©NIJPP
Publications 2025

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5479
PRINT ISSN: 2992-605X

NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND PHARMACY (NIJPP)

Volume 6 Issue 1 Page 128-133, 2025

https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJPP/2025/61128133

Minimally Invasive Surgical Techniques for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: Trends and Outcomes

Omeye Francis I.

Faculty of Medicine Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH) is a common condition affecting older men, leading to lower urinary tract symptoms and significantly impacting quality of life. In recent years, minimally invasive surgical techniques have emerged as viable alternatives to traditional surgical approaches, offering reduced recovery times, fewer complications, and enhanced patient outcomes. This review evaluates the current trends and outcomes of minimally invasive procedures for BPH management, including UroLift, laser therapies (e.g., Holmium Laser Enucleation of the Prostate), and Transurethral Resection of the Prostate (TURP). The advantages and limitations of each technique are critically assessed in terms of effectiveness, safety, long-term outcomes, and patient satisfaction. Furthermore, the review highlights the evolving role of these procedures in the broader context of patient-centered care, taking into consideration advancements in technology and surgical techniques. By comparing the success rates, recovery timelines, and complications of these methods, this review provides a comprehensive understanding of the current landscape of minimally invasive interventions in the treatment of BPH.

Keywords: Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia, minimally invasive surgery, UroLift, laser therapies, Holmium Laser Enucleation of the Prostate and TURP

INTRODUCTION

Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH) is a common condition affecting the prostate gland in aging men, characterized by the non-cancerous enlargement of the prostate. As the prostate enlarges, it can compress the urethra, leading to urinary symptoms such as increased frequency, urgency, nocturia, weak stream, and difficulty in urination[1–4]. BPH is primarily driven by hormonal changes, including the increased action of dihydrotestosterone (DHT) on prostate cells, coupled with age-related tissue remodeling. While BPH is not life-threatening, its symptoms can significantly affect a man's physical and psychological well-being[2, 5].

BPH is highly prevalent in older men, with symptoms often becoming more pronounced after the age of 50. It is estimated that approximately 50% of men aged 50 and above experience symptoms of BPH, and the prevalence rises to 90% in men aged 80 and older[6–8]. The condition is not only a cause of physical discomfort but also leads to a marked decline in the quality of life. The frequent need to urinate, interrupted sleep patterns due to nocturia, and the potential for more severe complications like urinary retention and bladder infections can cause significant distress. Additionally, the psychological impact of living with chronic symptoms can result in feelings of embarrassment, anxiety, and depression, further diminishing overall well-being. Given the high prevalence and burden of BPH, management strategies have evolved to reduce symptoms while minimizing risks and recovery time. Traditional treatment options, such as medication and invasive surgical procedures, are effective but often come with side effects or prolonged recovery periods[9]. As a result, there has been growing interest in minimally invasive approaches for BPH management. These methods, which include transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP), laser therapies, and prostatic stent placement, offer promising alternatives with reduced hospitalization, faster recovery, and fewer complications. Minimally invasive interventions aim to provide effective symptom relief with fewer adverse effects, improving patient outcomes and quality of life [9, 10]. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of minimally invasive treatment options for BPH, with a focus on their clinical efficacy, safety, and patient outcomes. By evaluating the latest advancements in these approaches, the review seeks to inform healthcare providers about the most current and effective strategies for managing BPH. Additionally, the review will explore the potential future directions for treatment innovations, considering the emerging technologies and techniques that could further enhance patient care and quality of

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5479
PRINT ISSN: 2992-605X

life. The goal is to assist clinicians in selecting the most appropriate treatment modalities based on individual patient needs and characteristics.

