate volume PSA levels <p>Peroperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Operating time (min) Length of hospital stay (h) Length of catheterization (h) Change in hemoglobin (mg/dL) <p>Adverse events or complications</p>	<p>Grade: B Level of evidence: 2b</p>
Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Randomized controlled trial Protocol designed in accordance with AUA guidelines Method of randomization not described Power assumptions not described Nonblinded Single centre Analyzed on intention to treat basis Australia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 76 patients Mean age: 65.7 yr Age range: 51–81 yr <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum urinary flow rate ≤ 15 mL/s IPSS score ≥ 12 Age > 50 yr Prostate volume 15–85 cm³ Referred by family physician for LUTS Obstructed bladder Able to complete QoL, symptom and sexual function questionnaires 	<p>PVP†</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) 38 patients Mean age: 65.2 yr Age range: 51–81 yr <p>TURP†</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard technique (no special modifications) 38 patients Mean age: 66.2 yr Age range: 55–80 yr Surgeon experience (both trial arms): all surgeons had performed 35–325 TURPs and < 5 laser prostatectomies 	<p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 6 wk, 3 mo, 6 mo and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum urinary flow rate Postvoiding residual volume IPSS score IPSS QoL score 	<p>Grade: A Level of evidence: 1b</p>

Continued on next page

Table 3. continued

Study	Methods	Patients	Intervention	Outcomes	Study quality*
Noncomparative studies Hai and Malek ¹²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • United States 	<p>Exclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neurogenic bladder disorder 2. Known or suspected prostate cancer 3. Postvoid residual volume > 400 mL 4. Chronic urinary retention 5. Taking finasteride or dutasteride 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 	<p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prostate volume <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of hospital stay (h) 3. Length of catheterization (h) 4. Change in hemoglobin (mg/dL) <p>Adverse events or complications</p>	<p>Grade: C Level of evidence: 4</p>
Mattioli et al ¹³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • Italy 	<p>Exclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neurogenic bladder disorder 2. Prostate cancer 3. Urinary retention 4. Urethral stricture 5. Bladder neck contracture 6. UTI 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 	<p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate <p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3, 6, and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PSA levels 2. Prostate volume <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p>	<p>Grade: C Level of evidence: 4</p>

Continued on next page

Table 3. continued

Study	Methods	Patients	Intervention	Outcomes	Study quality*
Sandhu et al ¹⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • United States 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 64 patients • Mean age: 70.1 yr • Age range: 44–92 yr <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Patients with prostate volumes > 60 cm³ 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: all procedures performed by same surgeon 	<p>2. Postvoiding residual volume</p> <p>3. AUA-SI score</p> <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) 3. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3, 6 and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. IPSS score <p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 6 or 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PSA levels <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) 3. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3, 6 and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. AUA-SI score 4. AUA-QoL scores 	<p>Grade: C</p> <p>Level of evidence: 4</p>
Te et al ¹⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multicentre study • Prospective • 6 medical centres • United States 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 139 patients • Mean age: 67.7 yr • Age range: 45–88 yr <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate < 15 mL/s 2. Postvoid residual volume < 350 mL 3. AUA-SI score > 12 4. Prostate volume > 15–200 cm³ 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 	<p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3, 6 and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. AUA-SI score 4. AUA-QoL scores 	<p>Grade: C</p> <p>Level of evidence: 4</p>

Continued on next page

Table 3. continued

Study	Methods	Patients	Intervention	Outcomes	Study quality*
Barber et al ¹⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • United Kingdom 	<p>Exclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neurogenic bladder disorder 2. Prostate cancer 3. PSA > 10 ng/mL 4. Urethral stricture 5. Bladder neck contracture 6. Urinary incontinence 7. Prostatitis 8. UTI 9. Serum creatinine > 1.8 mg/dL <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On routine waiting list for TURP 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 	<p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 6 and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduced prostate volume 2. Sexual function (also measured at 3 mo) <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) 3. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. IPSS score 4. IPSS QoL scores <p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prostate volume 2. Erectile function (ITEF-5 score) <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Length of catheterization (h) 2. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 3 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 	<p>Grade: C Level of evidence: 4</p>
Fu et al ¹⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • Multi-centre • China 	<p>196 patients: 196</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refractory urinary retention: 58 • No refractory urinary retention: 138 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 	<p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prostate volume 2. Erectile function (ITEF-5 score) <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Length of catheterization (h) 2. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 3 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 	<p>Grade: C Level of evidence: 4</p>

Continued on next page

Table 3. continued

Study	Methods	Patients	Intervention	Outcomes	Study quality*
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean age: 75 yr • Age range: 50–92 yr • Inclusion criteria • None specified • Included patients with and without refractory urinary retention 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. IPSS score 4. IPSS QoL scores <p>Secondary outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sexual function <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) 3. Change in hemoglobin (g/dL) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. IPSS score 4. IPSS QoL scores <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 6 and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. IPSS score 4. IPSS QoL scores 	Grade: C Level of evidence: 4
Park and Ha ¹⁸	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • Consecutive patients • South Korea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 82 patients • Mean age: 82 yr • Age range: 51–86 yr • Inclusion criteria • None specified 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PVTM) performed on out-patient basis • Surgeon experience: not described 		
Sarica et al ¹⁹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • Turkey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 240 patients • Mean age: 67.4 yr • Age range: 46–83 yr • Exclusion criteria 1. Urethral stricture 2. Neurogenic bladder 3. Urinary incontinence 4. UTI 5. Compromised renal function 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 		Grade: C Level of evidence: 4

Continued on next page

Table 3. continued

Study	Methods	Patients	Intervention	Outcomes	Study quality*
Volkan et al ²⁰	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • Turkey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 186 patients • Mean age: 66 yr • Age range: 47–90 yr <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate < 10 mL/s 2. IPSS score > 8 <p>Exclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neurogenic bladder disorder 2. Prostate cancer 3. PSA > 4 ng/mL 4. Indwelling catheter 5. Urethral stricture 6. Previous prostate surgery 7. Prostate volume > 70 cm³ 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: all procedures performed by 1 of 2 surgeons 	<p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 6 and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prostate volume <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) 3. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3 and 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. IPSS score <p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 1 d, 15 d, 1 mo and 2 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PSA levels <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Length of catheterization (h) 2. Length of hospital stay (h) 3. Change in hemoglobin (g/dL) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3 and 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. AUA-SI score 	<p>Grade: C</p> <p>Level of evidence: 4</p>
Han et al ²¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • South Korea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 104 patients • Mean age: 66.1 yr • Age range: 51–84 yr <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate < 15 mL/s 2. AUA-SI score > 8 3. Age > 50 yr 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 	<p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 6 and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prostate volume <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) 3. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3 and 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. AUA-SI score 	<p>Grade: C</p> <p>Level of evidence: 4</p>

Continued on next page

Table 3. continued

Study	Methods	Patients	Intervention	Outcomes	Study quality*
Monoski ²²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Retrospective • Consecutive patients • United States 	<p>Exclusion criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neurogenic bladder disorder 2. Detrusor underactivity <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <p>Patients with urinary retention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Postvoid residual volume > 400 mL; or indwelling catheter or suprapubic tube; or clean intermittent catheterization at least once daily 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 	<p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: 6 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prostate volume <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Length of catheterization (h) 2. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3, 6 and 12 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. IPSS score 	<p>Grade: C</p> <p>Level of evidence: 4</p>

Continued on next page

symptom score measured pre- and posttreatment. However, the types of secondary and operative outcomes measured differed.

