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Though scleroring adenosis of the prostate is uncommon, the author could kindly address the following postulations scientifically during the discussion. 1. Could sclerosing adenosing be a precursor of adenocarcinoma of the prostate? 2. Even though most of the patients with sclerosing adenosis had PSA within reference range, what do the author suggest as a long term followup for these patients?