Minimally Invasive Surgical Techniques for BPH

Minimally invasive surgical techniques for benign prostate hyperplasia (BPH) are a group of procedures that aim to treat an enlarged prostate with less trauma, faster recovery times, and reduced risk of complications compared to traditional open surgery[11, 12]. These techniques typically involve smaller incisions or no incisions at all, often using specialized instruments, lasers, or energy sources to remove or shrink the obstructive prostate tissue. Key principles include using advanced imaging techniques like ultrasound or video-assisted endoscopy for precise tissue removal, faster recovery, and preservation of function. Traditional surgical methods, such as open prostatectomy, involve making a large abdominal incision to access and remove part or all of the prostate gland. This method has longer hospital stays, more extended recovery periods, higher risk of infection, and more significant pain due to the large incision[13, 14]. It also has higher risks and complications, including bleeding, blood clots, sexual dysfunction, incontinence, and longer-term recovery challenges. Minimally invasive techniques include Transurethral Resection of the Prostate (TURP), Laser Therapy (e.g., Holmium Laser Enucleation of the Prostate [HoLEP], Prostatic Urethral Lift (PUL), Transurethral Microwave Thermotherapy (TUMT), and Water Vapor Therapy (Rezūm). Recovery times are typically shorter and quicker than traditional surgery, with many patients returning home the same day or within a few hours[15, 16]. However, there are still risks, including urinary retention, infection, and erectile dysfunction, which are generally lower than with open surgery. In conclusion, minimally invasive procedures for BPH offer significant advantages over traditional open prostatectomy in terms of recovery time, complication rates, and quality of life outcomes. The choice of treatment depends on the individual patient's condition, prostate size, and other health factors.

UroLift System

The UroLift System is a minimally invasive treatment for benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) that involves lifting and holding the enlarged prostate tissue out of the way, opening the urethra, and relieving obstruction. It uses small implants to create a clear pathway for urine flow. The system is indicated for men with moderate to severe lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) who are not sufficiently managed by medication and are not suitable for more invasive surgeries like TURP or prefer a minimally invasive approach[17]. Clinical studies have demonstrated that the UroLift System provides significant improvement in symptoms, including reduced urinary frequency, urgency, and nocturia. Success rates are typically high, with a significant proportion of patients experiencing symptom relief within 2-3 months post-procedure. Long-term data shows sustained improvement in symptom scores and quality of life for up to 5 years, though outcomes can vary based on prostate size and individual patient characteristics.[18, 19]. Advantages of the UroLift System include minimal recovery time, reduced complications, and no incisions required. However, it is not suitable for patients with extremely large prostates or certain anatomical issues that may prevent proper implant placement[20]. Temporary symptom relief may occur, and urinary retention or discomfort may occur immediately after the procedure, which typically resolves within a few days. The cost of the procedure may be higher than other treatments and its availability may be limited in some regions, potentially impacting patient access.

Laser Therapies for BPH

Laser therapies, such as Holmium Laser Enucleation of the Prostate (HoLEP) and GreenLight Laser, are effective, minimally invasive treatments for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH). HoLEP involves using a holmium laser to enucleate the enlarged prostate tissue, which is then removed with a morcellator[21]. The laser energy emits energy that is absorbed by the water content in tissues, causing the tissue to vaporize, coagulate, and shrink, resulting in the resection and removal of the obstructive tissue in the prostate, relieving urinary symptoms associated with BPH. HoLEP has shown high success rates in improving urinary flow, reducing prostate volume, and providing long-term symptom relief. Studies suggest it offers comparable outcomes to traditional surgery (e.g., TURP), with fewer complications. Patients typically experience significant improvement in symptoms like urinary retention, frequency, and urgency. Advantages of HoLEP include precision, blood loss reduction, shorter hospitalization, and reduced blood loss compared to traditional surgery[22]. GreenLight Laser uses a potassium-titanyl-phosphate (KTP) laser to vaporize the obstructive prostate tissue, producing high-energy light at a wavelength absorbed by red blood cells. It is effective in reducing symptoms of BPH and has a high success rate in improving urinary flow. Advantages of GreenLight Laser include reduced blood loss, outpatient procedure, and minimal risk of sexual dysfunction compared to more invasive treatments like TURP. However, patient selection should be tailored to individual needs, considering factors like prostate size, comorbidities, prior treatments, surgeon experience, and long-term effectiveness. Overall, laser therapies offer numerous advantages, such as precision, reduced blood loss, and shorter hospital stays, but patient selection should be tailored to individual needs[22].

