Voxel-level Classification of Prostate Cancer Using a Four-Compartment Restriction Spectrum Imaging Model

Christine H Feng, MD¹

Christopher C Conlin, PhD²

Kanha Batra, MS³

Ana E Rodríguez-Soto, PhD²

Roshan Karunamuni, PhD¹

Aaron Simon, MD, PhD¹

Joshua Kuperman, PhD²

Rebecca Rakow-Penner, MD, PhD²

Michael E Hahn, MD, PhD²

Anders M Dale, PhD²

Tyler M Seibert, MD, PhD^{1,3}

¹Department of Radiation Medicine and Applied Sciences, UC San Diego School of Medicine, La Jolla, CA, USA

²Department of Radiology, UC San Diego School of Medicine, La Jolla, CA, USA

³Department of Bioengineering, UC San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

Corresponding Author:

Tyler Seibert, MD, PhD

Altman Clinical and Translational Research Institute

9500 Gilman Dr. #0861

La Jolla, CA 92093

Telephone: (858) 246-5988

E-mail: tseibert@ucsd.edu

Abstract

Purpose: Diffusion MRI is integral to detection of prostate cancer (PCa), but conventional ADC cannot capture the complexity of prostate tissues. A four-compartment restriction spectrum imaging (RSI₄) model was recently found to optimally characterize pelvic diffusion signals, and the model coefficient for the slowest diffusion compartment, RSI₄-C₁, yielded greatest tumor conspicuity. In this study, RSI₄-C₁ was evaluated as a quantitative voxel-level classifier of PCa.

Methods: This was a retrospective analysis of 46 men who underwent an expanded-acquisition pelvic MRI for suspected PCa. Twenty-three men had no detectable cancer on biopsy or clinical follow-up; the other 23 had biopsy-proven PCa corresponding to a lesion on MRI (PI-RADS category 3-5). High-confidence cancer voxels were delineated by expert consensus, using imaging data and biopsy results. The entire prostate was considered benign in patients with no detectable cancer. Diffusion images were used to calculate RSI₄-C₁ and conventional ADC. Voxel-level discrimination of PCa from benign prostate tissue was assessed via receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves generated by bootstrapping with patient-level case resampling. Specifically, we compared RSI₄-C₁ and conventional ADC on mean (and 95% CI) for two metrics: area under the curve (AUC) and false-positive rate for a sensitivity of 90% (FPR₉₀). Classifier images were also compared.

Results: RSI₄-C₁ outperformed conventional ADC, with greater AUC [0.977 (0.951-0.991) vs. 0.921 (0.873-0.949)] and lower FPR₉₀ [0.033 (0.009-0.083) vs. 0.201 (0.131-0.300)].

Conclusion: RSI₄-C₁ yielded a quantitative, voxel-level classifier of PCa that was superior to conventional ADC. RSI classifier images with a low false-positive rate might improve PCa detection.

Keywords: prostate cancer, restriction spectrum imaging, RSI, diffusion MRI

Introduction

Prostate cancer is the second most frequent malignancy in men worldwide and is a common cause of cancer deaths in men¹. Strategies to improve outcomes for men with prostate cancer seek to optimize detection, staging, and clinical risk stratification. The 12-core systematic biopsy remains a common method for initial diagnosis and Gleason grading of prostate cancer, but is prone to sampling errors that can drastically influence risk stratification and treatment^{2,3}. Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has become increasingly popular for its added value in identifying suspicious lesions for targeted biopsy⁴⁻⁶.

Clinical multiparametric MRI currently includes diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) and apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) maps to determine a qualitative risk of clinically significant cancer (PI-RADS v2⁷). However, conventional ADC is a measurement of overall diffusion rate of water within a voxel and can be influenced by multiple factors. It has shown correlation with presence of malignancy, but remains limited by motion sensitivity⁸, magnetic field inhomogeneity⁹, and high false-positive rates from inflammation, hemorrhage, or benign lesions that limit tumor conspicuity and localization¹⁰⁻¹². Twenty-eight percent of PI-RADS (v2) category 5 lesions (the highest level of suspicion) do not yield a diagnosis of clinically significant cancer¹³, and false positive rates are even higher for category 3 and 4 lesions.