Overall quality of included studies

As with most new technologies, the number of studies of PVP (i.e., evidence) available for review was limited. Nonetheless, the combined quality of these studies, and in turn the strength of evidence presented, was considered fair. Specifically, both comparative studies received high grades (A¹⁰ and B¹¹), while the 12 noncomparative studies^{12–23} were assigned a lower grade (C).

Safety

The following adverse events and complications were assessed: acute renal failure, urinary retention, clot retention, hematuria, dysuria, urinary tract infection, incontinence, urethral stricture, bladder neck contracture, bladder stenosis and sexual dysfunction (Table 4). Pooled complication rates from the 12 case series ranged from 0% for bladder stenosis to 9.3% for mild-to-moderate dysuria. When compared with those commonly reported for TURP,²⁴ rates were either similar or considerably lower (i.e., urinary retention and clot retention). Further, none of the patients across the series required blood transfusions. Conversely, published transfusion rates for TURP range from 5% to 11%.²⁴ Similar trends were observed from pooled analyses of relative risks for the 2 comparative studies (Table 5). With 1 exception (clot retention), none of the estimates were statistically significant, suggesting that in general the risk of experiencing a complication was comparable between treatment groups. Patients receiving PVP were significantly less likely to develop clot retention. Importantly, the absolute values of estimates were interpreted conservatively, as both studies involved relatively small numbers of patients. Nonetheless, accounting for the findings from all 14 studies, PVP appears to be a safe procedure, carrying with it a risk of adverse events and complications that appears to be similar to the “gold standard” treatment.

One study specifically examined the effect of physician experience on the risk of complications and adverse events to assess the learning curve associated with PVP.¹¹ Prior to study inception, physicians experienced in performing TURP had

Table 3. continued

Study	Methods	Patients	Intervention	Outcomes	Study quality*
Ruszat et al ^{†‡}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case series • Prospective • Consecutive patients • 21 patients lost to follow-up • Switzerland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2. Failed voiding trial • 3. Taking at least 1 medication for BPH 	<p>PVP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laser: 80 W KTP/532 nm laser (GreenLight PV) • Surgeon experience: not described 	<p>Secondary outcomes (follow-up: discharge)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PSA levels <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (min) 2. Length of catheterization (h) 3. Length of hospital stay (h) <p>Adverse events or complications</p> <p>Primary outcomes (follow-up: 1, 3, 6, 12 and 24 mo)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum urinary flow rate 2. Postvoiding residual volume 3. IPSS score 4. IPPS QoL scores <p>Perioperative outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operating time (mins) 2. Length of catheterization (h) 3. Length of hospital stay (h) 4. Change in hemoglobin (g/dL) <p>Adverse events or complications</p>	Grade: C Level of evidence: 4

TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate; PVP = photoselective vapourization of the prostate; IPSS = International Prostate Symptom Severity; QoL = Quality of Life; PSA = prostate specific antigen; AUA = American Urological Association; LUTS = lower urinary tract symptoms; UTI = urinary tract infection; SI = Symptom Index; BPH = benign prostatic hyperplasia.

* Based on the Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine Levels of Evidence (available www.cebm.net/levels_of_evidence.asp#levels).

† No statistically significant differences between patient groups except in mean postvoid residual volume (PVP: 146.1 mL v. TURP: 120.7 mL).

‡ No statistically significant differences in patients between treatment arms.

Table 4. Summary of adverse events and complications reported in patient who underwent PVP

Study	No. of patients	Acute renal failure	Urinary retention	Clot retention	Hematuria†	Dysuria‡	UTI	Incontinence (stress or urge)	Adverse event or complication; no. (and %)*				Retrograde ejaculation‡	
									Stricture (bladder neck or urethral) or bladder neck contracture	Bladder stenosis	Epididymitis	ED		
Comparative studies														
Bachmann ¹⁰	64	1 (1.6)	5 (7.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (10.9)	7 (10.9)	0 (0.0)	5 (7.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	38	0 (0.0)	3 (7.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (21.1)	2 (5.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (13.2)	0 (0.0)	NA	NA	
Pooled total	102	1 (0.98)	8 (7.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	15 (14.7)	9 (8.8)	0 (0.0)	5 (4.9)	5 (4.9)	0 (0.0)	—	—	
Noncomparative studies														
Hai and Malek ¹²	10	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)	2 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA	NA	
Sandhu et al ¹⁴	64	0 (0.0)	2 (3.1)	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	2 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA	NA	
Te et al ¹⁵	139	0 (0.0)	7 (5.0)	1 (0.7)	12 (8.6)	13 (9.4)	3 (2.2)	9 (6.5)	3 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	27 (36.0)	
Barber et al ¹⁶	30	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (55.6)	
Fu et al ¹⁷	196	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	5 (2.6)	3 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA	
Park and Ha ¹⁸	82	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (3.7)	7 (8.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA	NA	
Sarica et al ¹⁹	240	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (2.9)	26 (10.8)	0 (0.0)	8 (3.3)	2 (0.8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	132 (55)	
Volkan et al ²⁰	186	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.1)	10 (5.4)	55 (29.6)	12 (6.5)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA	NA	
Han et al ²¹	104	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	12 (11.6)	
Monoski ²²	40	0 (0.0)	3 (7.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (7.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA	NA	
Ruszat et al ²³	183	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.1)	10 (5.5)	8 (4.4)	3 (1.6)	10 (5.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA	NA	
Pooled total	1274	1 (0.1)	12 (0.9)	5 (0.4)	40 (3.1)	119 (9.3)	26 (2.0)	20 (1.6)	26 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	—	—	
Published values for TURP, % [§]	—	NA	4.9	6.8	6.0	12.0	4.7	1.3	3.6	3.4	1.3	4.9	52.8	

PVP = photoselective vaporization of the prostate; UTI = urinary tract infection; ED = erectile dysfunction; NA = not available.
 *Unless otherwise indicated.
 †Mild to moderate; no medical treatment required.
 ‡Denominator comprised of self-reported sexually active men prior to surgery.
 §From published clinical practice guidelines.

each completed less than 5 laser prostatectomies. The results demonstrated no difference in complication rates as the number of procedures increased.

