

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 Background: MRI, bone scan, and CT staging is recommended in the staging of
30 prostate cancer. However, prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission
31 tomography (PSMA PET) could be superior in detection of local and distant prostate
32 cancer cells. Most PSMA PET scans for prostate cancer are performed with a
33 Gallium-68 ligand, with the Fluorine-18 (^{18}F) ligand being introduced more recently.
34 Methods: We will conduct a retrospective review of electronic patient records for all
35 consecutive patients who underwent preoperative ^{18}F -PSMA PET scan for prostate
36 cancer from its introduction at our centre in 2019. We will compare PET scans with
37 other imaging modalities and evaluate its use in diagnosis and management
38 decisions for prostate cancer.
39 Conclusions: Understanding the role of ^{18}F -PSMA PET in diagnosis and
40 management could influence the diagnostic pathway of primary and secondary
41 prostate cancer.
42 Trial registration: Not applicable.

43 BACKGROUND

44 European Association of Urology guidelines recommend the use of magnetic
45 resonance imaging (MRI) to assess local staging of prostate cancer alongside
46 computer tomography (CT) and a bone scan to assess distant metastasis in patients
47 with higher risk disease ¹. However, MRI and CT have low sensitivity ^{2,3}, and MRI
48 has low specificity for detecting lymph node metastasis ⁴⁻⁶. This is problematic as
49 patients considered appropriate for radical therapy for localised disease may have
50 micro-metastases ⁷.

51

52 An alternative is positron emission tomography (PET), which can detect local and
53 distant prostate cancer cells ⁸. ¹⁸F-fluorodeoxyglucose is a tracer that is used in most
54 oncological PET scans ⁹, as it has preferential uptake in cancer cells ¹⁰. However,
55 early studies into its use in prostate cancer were not promising, with one study
56 showing a sensitivity of 37% ¹¹⁻¹³, as such alternative PET tracers have been trialled
57 ⁹. These include Gallium-68 (⁶⁸Ga) and Fluorine-18 (¹⁸F) prostate-specific membrane
58 antigen (PSMA) PET.

59

60 ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET

61 ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET is a ligand that binds to PSMA – a glycoprotein that is
62 overexpressed on the surface of prostate cancer cells ⁸. In a randomised controlled
63 trial of 302 men with high-risk prostate cancer, Hofman et al. evaluated the accuracy
64 of ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET versus CT and bone scan at detecting pelvic nodal or distant
65 metastatic disease. ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET had significantly superior accuracy (92% v

66 65%, $p < 0.0001$), as well as higher sensitivity (85% v 38%) and specificity (98% v
67 91%) compared to CT and bone scan ¹⁴.

68

69 Petersen and Zacho conducted a systematic review of ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET for lymph
70 node staging in prostate cancer. In 18 studies including 969 patients, the weighted
71 sensitivity and weighted specificity compared to pathology as a reference was 59%
72 (range 23-100%) and 93% (range 67-100%), respectively. In four studies, ⁶⁸Ga-
73 PSMA-PET was superior to CT or MRI, but in three studies comparing ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-
74 PET to mpMRI (multiparametric MRI) or diffusion weighted MRI there were mixed
75 results ¹⁵.

76

77 ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET may also be used to improve the detection of metastatic disease in
78 those with biochemical recurrence (BCR). In a systematic review of 37 studies
79 comprising 4790 patients, Perera et al. demonstrated that in patients with
80 biochemical recurrence (BCR) ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET positivity increased with increasing
81 PSA level, and could be used to detect recurrence at low PSA levels (⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-
82 PET positivity for < 0.2 ng/ml was 33% and for 0,2-0.5ng/ml was 45%) ¹⁶.

83

84 Hofman et al. also found that first-line ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET changed management
85 intent, modality, or modality delivery more commonly compared to CT and bone scan
86 (28% v 15%, $p = 0.008$). ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET was also associated with management
87 change in those who received in second-line compared to CT and bone scan (27%
88 v 5%) ¹⁴. Han et al. performed a systematic review of the impact of ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET
89 on management decisions. 1163 patients across 15 studies were included, and there
90 were management changes in 54% (95% CI 47-60%) of patients following ⁶⁸G-

91 PSMA-PET¹⁷. ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET positivity was significantly associated with increased
92 rate of management change and meta-regression demonstrated that for each
93 percent increase in positivity there was a 0.55% change in management (p<0.05).