Advanced diffusion models use additional parameters to separate and characterize diffusion signals originating from various microstructural compartments within a voxel¹⁴⁻¹⁶. Restriction spectrum imaging (RSI) is a flexible framework that allows for a mixture of restricted intracellular, hindered extracellular, and freely diffusing water compartments to be probed with clinically relevant protocols^{10,17}. The RSI technique models signal intensity as a function of *b*-value using a series of exponential decay functions, each representing a diffusion compartment with a specific, pre-determined ADC^{10,17}. Optimal compartmental ADCs were recently estimated for the prostate (and seminal vesicles) using RSI models of two to five tissue compartments¹⁸. The overall diffusion signal was better characterized in models using more compartments, with the four-compartment model emerging as the best option by relative Bayesian information criterion¹⁸. In this study, we apply the four-compartment RSI model to the prostate and assess voxel-level accuracy for detection of prostate cancer, as compared to ADC.

Methods

Study Population

This was a retrospective study of 46 consecutive men who underwent screening pelvic MRI for suspected prostate cancer between August and December 2016 using an expanded acquisition protocol on a single scanner. Standard-of-care evaluations determined that 23 men had no detectable cancer, while another 23 men had prostate cancer attributable to a PI-RADS v2.1 category 3-5 lesion on MRI. This study was reviewed and approved by the UC San Diego Institutional Review Board (IRB #191878).

MRI data acquisition and post-processing

Scans were collected on a 3T clinical MRI scanner (Discovery MR750, GE Healthcare, Waukesha, WI, USA) using a 32-channel phased-array body coil centered on the pelvis. Each patient underwent a high-resolution, T2-weighted sequence with identical scan coverage as the multi-shell DWI volume (TR: 6225 ms, TE: 100 ms, resolution: 0.39×0.39 mm, matrix: 512×512 , slice thickness: 3 mm). A multi-shell diffusion volume was also acquired for each patient, sampling 5 b -values (0, 200, 1000, 2000, and 3000 s/mm^2) at 6 unique gradient directions (TR: 5000 ms, TE: 80 ms, resolution: 1.6×1.6 mm, matrix: 128×128 , slice thickness: 3 mm). The $b = 0$ s/mm^2 volumes were acquired using forward and reverse phase encoding to allow for correction of B0-inhomogeneity distortions. The acquisition time for the diffusion volume was approximately 5 minutes.

Post-processing of MRI data was completed using in-house programs written in MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA). Diffusion data were corrected for distortions arising from B0 inhomogeneity, gradient nonlinearity, and eddy currents^{10,19}. Conventional ADC was calculated for each voxel using distortion-corrected DWI sequences performed with b -values of 0, 200, and 1000 s/mm^2 .

Prostate Data Extraction

The body, prostate, and prostate cancer lesion regions of interest (ROIs) were contoured by a radiation oncologist using MIM (MIM Software Inc, Cleveland, OH, USA). Prostate cancer ROIs were defined directly on DWI volumes, using all available clinical information. Defining

ROIs on DWI prevents inadvertent inclusion of benign tissue into the ROI due to subtle registration errors. ROIs were verified via consensus by two board-certified sub-specialist radiologists, M.H. and R.R.P. The finalized ROIs were exported as binary masks into a MATLAB-compatible format that matched the resolution of the DWI volumes.

RSI Models of Prostate Diffusion

The relationship between corrected signal intensity and b-value was modeled as a linear combination of exponential decays, where $S_{corr}(b)$ represents the noise-corrected DWI signal at a particular b value, C represents signal contribution of each compartment to the overall signal, and D represents the estimated ADC value for that compartment.

$$S_{corr}(b) = C_1 e^{-bD_1} + C_2 e^{-bD_2} + C_3 e^{-bD_3} + C_4 e^{-bD_4}$$

Noise correction for DWI volumes was performed as previously described¹⁸. Signal intensity was normalized by the median $b=0$ intensity within the prostate for each subject. Optimal D values for each compartment were previously determined by fitting the multi-shell DWI data from all voxels within the benign body and prostate cancer lesion ROIs¹⁸. The compartments are ordered from lowest to highest D , with the first compartment of each model describing the most restricted mode of diffusion. Prior work identified the four-compartment RSI model as optimally describing the diffusion signal from the prostate and prostate cancer¹⁸. For this model, the optimal ADCs for the compartments were 1.0 e-4, 1.8 e-3, 3.6 e-3, and $>>3.0$ e-3 mm²/s, approximately representing restricted, hindered, free diffusion, and flow, respectively¹⁸.