Efficacy

Operative outcomes

Among the 12 case series, the average operating time ranged from 20 minutes to 137 minutes, increasing with preoperative prostate volume (Table 6). Average catheterization times varied

from 7.6 hours to 43 hours; in 5 of the studies, a significant proportion of patients required no post-operative catheterization. In all but 1 of the studies, average hospital stays were less than 24 hours, with some patients going home as little as 5 hours after the procedure. Across studies that followed patients for 12 months, reoperation rates ranged from 0% to 7.5%. When values were compared with those published for TURP, PVP appeared favourable in terms of catheterization time and length of patient hospitalization.^{24,25} Reoperation rates were similar for both procedures. These findings

Table 5. Adverse events and complications following PVP, compared with TURP

Adverse event or complication	Study	Group; no. of study patients with adverse events		Pooled estimate RR (95% CI)	Favours PVP or TURP
		PVP	TURP		
Severe bleeding*	Bachmann ^{10†}	0/64	4/37	0.11 (0.01–1.99); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ^{11‡}	0/38	4/38		
Acute renal failure	Bachmann ¹⁰	0/64	0/37	3.00 (0.01–1.99); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	1/38	0/38		
Capsule perforation	Bachmann ¹⁰	0/64	0/37	0.33 (0.01–7.93); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	0/38	1/38		
Urinary retention	Bachmann ¹⁰	5/64	1/37	2.94 (0.64–13.56); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	3/38	1/38		
Clot retention	Bachmann ¹⁰	0/64	1/37	0.09 (0.01–0.72)	PVP
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	0/38	10/38		
	Bachmann ¹⁰	7/64	4/37		
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	2/38	3/38		
Dysuria	Bachmann ¹⁰	7/64	4/37	0.89 (0.34–2.33); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	2/38	3/38		
Urethral stricture	Bachmann ¹⁰	5/64	1/37	0.59 (0.02–18.42); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	0/38	5/38		
Bladder stenosis	Bachmann ¹⁰	0/64	0/37	1.67 (0.43–6.49); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	5/38	3/38		
TUR syndrome	Bachmann ¹⁰	0/64	0/37	0.33 (0.01–7.93); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	0/38	1/38		
ED	Bachmann ¹⁰	0/64	0/37	0.19 (0.01–4.66); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	NA	NA		
Recatheterization§	Bachmann ¹⁰	0/64	0/37	0.17 (0.02–1.32); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	1/38	6/38		
Transfusion	Bachmann ¹⁰	0/64	0/37	0.33 (0.01–7.93); NS	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	0/38	1/38		

PVP = photoselective vapourization of the prostate; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate; RR = relative risk; CI = confidence interval; NA = no data available; TUR = transurethral resection; ED = erectile dysfunction; NS = not statistically significant.

*Severe bleeding requiring intraoperative management or abortion of the procedure.

†The study by Bachmann¹⁰ is a randomized controlled trial.

‡The study by Bouchier-Hayes¹¹ is a nonrandomized controlled trial.

§Recatheterization for > 48 h owing to failed trial voiding or secondary hemorrhage.

Table 6. Operative outcomes following PVP from included noncomparative studies

Study	Patient characteristics															
	Age, yr			Postoperative prostate volume			Operating time, min		Length of hospital stay, h		Length of catheterization, h		Change in hemoglobin, g/dL		Reoperation within follow-up period*	
	Mean (and SD)†	Range	Mean (and SD)†	Range	Mean (and SD)†	Range	Mean (and SD)†	Range	Mean (and SD)†	Range	Mean (and SD)†	Range	Mean (and SD)†	Range	No. (and %)	Follow-up, mo
Hai and Malek ¹²	64.1 (7.6)	58–73	41.4 (18.5)	24–76.3	19.8 (4.9)	14–28	NA	NA	17.2 (9.6)	0–28	NA	NA	NA	NA	0 (0.0)	12
Mattioli et al ¹³	NA	48–85	NA	NA	NA	15–60	NA	NA	NA	3–6	NA	NA	NA	NA	0 (0.0)	12
Sandhu et al ¹⁴	70.1 (10.7)	NA	101 (40)	NA	122.9 (23.3)	53–193	< 23 h	NA	NA	0–23	NA	NA	NA	NA	3 (4.7)	12
Te et al ¹⁵	67.7 (8.7)	45–88	54.6 (31.7)	21–174	38.7 (23.3)	9–140	119 patients ≤ 23; 27 patients 24–72	NA	14.1 (14.7)	0–72	NA	NA	NA	NA	0 (0.0)	12
Barber et al ¹⁶	66	NA	60	NA	NA	NA	18 patients < 4; 12 patients < 24	NA	NA	0–15	NA	NA	NA	NA	0 (0.0)	6
Fu et al ¹⁷	75	50–92	63.5 (16.8)	30–336	45.2 (18.5)	15–210	NA	NA	43.2 (21.6)	NA	NA	NA	–1.3#	NA	0 (0.0)	3
Park and Ha ¹⁸	65.6	51–86	39.7	22–75	24.7	15–45	NA	NA	17.2	2–24	NA	NA	NA	NA	0 (0.0)	6
Sarica et al ¹⁹	67.4	46–83	52.1	28–120	45	25–90	< 24	NA	12.2 (6.8)	6–24	NA	NA	NA	NA	0 (0.0)	12
Volkan et al ²⁰	66 (8)	47–90	48.1 (13.2)	17–94	57 (17)	10–120	14.4 (1.2)	10.5–17	7.6 (0.9)	6–13	NA	NA	–0.6#	NA	2 (1.1)	12
Han et al ²¹	44.9	23–95	47.6 (23.9)	NA	44.9	23–95	4.8 (10.3)	NA	27.1 (11.0)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2 (2.5)	6
Monoski ²²	NA	NA	110.7 (47.9)	NA	137.3 (63.4)	NA	< 23	NA	NA	0–23	NA	NA	NA	NA	3 (7.5)	12
Ruszat et al ²³	71.7 (9.5)	46–95	56.1 (31.0)	10–180	59.5 (26.4)	10–160	129.6 (57.6)	72–384	43.2 (45.6)	24–240	NA	NA	NA	NA	15 (8.2)	24

PVP = photoselective vaporization of the prostate; SD = standard deviation; NA = no data available.
 *Reoperation for recurrent symptoms, i.e., re-PVP, TURP (transurethral resection of the prostate), urethrotomy or bladder neck incision.
 †SDs reported where available.
 #Difference between pre- and postoperative values not statistically significant.

paralleled those from analyses of the 2 comparative studies (Table 7). No statistically significant differences in operating times and reoperation rates were observed between treatment groups. However, catheterization times and hospital stays were statistically significantly shorter for the PVP group.