94

95 **¹⁸F-PSMA-PET**

96 A more recent development in PSMA-PET imaging is the use of ¹⁸F-PSMA-PET as
97 an alternative tracer to ⁶⁸Ga, utilising the ¹⁸F radio-isotope ligand to label PSMA. One
98 advantage of ¹⁸F is its minimal urinary excretion compared to ⁶⁸Ga, which is limited by
99 primary excretion through the urinary system, resulting in accumulation in the
100 bladder, obscuring the prostate¹⁸. Furthermore, ¹⁸F has practical advantages over
101 ⁶⁸Ga, including a longer half-life, aiding production of the agent in a central facility
102 and distribution to distant imaging centres (Table 1)¹⁸.

103

104 Prive et al compared ¹⁸F-PSMA-PET to conventional mp-MRI for local primary
105 staging, in a cohort of 55 patients with intermediate to high risk prostate cancer¹⁹. 23
106 patients received both imaging modalities and underwent radical prostatectomy, with
107 prostate specimens subsequently available for histopathological analysis. Using
108 histopathological T stage as reference, this study demonstrated ¹⁸F-PSMA-PET
109 correctly staged seminal vesical invasion (pT3b) more often than mp-MRI (90 vs
110 76%), whereas mp-MRI correctly staged extra-capsular extension (pT3a) more often
111 than ¹⁸F-PSMA-PET (90 vs 57%).

112

113 Rowe et al evaluated ¹⁸F-PSMA-PET performance in distant lesion detection in
114 metastatic prostate cancer²⁰. Eight patients with biochemical recurrence underwent
115 both ¹⁸F-PSMA-PET and CT-bone scan. 139 sites of PET positive for metastatic

116 disease were detected, whereas only 45 sites of metastatic disease were identified
117 on CT-bone scan. Although metastatic deposit biopsy data was not available for
118 reference, regression analysis estimated 72% (95% CI 55-84%) of negative or
119 equivocal lesions on CT-bone scan would be positive on ^{18}F -PSMA-PET.
120 Conversely, it was estimated that only 3% (95% CI 1-7%) of negative or equivocal
121 lesions on ^{18}F -PSMA-PET would be positive on CT-bone scan.

122

123 Dietlein et al compared ^{18}F -PSMA-PET to ^{68}Ga -PSMA-PET in the context of
124 biochemically recurrent prostate cancer²¹. They performed PSMA-PET scans with
125 both tracers on 25 patients with biochemically recurrent prostate cancer. This
126 demonstrated non-inferiority of ^{18}F -PSMA-PET and suggested its improved
127 sensitivity in localising relapsed tumours after prostatectomy in moderately raised
128 PSA contexts.

129

PET Modality	Mechanism of targeting		Sites of physiological uptake	Advantages	Disadvantages
	Tracer	Target			
G68-PSMA-PET	Gallium-68 radioisotope	PSMA: transmembrane protein over-expressed in PCa	Kidney, bladder, salivary/lacrimal glands, liver, spleen, intestines	High prostatic specificity	Higher urinary clearance
F18-PSMA-PET	Fluorine-18 radioisotope	PSMA: transmembrane protein over-expressed in PCa	Kidney, salivary/lacrimal glands, liver, spleen, intestines	High prostatic specificity; Minimal urinary clearance	

130

131 Table 1: Comparison of different PET modalities for prostate cancer imaging

132

133 Our centre has performed ^{18}F -PSMA PET since 2019 and we have conducted all
134 primary staging with this modality since August 2020. In this study, we aim to
135 examine the added value of ^{18}F -PSMA PET over conventional staging modalities for

136 primary and secondary disease, local and distant disease, and to investigate the
137 influence of ^{18}F -PSMA PET on treatment decisions.

138 **Hypothesis**

139 ^{18}F -PSMA PET has suitable accuracy for investigation of primary and secondary
140 prostate metastasis (nodal and distant) and alters management subsequently.

141 **Aims**

- 142 • Comparison of PSMA-PET vs mpMRI for T and N stage
- 143 • Comparison of PSMA-PET vs MRI marrow, MRI Narrow Slice, or bone scan
144 for M stage
- 145 • Comparison between imaging modalities for positive, negative, and equivocal
146 results
- 147 • Comparison between imaging modalities and histology results
- 148 • Added value of PSMA-PET in clinically significant disease where there is a
149 discordance between pathology findings and biochemistry
- 150 • Impact of PSMA-PET for primary staging on decision making and treatment
151 strategy
- 152 • Impact of PSMA-PET for secondary staging (BCR post radical local therapy)
153 on decision making and treatment strategy
- 154 • Influence of risk factors on the above aims – e.g. PSA level or D’Amico risk
155 classification.