Transurethral Resection of the Prostate (TURP)

Transurethral Resection of the Prostate (TURP) is a surgical procedure used to treat benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH), a condition where the prostate enlarges, obstructing the urethra and causing urinary symptoms. The procedure involves preoperative preparation, access and instrumentation, and resection using a

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5479
PRINT ISSN: 2992-605X
special loop or electrocautery. TURP is considered the gold standard for BPH treatment, with a high success rate in relieving symptoms such as frequent urination, difficulty starting urination, weak urine flow, and nocturia. Several minimally invasive alternatives have emerged in recent years, such as laser treatments, Prostatic Urethral Lift (PUL), Transurethral Microwave Therapy (TUMT), and Water Vapor Therapy (Rezūm). These methods tend to have shorter recovery times, lower rates of complications, and are better suited for patients with certain medical conditions. However, TURP remains the gold standard for moderate to large prostate enlargement patients[23]. Long-term follow-up data shows that TURP has a high rate of symptom improvement, with 70-80% of patients reporting significant relief for up to 10 years. However, some patients may experience recurrent symptoms or require additional interventions. TURP carries potential risks and complications, such as bleeding, infection, retrograde ejaculation, urinary incontinence, and Transurethral Resection Syndrome (TUR syndrome). Despite these risks, TURP remains a well-established and effective treatment option for BPH, especially in patients with larger prostates or those not responding to medical treatments[24].

Comparative Analysis of Minimally Invasive Techniques

The study compares minimally invasive techniques for the surgical management of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). It evaluates their effectiveness in symptom relief, recovery times, safety profiles, long-term outcomes, and patient satisfaction. TURP is considered the gold standard, providing significant and sustained symptom relief in most patients. Laser enucleation, such as Holmium Laser Enucleation of the Prostate (HoLEP), offers excellent symptom relief and is effective in larger prostates[25]. TUVP, a newer technique that provides symptom relief through mechanical lifting of prostate tissue, also offers good symptom relief. Water Vapor Thermal Therapy (Rezūm) uses steam to ablate prostate tissue, showing promising symptom relief with fewer side effects and shorter recovery times compared to TURP[26, 27].

Recovery times and hospital stays vary between TURP and HoLEP. TURP requires a longer hospital stay and several weeks of post-operative care to manage side effects like bleeding and urinary retention. HoLEP has a favorable safety profile with a lower risk of bleeding, but there may still be a risk of infection and incontinence. TUVP is relatively safe with low complication rates, but there can be risks such as urethral strictures or irritation. PUL is less invasive and has a lower risk of complications, but overall safety is high. Long-term outcomes and recurrence rates vary among techniques. TURP offers long-term efficacy, but recurrence rates can be higher, particularly in patients with larger prostates or poor compliance to follow-up care. HoLEP has generally favorable long-term outcomes, with low recurrence rates even for larger prostates. TUVP is effective in symptom control but may not be as robust as TURP or HoLEP. PUL is more effective in mild to moderate BPH but may be less effective for very large prostates. In conclusion, minimally invasive techniques for BPH surgery offer promising results with quicker recovery, fewer complications, and lower recurrence rates compared to traditional methods like TURP. The choice of procedure depends on factors such as prostate size, patient preferences, and the risk of complications.

Emerging Technologies and Future Directions

The field of minimally invasive surgery (MIS) is constantly evolving, offering new techniques that improve patient outcomes, reduce recovery times, and minimize complications. Emerging technologies like focal laser ablation, plasma enucleation, transurethral microwave therapy (TUMT), and high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU) are revolutionizing BPH treatment. Robotic-assisted procedures, such as the da Vinci Surgical System, provide enhanced visualization, precision, and control during surgery, reducing the risk of complications[28]. Nanotechnology in BPH treatment has the potential to revolutionize BPH treatment by enabling targeted drug delivery directly to the prostate tissue. Nanoparticles can deliver drugs or genetic material into the prostate with high precision, minimizing side effects and enhancing therapeutic efficacy. Thermal ablation using nanotechnology can enhance thermal ablation therapies, while nanorobots could be used for tissue repair[29]. Molecular-targeted therapies for BPH include gene therapy and RNA-based treatments that target specific molecular pathways involved in BPH. Examples include RNA interference techniques, immunotherapy, targeted drug delivery using biodegradable polymers, and monoclonal antibodies. Future directions for BPH treatment include personalized medicine, 3D imaging and printing, and artificial intelligence and machine learning. Genomic profiling can determine the most suitable treatment for individual patients, while 3D imaging techniques combined with 3D printing can create accurate, patient-specific models of the prostate. AI and machine learning algorithms can optimize surgical planning and robotic systems, predicting outcomes based on patient data. As these technologies continue to evolve, the landscape of BPH surgery will likely shift towards more effective, less invasive, and more tailored treatment options for patients[30].