Primary outcomes

Despite variations in length of follow-up and timing of the first postoperative visit, all 12 case series reported comparable patterns of improvement in functional outcomes. Specifically, percent cumulative improvements in peak urinary flow rates, peak residual volumes and symptom scores from

preoperative levels remained statistically significant throughout the follow-up period of each study (Table 8, Table 9, Table 10). Six of the series also measured changes in quality of life (bother) scores, and reported consistent statistically significant improvements over time (Table 11). Pooled values were compared with those published for TURP at each follow-up point and found to be similar (Table 8, Table 9, Table 10). A meta-analysis of results from the first follow-up visit (i.e., the only data available for both studies) in the comparative studies revealed the same trends. There were no statistically significant differences in improvements in peak flow rates, post residual volumes, symptom scores or quality of life scores between treatment groups (Table 12).

Table 7. Operative outcomes following PVP, compared with TURP, from included comparative studies

Parameter		Group; mean (and SD)		Pooled effect estimate weighted mean difference (95% CI)†	Favours PVP or TURP
		PVP	TURP		
Age, yr	Bachmann ¹⁰ ‡	71.0 (9.3)	68.7 (7.9)	NA <i>p</i> > 0.05	NA
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹ §	65.23 (range 51–81)	66.23 (range 55–80)	<i>p</i> > 0.05	
Preoperative prostate volume, cm ³	Bachmann ¹⁰	65.1 (36.9)	48.9 (21.2)	NA <i>p</i> > 0.05	NA
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	42.44 (range 16.5–82.6)	33.22 (range 15.4–67.5)	<i>p</i> > 0.05	
Operating time, min	Bachmann ¹⁰	59.6 (24.4)	49.4 (16.0)	— <i>p</i> = 0.05 (NS)	Neither
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	30.24	31.33	<i>p</i> > 0.05 (NS)	
Length of hospital stay, d	Bachmann ¹⁰	5.5 (2.7)	7.1 (1.8)	-2.08 (-0.73 to -1.42)	PVP
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	1.08 (0.28)	3.39 (1.17)		
Length of catheterization, h	Bachmann ¹⁰	43.2 (43.2)	72 (36)	-31.29 (-39.72 to -22.87)	PVP
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	12.2 (8.6)	44.5 (30.2)		
Blood loss (change in hemoglobin), g/dL	Bachmann ¹⁰	0.7	1.7	— <i>p</i> = 0.027	PVP
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	0.5	1.5		
Reoperation within follow-up period		No. of patients	No. of patients	RR (95% CI)	Neither
	Bachmann ¹⁰	0	0	4.87 (0.24–98.18)	
	Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	2	0	(NS)	

PVP = photoselective vapourization of the prostate; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate; SD = standard deviation; CI = confidence interval; NA = not applicable; NS = not statistically significant; RR = relative risk.
 *Unless otherwise indicated.
 †Weighted mean differences were calculated where reported data permitted.
 ‡The study by Bachmann¹⁰ is a randomized controlled trial.
 §The study by Bouchier-Hayes¹¹ is a nonrandomized controlled trial.

Table 8. Change in peak urinary flow after PVP during follow-up across studies

Study	Variable	Increase in maximum urinary flow rate from preoperative values, mL/s					
		Discharge	1 mo	3 mo	6 mo	12 mo	24 mo
Comparative studies							
Bachmann ¹⁰	Mean increase	8.9	10.7	10.6	11.2	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	129.0	155.0	153.6	162.3	NA	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	< 0.001	< 0.001			NA	NA
Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	Mean increase	NA	12.0†	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	167.4†	NA	NA	NA	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	0.009	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pooled weighted mean increase, mL/s		8.9	—	10.6	11.2	—	—
Noncomparative studies							
Hai and Malek ¹²	Mean increase	NA	11.7	15.3	19.1	20.4	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	113.6	148.5	185.4	198.1	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA
Mattioli et al ¹³	Mean increase	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.0	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	NA	197.5	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sandhu et al ¹⁴	Mean increase	NA	8.5	8.3	12.1	11.0	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	107.6	105.1	153.2	139.2	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA
Te et al ¹⁵	Mean increase	NA	11.7	12.8	14.0	14.8	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	150.0	164.1	179.4	189.7	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	NA
Barber et al ¹⁶	Mean increase	NA	NA	NA	11.2	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	136.6	NA	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fu et al ¹⁷	Mean increase	NA	NA	12.9	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	192.5	NA	NA	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	NA	< 0.05	NA	NA	NA
Park and Ha ¹⁸	Mean increase	NA	NA	NA	8.7	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	110	NA	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	NA	NA	< 0.01	NA	NA
Sarica et al ¹⁹	Mean increase	6.7	NA	NA	16.7	18.2	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	84.8	NA	NA	211.4	230.4	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	< 0.001	NA	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA
Volkan et al ²⁰	Mean increase	NA	7.7	7.7	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	108.5	108.5	NA	NA	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA	NA	NA
Han et al ²¹	Mean increase	NA	8.8	8.3	6.5	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	106.4	99.6	78.8	NA	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA	NA
Monoski ²²	Mean increase	NA	9.4	8.0	12.3	11.5	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	139.8	114.7	188.2	174.8	NA
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	NA
Ruszat et al ²³	Mean increase	7.5	11.4	12.1	12.0	12.9	14.4
	Cumulative improvement, %	105.1	160.7	170.7	168.6	182.2	203.1
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pooled weighted mean increase, mL/s		7.0	9.7	10.5	13.2	16.4	14.4
Published values for TURP; mean increase in maximum urinary flow rate‡				3–9 mo: 10.5		12 mo: 10.8	16 mo: 8.1

PVP = photoselective vapourization of the prostate; NA = no data available; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate.
 *Statistical significance when compared with preoperative or baseline value.
 †After 6 weeks of follow-up.
 ‡From published clinical practice guidelines (American Urological Association, 2003).