156 **METHODOLOGY**

157 We will conduct a retrospective review of electronic patient records for all
158 consecutive patients who underwent preoperative ¹⁸F-PSMA PET scan for prostate
159 cancer from its introduction at the Churchill Hospital, Oxford, UK in 2019. Patients
160 will be identified from the list of PET scans held by the radiology department and
161 relevant data points will be collected (Table 2).

162 The STROBE (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
163 Epidemiology) guidelines for cohort studies will be followed ²².

164 **PICOS**

165 Patients - all patients with prostate cancer who underwent a PSMA PET scan

166 Intervention - PET scan

167 Comparison - mpMRI, MRI Marrow, Bone scan, Pathological stage

168 Outcome - Diagnostic accuracy for stage & management implication

169 Study type - retrospective consecutive cohort study

170

Demographics

Date of birth
PSA at time of diagnosis
D'Amico risk classification
Primary or secondary prostate cancer
Previous treatment for prostate cancer

Imaging

PSMA PET report
PSMA PET date
PSMA PET stage - T, N, M
PSA at time of PSMA PET
MRI report
MRI date
MRI stage - T, N
MRI Highest PIRADS
MRI prostate volume
MRI Marrow – M stage
Bone Scan – M stage
Narrow slice MRI – positive or negative outcome

Biopsy / Histology

Biopsy / Histology report
Biopsy / Histology date
Grade
Stage
Positive margins
Lymph node pathology

Decision making

Management decision
MDT report / Clinic letter detailing decision
Did PSMA PET impact decision making? Y/N

171

172 Table 2: Data points which we intend to collect. As this study is a retrospective study,

173 we may need to amend data points depending on whether the data is available

174

175 REFERENCES

- 176 1. Mottet N, van den Bergh RCN, Briers E, et al. EAU-EANM-ESTRO-ESUR-
177 SIOG Guidelines on Prostate Cancer—2020 Update. Part 1: Screening,
178 Diagnosis, and Local Treatment with Curative Intent. *Eur Urol.* 2021;79(2):243-
179 262. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2020.09.042
- 180 2. Hövels AM, Heesakkers RAM, Adang EM, et al. The diagnostic accuracy of CT
181 and MRI in the staging of pelvic lymph nodes in patients with prostate cancer:
182 a meta-analysis. *Clin Radiol.* 2008;63(4):387-395.
183 doi:10.1016/j.crad.2007.05.022
- 184 3. Harisinghani MG, Barentsz J, Hahn PF, et al. Noninvasive Detection of
185 Clinically Occult Lymph-Node Metastases in Prostate Cancer. *N Engl J Med.*
186 2003;348(25):2491-2499. doi:10.1056/nejmoa022749
- 187 4. Thoeny HC, Froehlich JM, Triantafyllou M, et al. Metastases in normal-sized
188 pelvic lymph nodes: Detection with diffusion-weighted MR imaging. *Radiology.*
189 2014;273(1):125-135. doi:10.1148/radiol.14132921
- 190 5. Kiss B, Thoeny HC, Studer UE. Current Status of Lymph Node Imaging in
191 Bladder and Prostate Cancer. *Urology.* 2016;96:1-7.
192 doi:10.1016/j.urology.2016.02.014
- 193 6. Mottet N, van den Bergh RCN, Briers E, et al. *EAU-ESTRO-ESUR-SIOG*
194 *Guidelines on Prostate Cancer.*; 2018. [https://uroweb.org/wp-](https://uroweb.org/wp-content/uploads/EAU-ESUR-ESTRO-SIOG-Guidelines-on-Prostate-Cancer-large-text-V2.pdf)
195 [content/uploads/EAU-ESUR-ESTRO-SIOG-Guidelines-on-Prostate-Cancer-](https://uroweb.org/wp-content/uploads/EAU-ESUR-ESTRO-SIOG-Guidelines-on-Prostate-Cancer-large-text-V2.pdf)
196 [large-text-V2.pdf](https://uroweb.org/wp-content/uploads/EAU-ESUR-ESTRO-SIOG-Guidelines-on-Prostate-Cancer-large-text-V2.pdf). Accessed June 11, 2021.
- 197 7. Sathianathan NJ, Geurts N, Nair R, Lawrentschuk N, Murphy DG, Lamb AD.
198 The phylogenetic future of prostate cancer staging: PSMA-PET and the
199 dandelion theory. *Futur Oncol.* 2017;13(20):1801-1807. doi:10.2217/fo-2017-