Patient-Centered Care Considerations

Patient-centered care is crucial for the successful treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). It involves tailoring medical interventions to meet individual needs, preferences, and circumstances. Key factors to consider include prostate size, symptom severity, medical history and comorbidities, age and functional status, patient preference, and prior BPH treatments. Managing patient expectations is essential, with clear communication about the procedure, potential outcomes, and possible risks. Patients should be informed about expected outcomes, recovery time, side effects and risks, long-term results, and patient involvement in the decision-

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5479
PRINT ISSN: 2992-605X

making process. Post-operative care and follow-up protocols are crucial for minimizing complications and ensuring a successful recovery. These include immediate monitoring and pain management, hydration and urinary function, managing side effects, activity restrictions, follow-up appointments, managing complications, and providing patient education and support. Initial follow-ups should be scheduled within 1–2 weeks post-surgery to assess recovery progress, remove any remaining catheter if present, and monitor for complications. Long-term follow-ups should continue at 3–6-month intervals for the first year, and then annually thereafter. If complications occur, appropriate interventions should be planned promptly. For persistent symptoms or recurrence of BPH after minimally invasive treatment, further treatment options may be considered. Patient education and support should include information about lifestyle modifications that can help manage BPH symptoms post-surgery, such as weight loss, pelvic floor exercises, and dietary changes. Support groups or counseling can also be offered for patients struggling with emotional or psychological effects post-surgery.

Patient-centered care in minimally invasive BPH treatment involves thoughtful selection, effective management of expectations, and a detailed post-operative care plan.

CONCLUSION

Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH) management has evolved significantly with the advent of minimally invasive treatments, which aim to improve patient outcomes while minimizing complications and recovery time. Current trends in BPH treatment emphasize techniques such as **transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP)**, **laser therapies**, **prostatic urethral lift (PUL)**, **water vapor thermal therapy**, and **reversible prostatic artery embolization**. These approaches have gained popularity due to their efficacy in alleviating urinary symptoms, their reduced invasiveness, and their applicability to a broader patient population, including those with significant comorbidities.

In assessing the effectiveness and clinical roles of these techniques, it is clear that no single modality is universally superior. TURP remains the gold standard for moderate to severe cases, while laser therapies, such as Holmium Laser Enucleation of the Prostate (HoLEP), offer long-term efficacy and safety profiles comparable to TURP. PUL and water vapor thermal therapy have emerged as promising alternatives for patients seeking outpatient, low-risk options with minimal sexual dysfunction. Prostatic artery embolization, though less invasive, requires further validation through large-scale studies to establish its long-term benefits and standardization.

Looking forward, the future of BPH management is likely to be shaped by advancements in **robotics, imaging technology**, and **biomarker-based patient stratification**. Techniques that further reduce invasiveness, improve precision, and optimize outcomes for specific patient groups will likely dominate clinical practice. Additionally, the integration of **artificial intelligence (AI)** in diagnosis and treatment planning may further enhance personalized care for BPH. With ongoing innovation and research, minimally invasive treatments for BPH are poised to play a pivotal role in addressing this prevalent condition effectively and efficiently in diverse clinical settings.