Table 9. Change in postvoiding residual volume after PVP during follow-up across included studies

Study	Variable	Decrease in postvoiding residual volume from preoperative values, mL					
		Discharge	1 mo	3 mo	6 mo	12 mo	24 mo
Comparative studies							
Bachmann ¹⁰	Mean decrease	74.6	129.0	133.0	133.2	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	51.1	88.3	91.0	91.2	NA	NA
	p value*	<0.001	<0.001	0.048	0.025	NA	NA
Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	Mean decrease	NA	125.0†	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	85.0†	NA	NA	NA	NA
	p value*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pooled weighted mean decrease, mL							—
		74.6	—	133.0	133.2	—	—
Noncomparative studies							
Hai and Malek ¹²							
	Mean decrease	NA	117.2	132.2	133.6	134.6	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	85.2	96.1	97.1	97.8	NA
	p value*	NA	0.005	0.003	0.001	0.001	NA
Mattioli et al ¹³							
	Mean decrease	NA	NA	NA	NA	98.5	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	NA	96.6	NA
	p value*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sandhu et al ¹⁴							
	Mean decrease	NA	111.0	111.0	122.0	80.0	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	58.7	58.7	64.6	42.3	NA
	p value*	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.07	NA
Te et al ¹⁵							
	Mean decrease	NA	78.7	88.6	88.2	89.5	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	68.9	77.5	77.2	78.3	NA
	p value*	NA	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	NA
Barber et al ¹⁶							
	Mean decrease	NA	NA	NA	88.5	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	75.3	NA	NA
	p value*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fu et al ¹⁷							
	Mean decrease	NA	NA	132.6	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	83.7	NA	NA	NA
	p value*	NA	NA	< 0.05	NA	NA	NA
Park and Ha ¹⁸							
	Mean decrease	NA	NA	NA	62.2	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	98.0	NA	NA
	p value*	NA	NA	NA	< 0.01	NA	NA

Continued on next page

Table 9. continued

Study	Variable	Decrease in postvoiding residual volume from preoperative values, mL						
		Discharge	1 mo	3 mo	6 mo	12 mo	24 mo	
Sarica et al ¹⁹	Mean decrease	NA	NA	NA	93.0	129.4	NA	
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	63.9	88.9	NA	
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	NA	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA	
Volkan et al ²⁰	Mean decrease	NA	NA	127.1	NA	NA	NA	
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	93.5%	NA	NA	NA	
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	NA	< 0.001	NA	NA	NA	
Han et al ²¹	Mean decrease	NA	52.1	61.5	59.8	NA	NA	
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	63.6%	75.0%	72.9%	NA	NA	
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	NA	NA	
Monoski ²²	Mean decrease	NA	165.4	223.4	181.7	216.1	NA	
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	54.6%	68.2%	56.7%	65.7%	NA	
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	NA	
Ruszat et al ²³	Mean decrease	137.5	184.5	189.2	173.2	177.5	199.1	
	Cumulative improvement, %	58.7	85.6	87.1	83.8	83.0	86.5	
	<i>p</i> value*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Pooled weighted mean decrease (and % improvement), mL		137.5 (58.7)	112.2 (70.5)	117.7 (76.2)	103.3 (74.4)	114.9 (76.2)	199.1 (86.5)	
Published values for TURP; mean decrease (and mean % improvement), mL				44.7 (44.0)	NA	52.2 (51.0)	69.2 (68.0)	

PVP = photoselective vaporization of the prostate; NA = no data available; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate.
 *Statistical significance when compared with preoperative of baseline value.
 †After 6 weeks of follow-up.

Secondary outcomes

Of the 12 case series, 3 examined the effect of PVP on sexual functioning through a comparison of pre- and postprocedural rates of erectile dysfunction.^{15–17} No differences were found across studies. Only 1 of the comparative studies evaluated sexual function, with patients completing a self-administered questionnaire both before surgery and during each follow-up visit. No differences from baseline (i.e., presurgery) or between the TURP and PVP groups were noted. Prostate specific antigen levels, measured in 4 of the case series and 1 of the comparative studies, decreased by about 30%–40%, an amount similar to that reported for TURP.^{10,12,14,20,22} Across all 5 case series and both comparative studies that assessed changes in prostate volume, reductions of 30%–42% were found. According to the results of the 2 comparative studies, these values were roughly equivalent to those for TURP.^{10,11}

Performance of PVP in high-risk groups

Two of the case series included patients on anti-coagulants, among whom the prevalence of cardiovascular disease, cerebrovascular disease and peripheral vascular disease was high (31%) and the use of TURP was contraindicated.^{14,26} In all patients, PVP was performed successfully with no reports of thromboembolic or bleeding events. No transfusions were required. Functional outcomes were similar to those reported for the non-high risk patients, suggesting that PVP may be both a safe and efficacious option for high-risk patients.

Durability of PVP

While the short-term efficacy of PVP appears similar to that of TURP, the lack of data beyond 2 years precludes assessment of its durability (i.e., long-term efficacy).

Economic considerations

Summary of existing economic analyses

We found 4 economic analyses of PVP: 2 peer-reviewed studies,^{11,27} 1 conference abstract²⁸ and 1 government report.²⁹ A brief description of each analysis is presented in Table 13. Although the

Table 10. Change in IPSS and AUA symptom scores after PVP during follow-up across included studies

Study	Variable	Decrease in score from preoperative values					
		Discharge	1 mo	3 mo	6 mo	12 mo	24 mo
Comparative studies							
Bachmann ¹⁰	Mean decrease*	9.1	9.5	11.4	12.9	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	50.3	52.5	63.0	71.3	NA	NA
	p value†	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA	NA
Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	Mean decrease*	NA	14.0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	49.8	NA	NA	NA	NA
	p value†	NA	< 0.001	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pooled weighted mean decrease in score (and % improvement)							11.4 (66.5) 11.4 (63.0) 12.9 (71.3) —
Noncomparative studies							
Hai and Malek ¹²							
Mattioli et al ¹³	Mean decrease*	NA	16.8	17.9	19.8	20.6	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	72.4	77.2	85.3	88.8	NA
	p value†	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA
Sandhu et al ¹⁴	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.4	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	NA	52.0	NA
	p value†	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Te et al ¹⁵	Mean decrease*	NA	8.5	9.8	11.2	11.7	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	46.2	53.3	60.9	63.6	NA
	p value†	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA
Barber et al ¹⁶	Mean decrease*	NA	16.0	18.0	18.9	19.7	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	67.0	75	79.0	82.0	NA
	p value†	NA	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	NA
Fu et al ¹⁷	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	NA	15.4	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	68.8%	NA	NA
	p value†	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Park and Ha ¹⁸	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	20.9	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	78.6	NA	NA	NA
	p value†	NA	NA	< 0.05	NA	NA	NA
	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	NA	15.7	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	71.0%	NA	NA
	p value†	NA	NA	NA	< 0.01	NA	NA

Continued on next page

Table 10. continued

Study	Variable	Decrease in score from preoperative values						
		Discharge	1 mo	3 mo	6 mo	12 mo	24 mo	
Sarica et al ¹⁹	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	NA	14.4	17.3	NA	
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	63.7%	76.5%	NA	
	p value†	NA	NA	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA	
Volkan et al ²⁰	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	4.7	12.1	12.0	NA	
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	25.0	64.4	63.8	NA	
	p value†	NA	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA	
Han et al ²¹	Mean decrease*	NA	10.4	12.6	11.4	NA	NA	
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	46.3	56.2	51.1	NA	NA	
	p value†	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA	NA	
Monoski ²²	Mean decrease*	NA	6.6	6.8	8.6	8.7	NA	
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	38.6	39.9	51.2	51.6	NA	
	p value†	NA	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	NA	
Ruszat et al ²³	Mean decrease*	7.7	7.9	10.2	11.6	11.4	11.6	
	Cumulative improvement, %	44.2%	45.5	57.9	65.6	64.8	68.0	
	p value†	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Pooled weighted mean decrease in score (and % improvement)		7.7 (44.2)	10.9 (51.8)	13.1 (57.4)	14.0 (66.4)	14.7 (69.8)	11.6 (68.0)	
Published values for TURP; mean decrease in symptom score‡			3–9 mo: 14.7	12 mo: 14.8	16 mo: 13.5			