200 0074

- 201 8. Kiess AP, Banerjee SR, Mease RC, et al. Prostate-specific membrane antigen
202 as a target for cancer imaging and therapy. *Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*.
203 2015;59(3):241-268. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26213140/>. Accessed
204 June 11, 2021.
- 205 9. Fraum TJ, Ludwig DR, Kim EH, Schroeder P, Hope TA, Ippolito JE. Prostate
206 cancer PET tracers: Essentials for the urologist. *Can J Urol*. 2018;25(4):9371-
207 9383. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30125515/>. Accessed June 29, 2021.
- 208 10. Heiden MGV, Cantley LC, Thompson CB. Understanding the warburg effect:
209 The metabolic requirements of cell proliferation. *Science (80-)*.
210 2009;324(5930):1029-1033. doi:10.1126/science.1160809
- 211 11. Salminen E, Hogg A, Binns D, Frydenberg M, Hicks R. Investigations with
212 FDG-PET scanning in prostate cancer show limited value for clinical practice.
213 *Acta Oncol (Madr)*. 2002;41(5):425-429. doi:10.1080/028418602320405005
- 214 12. Hofer C, Laubenbacher C, Block T, Breul J, Hartung R, Schwaiger M. Fluorine-
215 18-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography is useless for the
216 detection of local recurrence after radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol*.
217 1999;36(1):31-35. doi:10.1159/000019923
- 218 13. Minamimoto R, Senda M, Jinnouchi S, et al. The current status of an FDG-
219 PET cancer screening program in Japan, based on a 4-year (2006-2009)
220 nationwide survey. *Ann Nucl Med*. 2013;27(1):46-57. doi:10.1007/s12149-012-
221 0660-x
- 222 14. Hofman MS, Lawrentschuk N, Francis RJ, et al. Prostate-specific membrane
223 antigen PET-CT in patients with high-risk prostate cancer before curative-
224 intent surgery or radiotherapy (proPSMA): a prospective, randomised,

- 225 multicentre study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10231):1208-1216. doi:10.1016/S0140-
226 6736(20)30314-7
- 227 15. Petersen LJ, Zacho HD. PSMA PET for primary lymph node staging of
228 intermediate and high-risk prostate cancer: An expedited systematic review.
229 *Cancer Imaging*. 2020;20(1). doi:10.1186/s40644-020-0290-9
- 230 16. Perera M, Papa N, Roberts M, et al. Gallium-68 Prostate-specific Membrane
231 Antigen Positron Emission Tomography in Advanced Prostate Cancer—
232 Updated Diagnostic Utility, Sensitivity, Specificity, and Distribution of Prostate-
233 specific Membrane Antigen-avid Lesions: A Systematic Review and Meta-
234 analysis. *Eur Urol*. 2020;77(4):403-417. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2019.01.049
- 235 17. Han S, Woo S, Kim YJ, Suh CH. Impact of 68Ga-PSMA PET on the
236 Management of Patients with Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and
237 Meta-analysis. *Eur Urol*. 2018;74(2):179-190.
238 doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2018.03.030
- 239 18. Giesel FL, Hadaschik B, Cardinale J, et al. F-18 labelled PSMA-1007:
240 biodistribution, radiation dosimetry and histopathological validation of tumor
241 lesions in prostate cancer patients. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*.
242 2017;44(4):678-688. doi:10.1007/s00259-016-3573-4
- 243 19. Privé BM, Israël B, Schilham MGM, et al. Evaluating F-18-PSMA-1007-PET in
244 primary prostate cancer and comparing it to multi-parametric MRI and
245 histopathology. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis*. 2021;24(2):423-430.
246 doi:10.1038/s41391-020-00292-2
- 247 20. Rowe SP, Macura KJ, Mena E, et al. PSMA-Based [(18)F]DCFPyL PET/CT Is
248 Superior to Conventional Imaging for Lesion Detection in Patients with
249 Metastatic Prostate Cancer. *Mol imaging Biol*. 2016;18(3):411-419.

250 doi:10.1007/s11307-016-0957-6

251 21. Dietlein F, Kobe C, Neubauer S, et al. PSA-Stratified Performance of (18)F-

252 and (68)Ga-PSMA PET in Patients with Biochemical Recurrence of Prostate

253 Cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2017;58(6):947-952. doi:10.2967/jnumed.116.185538

254 22. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke

255 JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

256 (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet.*

257 2007;370(9596):1453-1457. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61602-X

258