REFERENCES

1. Tiruneh, T., Getachew, T., Getahun, F., Gebreyesus, T., Meskele, S.: Magnitude and factors associated with benign prostatic hyperplasia among adult male patients visiting Wolaita Sodo University comprehensive specialized hospital southern Ethiopia. Sci Rep. 14, 31556 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-83483-4
2. Awedew, A.F., Han, H., Abbasi, B., Abbasi-Kangevari, M., Ahmed, M.B., Almidani, O., Amini, E., Arabloo, J., Argaw, A.M., Athari, S.S., Atlaw, D., Banach, M., Barrow, A., Bhagavathula, A.S., Bhojaraja, V.S., Bikbov, B.,: The global, regional, and national burden of benign prostatic hyperplasia in 204 countries and territories from 2000 to 2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. The Lancet Healthy Longevity. 3, e754–e776 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568(22)00213-6
3. Ibiam, U.A., Uti, D.E., Ejeogo, C.C., Orji, O.U., Aja, P.M., Nwamaka, E.N., Alum, E.U., Chukwu, C., Aloke, C., Itodo, M.O., Agada, S.A., Umoru, G.U., Obeten, U.N., Nwobodo, V.O.G., Nwadum, S.K., Udoudoh, M.P.: Xylopia aethiopica Attenuates Oxidative Stress and Hepatorenal Damage in Testosterone Propionate-Induced Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia in Rats. Journal of Health and Allied Sciences NU. 14, 477–485 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-1777836
4. Ibiam, U.A., Uti, D.E., Ejeogo, C.C., Orji, O.U., Aja, P.M., Nwamaka, E.N., Alum, E.U., Chukwu, C., Aloke, C., Chinedum, K.E., Agu, P., Nwobodo, V.: In Vivo and in Silico Assessment of Ameliorative Effects of Xylopia aethiopica on Testosterone Propionate-Induced Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. Pharmaceutical Fronts. 05, e64–e76 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-1768477
5. Cao, D., Sun, R., Peng, L., Li, J., Huang, Y., Chen, Z., Chen, B., Li, J., Ai, J., Yang, L., Liu, L., Wei, Q.: Immune Cell Proinflammatory Microenvironment and Androgen-Related Metabolic Regulation During Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia in Aging. Front. Immunol. 13, (2022). https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2022.842008
6. Lim, K.B.: Epidemiology of clinical benign prostatic hyperplasia. Asian J Urol. 4, 148–151 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajur.2017.06.004