IPSS = International Prostate Symptom Severity; AUA = American Urological Association; PVP = photoselective vaporization of the prostate; NA = no data available; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate.
 *Decrease in IPSS score or Quality of Life Score indicates deduction in symptoms or increase in quality of life.
 †Statistical significance when compared with preoperative or baseline value.
 ‡From published clinical practice guidelines (American Urological Association, 2003).

quality of the studies reviewed varied, the findings did not. All 4 demonstrated that on a per case or per patient basis, the cost of PVP was less than that of TURP.

An economic model comparing TURP with PVP in Alberta

Based on findings from the review of clinical evidence for PVP compared with TURP, which demonstrated similar safety and efficacy profiles for the 2 treatments, a cost-minimization analysis from the payer’s perspective (i.e., Alberta’s Ministry of Health and Wellness) was performed. Information on direct costs for TURP was obtained from the Ministry. Since PVP is not yet offered in Alberta, costs for the procedure were collected from the manufacturer (D. Okamoto, American Medical Systems Inc., Minnetonka, Minnesota; personal communication, 2007) and the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care in Ontario,²⁹ where PVP is already being performed. This information, which was in turn used to compare PVP with TURP against a comprehensive list of cost elements, is summarized in Table 14. The following assumptions were made:

1. The preoperative physical examination by a physician and the diagnostic tests used to establish BPH are the same regardless of treatment choice; thus, the preoperative costs for both groups are the same.
2. Physician and nursing costs for both groups are the same.
3. PVP requires the use of disposable laser fibres, which are estimated in the Ontario government report to cost Can\$650 each.²⁹ For TURP, a resecting loop is required; these have been estimated to cost Can\$100 each. Regarding capital costs, TURP will already be available at the hospital or institution so there will be no additional capital expenditures. As a new program, PVP will require the purchase of a PVP GreenLight laser system (specifically, the new higher powered GreenLight HPS), which is estimated to cost Can\$125 000. This system is built to function in standard operating room suites without the need for external water connections or specialized electrical utilities. Therefore, it is assumed that no installation costs will be incurred.

Maintenance costs after the first year (after the warranty has expired) are estimated to be Can\$10 000 per year (D. Okamoto, American Medical Systems Inc., Minnetonka, Minnesota:

Table 11. Change in Quality of Life score after PVP during follow-up across included studies

Study	Variable	Discharge	Decrease in score from preoperative values				
			1 mo	3 mo	6 mo	12 mo	24 mo
Comparative studies Bachmann ¹⁰	Mean decrease*	1.8	1.7	2.2	2.2	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	54.5	51.5	66.7	66.7	NA	NA
	p value†	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA	NA
Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	Mean decrease*	NA	2.65	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	—	NA	NA	NA	NA
	p value†	NA	< 0.001	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pooled weighted mean decrease in score (and % improvement)			2.1 —	2.2 (66.7)	2.2 (66.7)	—	—
Noncomparative studies							
Hai and Malek ¹²	Mean decrease*	NA	2.7	3.5	3.9	3.9	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	62.8	81.9	90.7	90.7	NA
	p value†	NA	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	NA
Te et al ¹⁵	Mean decrease*	NA	2.2	2.8	3.1	3.3	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	51.2	65.1	72.1	76.7	NA
	p value†	NA	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	NA
Barber et al ¹⁶	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	NA	3.3	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	71.7%	NA	NA
	p value†	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fu et al ¹⁷	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	4.1	NA	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	71.9	NA	NA	NA
	p value†	NA	NA	< 0.05	NA	NA	NA
Park and Ha ¹⁸	Mean decrease*	NA	NA	NA	3.2	NA	NA
	Cumulative improvement, %	NA	NA	NA	69.6	NA	NA
	p value†	NA	NA	NA	< 0.01	NA	NA
Ruszat et al ²³	Mean decrease*	1.7	1.8	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.4
	Cumulative improvement, %	48.6	50.8	65.0	71.3	69.6	69.6%
	p value†	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pooled weighted mean decrease in score (and % improvement)			2.0(51.4)	3.3 (68.4)	3.0 (65.6)	3.0 (74.6)	2.4 (69.6)
Published values for TURP; mean decrease in symptom score‡			1.7 (48.6)	3–9 mo: 3.4	12 mo: 3.3	16 mo: 3.0	3.0

PVP = photoselective vaporization of the prostate; NA = no data available; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate.

*Decrease in International Prostate Symptom Severity score or Quality of Life score indicates deduction in symptoms or increase in quality of life.

†Statistical significance when compared with preoperative or baseline value.

‡From published clinical practice guidelines (American Urological Association, 2003).

personal communication, 2007). The equipment is amortized over 5 years, with an average of 1400 procedures each year (based on trends in Alberta over the past 5 years). However, early in its diffusion, patient throughput will likely be considerably less and the annual amortized costs will be substantially greater.

4. PVP patients will require observation in a step-down day ward after the procedure. This will contribute to the cost of the PVP treatment. For the TURP patients, an average length of hospital stay of 2 days is anticipated (using administrative data from Alberta Health and Wellness for the fiscal year 2004/05, median length of stay was 2 days).³⁰
5. There are no differences between the rates of complications and adverse events in the 2 groups. Also, since long-term data on PVP is limited, it is assumed (conservatively) that the

retreatment rates will be the same in both groups.

Table 14 demonstrates that differences in per treatment costs between PVP and TURP will most likely be due to differences in the cost of consumables, capital equipment and length of hospital stays. As previously mentioned, the only Canadian data for PVP (from the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care) found the cost per procedure was less than one-half that of TURP (Can\$3887 v. Can\$1184). Therefore, even if the costs of capital depreciation and system maintenance are added to these figures, the difference in cost will still be substantial. Since the actual cost per TURP in Alberta is about \$3437.87 (a value similar to that reported in Ontario), it would not be unreasonable to expect per case PVP costs in Alberta to lie between Can\$1500 and Can\$1800, making it the less costly alternative.

