



RE: holep versus thuflep in men with very large prostates (> 175 ml)

Francesco Montorsi^{1,2} · Paolo Capogrosso³ · Federico Dehò³ · Giorgio Gandaglia^{1,2} · Alberto Briganti^{1,2} · Andrea Salonia^{1,2}

Received: 15 April 2025 / Accepted: 16 April 2025 / Published online: 27 May 2025
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2025

Sir, we read with great interest the article by Cagri Aybal et al. comparing Holmium laser enucleation of the prostate (HoLEP) versus Thulium fiber laser EP (ThuFLEP) in men with very large prostates (>175 ml) recently published in *The World Journal of Urology* [1]. The authors should be commended for their comprehensive and detailed comparison between these two techniques, which demonstrated no significant differences in outcomes.

However, we noted that the authors reported a shorter enucleation time with ThuFLEP compared to HoLEP [1]. This finding contrasts with data from randomized trials and meta-analyses comparing these techniques, which generally support faster enucleation with holmium laser [2, 3]. Furthermore, contrary to what the authors state, two ex vivo trials have demonstrated that tissue separation depth was greater with holmium laser than TFL, and was objectively preferred by surgeons [4, 5], suggesting that finding the correct plane of dissection may be easier with holmium laser.

In this context, previous data show that following HoLEP, the vast majority of patients achieve a PSA level less than 1 ng/ml, similar to outcomes observed in patients treated with open simple prostatectomy [6]. This is a witness of the complete removal of the prostatic adenoma. Therefore, it would be valuable to know the 3-month postoperative mean PSA levels in both the HoLEP and ThuFLEP patients included in this analysis.

Author contributions FM and PC wrote the main manuscript. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Data availability No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Declarations

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Aybal HC, Yilmaz M, Barlas IS, Duvarci M, Guven S, Tunc L (2025) HoLEP versus thuflep in men with very large prostates (>175 ml). *World J Urol* 43:109
2. Kosiba M, Filzmayer M, Welte MN et al (2024) Thulium fiber laser vs. holmium laser enucleation of the prostate: results of a prospective randomized non-inferiority trial. *World J Urol* 42:49
3. Uleri A, Long Depaquit T, Farre A et al (2024) Thulium Fiber versus Holmium:Yttrium-aluminum-garnet laser for endoscopic enucleation of the prostate: A systematic review and Meta-analysis. *Eur Urol Focus* 10:914–921
4. Doizi S, Germain T, Panthier F, Comperat E, Traxer O, Berthe L (2022) Comparison of holmium:yag and thulium Fiber lasers on soft tissue: an ex vivo study. *J Endourol* 36:251–258
5. Yilmaz M, Esser J, Kraft L et al (2022) Experimental ex-vivo performance study comparing a novel, pulsed thulium solid-state laser, chopped thulium fibre laser, low and high-power holmium:yag laser for endoscopic enucleation of the prostate. *World J Urol* 40:601–606
6. Fallara G, Capogrosso P, Schifano N et al (2021) Ten-year Follow-up results after holmium laser enucleation of the prostate. *Eur Urol Focus* 7:612–617

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

✉ Paolo Capogrosso
paolo.capogrosso@gmail.com

¹ Department of Urology, Urological Research Institute, San Raffaele Hospital, Milan, Italy

² University Vita-Salute San Raffaele, Milan, Italy

³ Unit of Urology, Department of Medicine and Technological Innovations, Circolo & Fondazione Macchi Hospital, University of Insubria, Varese, Italy