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5479
PRINT ISSN: 2992-605X

7. Chughtai, B., Lee, R., Te, A., Kaplan, S.: Role of Inflammation in Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. Rev Urol. 13, 147–150 (2011)
8. Ngai, H.-Y., Yuen, K.-K.S., Ng, C.-M., Cheng, C.-H., Chu, S.-K.P.: Metabolic syndrome and benign prostatic hyperplasia: An update. Asian J Urol. 4, 164–173 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajur.2017.05.001
9. Miernik, A., Gratzke, C.: Current Treatment for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. Dtsch Arztebl Int. 117, 843–854 (2020). https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.2020.0843
10. Bortnick, E., Brown, C., Simma-Chiang, V., Kaplan, S.A.: Modern best practice in the management of benign prostatic hyperplasia in the elderly. Therapeutic Advances in Urology. 12, 1756287220929486 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1177/1756287220929486
11. Kim, H.J., Hong, S.K.: Application of robotics in the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia: a narrative review. Prostate International. (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prnil.2024.06.002
12. Rocco, B., Albo, G., Ferreira, R.C., Spinelli, M., Cozzi, G., Dell'Orto, P., Patel, V., Rocco, F.: Recent advances in the surgical treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. Therapeutic Advances in Urology. 3, 263–272 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1177/1756287211426301
13. Ilic, D., Evans, S.M., Allan, C.A., Jung, J.H., Murphy, D., Frydenberg, M.: Laparoscopic and robotic-assisted versus open radical prostatectomy for the treatment of localised prostate cancer. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2017, (2017). https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD009625.pub2
14. Hu, J.C.: Comparative Effectiveness of Minimally Invasive vs Open Radical Prostatectomy. JAMA. 302, 1557 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.1451
15. Bhandari, V., Bhandari, M.: Compare the clinical and postoperative outcomes: laparoscopic versus open surgery. Int Surg J. 7, 861 (2020). https://doi.org/10.18203/2349-2902.isj20200834
16. Comparison between minimally invasive simple prostatectomy and open simple prostatectomy for large prostates: A systematic review and meta-analysis of comparative trials. | Semantic Scholar, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Comparison-between-minimally-invasive-simple-and-A-Li-Cao/cf33f0638e7d622ab8b7cb45a4df93ddbbdf549d
17. Tsui, J.F., Dixon, C.: BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERPLASIA (K MCVARY , SECTION EDITOR) Urolift : a New Face of Minimally Invasive Surgical Technique for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia ? Presented at the (2016)
18. Al-Singary, W., Patel, R., Obi-Njoku, O., Patel, H.R.H.: The UroLift® System for lower urinary tract obstruction: patient selection for optimum clinical outcome. Minimally Invasive Therapy & Allied Technologies. 31, 456–461 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1080/13645706.2020.1816554
19. Userovici, M., Ochoa, A., Anract, J., Beurrier, S., Peyromaure, M., Barry Delongchamps, N.: Pose d'implants Urolift® intra-prostatique pour hyperplasie bénigne de la prostate : résultats après 7 ans d'expérience. Progrès en Urologie. 30, 147–154 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.purol.2020.01.003
20. Geisinger Commonwealth School of Medicine, Pennsylvania, United States, Denisenko, A., Somani, B., University Hospital Southampton NHS Trust, Southampton, United Kingdom, Agrawal, V., The Guthrie Clinic, Pennsylvania, United States: Recent advances in UroLift: A comprehensive overview. Turkish Journal of Urology. 48, 11–16 (2022). https://doi.org/10.5152/tud.2022.21149
21. Lee, M.H., Yang, H.J., Kim, D.S., Lee, C.H., Jeon, Y.S.: Holmium Laser Enucleation of the Prostate is Effective in the Treatment of Symptomatic Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia of Any Size Including a Small Prostate. Korean J Urol. 55, 737 (2014). https://doi.org/10.4111/kju.2014.55.11.737
22. Bae, J., Choo, M., Park, J.H., Oh, J.K., Paick, J.-S., Oh, S.-J.: Holmium Laser Enucleation of Prostate for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: Seoul National University Hospital Experience. Int Neurourol J. 15, 29 (2011). https://doi.org/10.5213/inj.2011.15.1.29
23. Minardi, D., Galosi, A., Yehia, M., Cristalli, A., Hanitzsch, H., Polito, M., Muzzonigro, G.: Transurethral resection versus minimally invasive treatments of benign prostatic hyperplasia: results of treatments. Our experience. Archivio italiano di urologia, andrologia : organo ufficiale [di] Societa italiana di ecografia urologica e nefrologica. (2004)
24. Djavan, B., Kazzazi, A., Bostanci, Y.: Revival of thermotherapy for benign prostatic hyperplasia. Current Opinion in Urology. 22, 16–21 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1097/MOU.0b013e32834d5469
25. Leong, J., Tokarski, A., Roehrborn, C., Das, A.: UroLift and Rezum: minimally invasive surgical therapies for the management of benign prostatic hyperplasia. The Canadian journal of urology. (2021)
26. Das, A., Han, T., Uhr, A., Roehrborn, C.: Benign prostatic hyperplasia: an update on minimally invasive therapy including Aquablation. The Canadian journal of urology. (2020)
27. Franco, J.V.A., Tesolin, P., Jung, J.H.: Update on the management of benign prostatic hyperplasia and the role of minimally invasive procedures. Prostate International. 11, 1–7 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prnil.2023.01.002
28. Becker, B., Rosenbaum, C.M.: Current Milestones and Future Horizons in Minimally Invasive Urologic Surgery. J Clin Med. 13, 6573 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm13216573

OPEN ACCESS
ONLINE ISSN: 2992-5479
PRINT ISSN: 2992-605X

29. Darzi, S.A., Munz, Y.: The impact of minimally invasive surgical techniques. Annu Rev Med. 55, 223–237 (2004). https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.med.55.091902.105248
30. Rosero, J.V.A.: Risk analysis of miscarriage among workers at the "sandflowers" floriculture in Pichincha province. Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología - Serie de Conferencias. 2, 602–602 (2023). https://doi.org/10.56294/sctconf2023602

CITE AS: Omeye Francis I. (2025). Minimally Invasive Surgical Techniques for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: Trends and Outcomes. NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND PHARMACY, 6(1):128-133. https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJPP/2025/61128133