Table 12. Mean changes in functional outcomes after PVP, compared with TURP, at first postdischarge follow-up visit of included comparative studies

Functional outcome	Study type	Intervention; mean difference between pre- and postoperative values		p value; difference between group	Favours PVP or TURP
		PVP	TURP		
Postvoiding flow					
Increase, mL/s	Non-RCT	10.7	12.6	> 0.05; NS	Neither
	RCT	12.0	8.6	> 0.05; NS	Neither
% Improvement	Non-RCT	155.0	183.0	> 0.05; NS	Neither
	RCT	167.4	149.0	> 0.05; NS	Neither
Postvoiding residual volume					
Decrease, mL	Non-RCT	129.0	93.9	> 0.05; NS	Neither
	RCT	125.0	86.0	> 0.05; NS	Neither
% Improvement	Non-RCT	88.2	77.8	> 0.05; NS	Neither
	RCT	NA	NA	—	—
IPSS					
Decrease in score	Non-RCT	9.5	6.7	> 0.05; NS	Neither
	RCT	14.0	12.9	> 0.05; NS	Neither
% Improvement	Non-RCT	52.5	38.7	> 0.05; NS	Neither
	RCT	49.8	50.2	> 0.05; NS	Neither
Quality of Life score					
Decrease in score	Non-RCT	1.7	1.3	> 0.05; NS	Neither
	RCT	2.7	2.9	> 0.05; NS	Neither
% Improvement	Non-RCT	51.5	38.2	> 0.05; NS	Neither
	RCT	NA	NA	—	—

PVP = photoselective vapourization of the prostate; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate; RCT = randomized controlled trial; IPSS = International Prostate Symptom Score; NS = not statistically significant; NA = not available.

Table 13. Summary of economic analyses comparing PVP with TURP*

Study	Study type	Costs considered	Source of information on costs and outcomes	Sensitivity analyses performed	Results	Study quality†
Stovsky et al ²⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed Markov model† comparing 5 types of treatment for BPH, including PVP and TURP Follow-up period: 2 years Perspective: payer (US Medicare Program) United States 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct medical costs (both physician and hospital) for the procedure, adverse events and retreatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs: Medicare claims from 2005 Outcomes: AUA guidelines data set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Varying adverse event rates PVP retreatment rate at which costs equal those for TURP Changing Medicare claims rates to 2006 figures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated costs for PVP during the 2-yr period were found to be less than those for TURP PVP: \$3876.84 TURP: \$5135.27 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study met most of the critical appraisal criteria
Bouchier-Hayes ¹¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewed Cost analysis conducted alongside a randomized controlled trial of PVP v. TURP Follow-up period: none; procedure only Perspective: payer (public health care system) Australia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct medical costs for the procedure only (no further information provided) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs: No information provided Outcomes: NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedure-related costs for PVP were less than those for TURP PVP: \$2975.08 TURP: \$3790.86 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study did not meet most of the critical appraisal criteria, which require detailed reporting of costing information, discounting and performance of sensitivity analyses
Ruszat ²³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conference abstract Cost analysis conducted alongside a prospective case series of PVP and TURP Follow-up period: none; procedure only Perspective: payer public health care system Switzerland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct medical costs for the procedure only (operating room, ward, disposable materials, and physician fees) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs: No information provided Outcomes: NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedure-related costs for PVP were less than those for TURP (exact values not provided) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study did not meet most of the critical appraisal criteria, which require detailed reporting of costing information, discounting, and performance of sensitivity analyses
Medical Advisory Secretariat ²⁹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government report Cost analysis of several treatments for BPH, including PVP and TURP Follow-up period: none; procedure only Perspective: payer public health care system Canada (Ontario) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct medical costs for the procedure only (operating room, ward, physician fees and blood transfusions) Capital costs not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs: physician and hospital costs; administrative data sets from Ontario Ministry of Health; blood transfusions; published literature Outcomes: NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedure-related costs for PVP were less than those for TURP PVP: \$1184 TURP: \$3887 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study met one-half of the critical appraisal criteria (capital cost elements and sensitivity analyses missing)

PVP = photoselective vaporization of the prostate; TURP = transurethral resection of the prostate; AUA = American Urological Association; NA = not available; BPH = benign prostatic hyperplasia.

* All costs are presented in Canadian dollars.

† Economic model in which the progress of a disease with and without interventions is modeled in a sequence on time periods.

‡ Based on appraisal guidelines for economic evaluations by Drummond et al.³¹

Interpretation

Although there are several commentaries and narrative reviews of PVP with earlier versions of the KTP laser,¹⁻³ our paper presents the first meta-analysis and systematic review of the safety, efficacy and economic consequences of PVP using the first commercially available KTP laser system (i.e., 80 W Greenlight PV System). Despite limited clinical evidence, findings were consistent across all 12 case series and both comparative studies, suggesting that, with 2 exceptions (blood transfusion and clot retention, which both favoured PVP), adverse events and complication rates are likely similar for PVP

and TURP. Therefore, it can be concluded that PVP offers an acceptable safety profile, even in anti-coagulated patients for whom TURP is often contraindicated.²⁶ Regarding efficacy, PVP was considered favourable to TURP in terms of length of patient hospitalization and catheterization time. There were no differences between the 2 procedures in operative or clinical outcomes. Importantly, none of the studies measured outcomes before 4–6 weeks following surgery; thus, it was not possible to assess the value to patients of shorter hospital stays and catheterization times. This may be significant, especially in patients who are still in the workforce. Nonetheless, based on the outcomes

Table 14. Comparison of costs for TURP and PVP

Item	Procedure; cost (\$Can)		Data source
	TURP	PVP	
Preoperative			
Physical examination	Equal	Equal	Alberta SoMB
Diagnostic tests (blood, urinalysis, etc.)	Equal	Equal	Health costing in Alberta 2005 Annual Report
Operative			
Personnel			
Circulating nurse	Equal	Equal	
Scrub nurse	Equal	Equal	
Urologist	Equal	Equal	Alberta SoMB
Anesthetist	Equal	Equal	Alberta SoMB
Consumables			
Fibre	Lower (0.00)	Higher (650.00)	Ontario Health Technology Advisory Committee
Loop	Higher (100.00)	Lower (0.00)	E. Woods urologist, Scarborough General Hospital, personal communication: 2006
Capital (equipment)	Lower (0.00)	Higher (27.00)*	
Postoperative			
Days of hospitalization			
Step-down unit	Lower (0.00)	Higher (unknown)	
General inpatient ward or unit (2 d)	Higher (unknown)	Lower (0.00)	
Treatment of complications or adverse events	Equal	Equal	
Postdischarge			
Treatment of complications or adverse events	Equal	Equal	Part 2 of this report
Retreatment	Equal	Equal	Part 2 of this report

TURP = Transurethral resection of the prostate; PVP = photoselective vapourization of the prostate; SoMB = Health Care Insurance Plan Schedule of Medical Benefits — Medical Procedure List 2005.
 *Can\$125 000 purchase price amortized over 2000 procedures in 5 yr.

evaluated, PVP appears to be as efficacious as TURP. Despite limited economic evidence, findings across all economic studies suggest that PVP is less costly than TURP. It could, therefore, offer an attractive alternative to payers. Further, PVP appears to involve a shorter learning curve relative to other laser approaches, which may enable surgeons to adopt the technology more readily.¹

In April 2007, the next generation PVP system, the 120 W GreenLight HPS received regulatory approval from Health Canada, making it commercially available.³¹ Recent laboratory testing and reports of early clinical experiences in the United States have suggested that the rate of tissue removal with the GreenLight HPS is significantly increased.³² However, this requires validation with larger study populations and longer follow-up periods.

From the *School of Public Health, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alta., the †Royal Alexandra Hospital, Edmonton, Alta., and the ‡Division of Urology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alta..

This article has been peer reviewed.

Competing interests: None declared.

References

- Kuntz RM. Current role of lasers in the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Eur Urol* 2006;49:961-9.
- Te AE. Current state of the art photoselective vaporization prostatectomy: laser therapy for benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2007;10:S2-5.
- Kirby RS. GreenLight photoselective vaporization of the prostate. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2007;10:S1.
- Norman RW, et al. Prostate-related symptoms in Canadian men 50 years of age or older: prevalence and relationships among symptoms. *Br J Urol* 1994;74:542-50.
- DiSantostefano RL, Biddle AK, Lavelle JP. An evaluation of the economic and patient-related consequences of treatments for benign prostatic hyperplasia. *BJU Int* 2006;97:1007-16.
- Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions 4.2.6. Ottawa (ON): Cochrane Collaboration; 2006. Available: www.cochrane.org/resources/handbook/Handbook4.2.6Sep2006.pdf (accessed 2006 Oct 4).
- Cohen J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educ Psychol Meas* 1960;20:37-46.
- Egger M, Smith GD, Altman DG. *Systematic reviews in health care: meta-analysis in context*. London (UK): BMJ Publishing Group; 2001.
- Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine. Levels of evidence and grades of recommendation. Oxford (UK): Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine; 2001. Available: www.cebm.net/levels_of_evidence.asp#notes (accessed 2006 Oct 4).
- Bachmann A. Photoselective vaporization (PVP) versus transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP): a prospective bi-centre study of perioperative morbidity and early functional outcome. *Eur Urol* 2005;48:965-72.
- Bouchier-Hayes DM. Photoselective vaporization of the prostate — towards a new standard. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2007;10:S10-4.
- Hai MA, Malek RS. Photoselective vaporization of the prostate: initial experience with a new 80 W KTP laser for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. *J Endourol* 2003;14:93-6.
- Mattioli M, Cremona F, Pozzoni F. Photoselective laser vaporization of the prostate (PVP) for treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). *J Endourol* 2003;17(Suppl 1):A318.
- Sandhu JS, Ng C, Vanderbrink BA, et al. High-power potassium-titanyl-phosphate photoselective laser vaporization of prostate treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia in men with large prostates. *J Urol* 2004;64:1155-8.
- Te AE, Malloy TR, Stein BS, et al. Photoselective vaporization of the prostate for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia: 12-month results from the first United States multicenter prospective trial. *J Urol* 2004;172:1404-8.
- Barber N, Zhu G, Donohue I, et al. Day case high-power KTP laser vaporization of the prostate — initial experience. *Eur Urol* 2004;2(Suppl 3):145.
- Fu WJ, Hong BF, Yang Y, et al. Photoselective vaporization of the prostate in the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2005;118:1610-4.
- Park MS, Ha T. The safety and short-term efficacy of photo selective vaporization of the prostate with 80 W KTP laser for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Eur Urol* 2005;3(Suppl 4):255.
- Sarica K, Alkan E, Luleci H, et al. Photoselective vaporization of the enlarged prostate with KTP laser: long-term results in 240 patients. *J Endourol* 2005;19:1199-202.
- Volkman T, Ihsan TA, Yilmaz O, et al. Short term outcomes of high power (80W) potassium-titanyl-phosphate laser vaporization of the prostate. *Eur Urol* 2005;48:608-13.
- Han E, Black L, Lavelle J. BPH-related surgical procedures in incontinent males with BPH. *Program and abstracts of the American Urological Association 2006 Annual Meeting*, May 20–25, 2006; Atlanta, Georgia. Abstract 1426.
- Monoski MA. Urodynamic predictors of outcomes with photoselective laser vaporization prostatectomy in patients with benign prostatic hyperplasia and preoperative retention. *Urol* 2006;68:312-7.
- Ruszat R, Wyler S, Seifert HH, et al. Photoselective vaporization of the prostate: subgroup analysis of men with refractory urinary retention. *Eur Urol* 2006;50:1040-9.
- American Urological Association. AUA guideline on management of benign prostatic hyperplasia. Chapter 1: diagnosis and treatment recommendations. *J Urol* 2003;170:530-47.
- Rassweiler J, Teber D, Kuntz R, et al. Complications of transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP): Incidence, management, and prevention. *Eur Urol* 2006;50:969-79.
- Ruszat R, Wyler S, Forster T, et al. Safety and effectiveness of photoselective vaporization of the prostate (PVP) in patients on ongoing oral anticoagulation. *Eur Urol* 2007;51:1031-41.
- Stovsky MD, Griffiths RI, Duff SB. A clinical outcomes and cost analysis comparing photoselective vaporization of the prostate to alternative minimally invasive therapies and transurethral prostate resection for the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. *J Urol* 2006;176:1500-6.
- Ruszat R, Sukser T, Scifert HH, et al. Photoselective vaporization (PVP) versus transurethral electroresection of the prostate (TURP): a comparative cost analysis. EAU Congress Paris Abstract No 9996. *Eur Urol Suppl* 2006;5:271.
- Medical Advisory Secretariat. *Energy delivery systems for treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia*. Toronto (ON): Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care; 2006.
- Alberta Health and Wellness. *Inpatient database 1999–2005*. Edmonton (AB): Alberta Health and Wellness; 2006.
- Therapeutic Products Directorate Medical Devices Bureau. Medical devices active licence listing. Ottawa (ON): Health Canada; 2006. Available: <http://cpe0013211b4c6d-cm0014e88ee7a4.cpe.net.cable.rogers.com/mdall/> (accessed 2007 May 10).
- Te AE. The next generation in laser treatments and the role of the GreenLight High-Performance System Laser. *Rev Urol* 2006;8(Suppl 3):S24-30.

Correspondence: Dr. Devidas Menon, Director, Health Policy and Management Stream, Professor, School of Public Health, University of Alberta, 13-103 Clinical Sciences Building, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB T6G 2G3; menon@ualberta.ca