Classification of Benign Prostate Tissue and Prostate Cancer

Prostate cancer conspicuity was related to the compartment with slowest diffusion in each model, called C_1 , with increased cancer conspicuity for the four-compartment model. Here, C_1 for the four-compartment RSI model (RSI₄- C_1) was assessed for its ability to correctly identify benign prostate tissue and prostate cancer at the voxel level. Results with RSI were compared to those using standard ADC.

Classification of cancer and benign prostate voxels was assessed via 1000 bootstrap samples with case resampling at the patient level to yield means and 95% confidence intervals for performance metrics. Benign subjects contributed voxels from the entire prostate, and cancer subjects contributed voxels from only the high-confidence cancer ROIs. Voxels outside the high-confidence ROIs in patients with known cancer were excluded from statistical analysis because prostate cancer is notoriously multifocal and voxel-level ground-truth histopathology was not available. Area under the curve (AUC) of receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves was the primary metric. Additionally, as a significant limitation of conventional ADC is poor specificity, performance was also assessed using the false positive rate for a sensitivity of 90% (FPR_{90}). Statistical significance was assessed using paired t-tests with two-sided $\alpha = 0.05$. P-values were truncated at $p < 10^{-16}$, if applicable.

Voxel-wise classifier maps were created by the logistic regression of RSI_4-C_1 (RSI_4-C_1 classifier) using all subjects. These maps were saved in DICOM format and overlaid on the T2 volume for visualization using MIM (MIM Software Inc, Cleveland, OH, USA) to indicate degree of suspicion for prostate cancer. ADC maps were generated for visual comparison.

Results

Patient characteristics for cases with prostate cancer are in **Table 1**. Of the men with benign prostates on biopsy and/or surgical pathology, ten had PI-RADS category 1 prostates, two had PI-RADS category 2 lesions, eight had PI-RADS category 3 lesions, two had PI-RADS category 4 lesions, and one had a PI-RADS category 5 lesion.

RSI_4-C_1 outperformed conventional ADC as a quantitative, voxel-level classifier. RSI_4-C_1 had a greater AUC: mean 0.977 (95% CI 0.951-0.991), compared to 0.921 (0.873-0.949) for ADC (**Figure 1A**). The false positive rate was also lower for RSI_4-C_1 : mean 0.033 (0.009-0.083), compared to 0.201 (0.131-0.300) for ADC (**Figure 1B**). Paired t-tests confirmed statistically significant differences in AUC and FPR_{90} between RSI_4-C_1 and conventional ADC ($p < 10^{-16}$, $t=84.00$ for AUC and $p < 10^{-16}$, $t=-118.07$ for FPR_{90}). ROC curves for RSI_4-C_1 and ADC are presented in **Figure 2**, and demonstrate the improvement in false positive rate while maintaining high sensitivity. The distribution of benign and cancer voxels by normalized signal intensity of

RSI₄-C₁ showed less overlap between the two groups of voxels compared to that of ADC (**Figure 3**). RSI₄-C₁ classifier output images and conventional ADC maps for representative subjects are shown in **Figure 4**.

Figure 1. Box plots depicting distribution of performance metrics for 1000 patient-level bootstrap samples for A) area under the curve (AUC) and B) the false positive rate at 90% sensitivity (FPR₉₀) for conventional ADC and RSI₄-C₁. Whiskers represent values within 1.5 times the interquartile range (IQR).

Figure 2. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for conventional ADC (grey) and RSI₄-C₁ (green) with confidence intervals indicated by shaded areas. FPR₉₀ is highlighted by a horizontal line at 0.9 sensitivity, with corresponding coordinate along the x-axis indicating false positive rate.

Figure 3. Normalized histograms of signal intensity for A) conventional ADC and B) RSI₄-C₁. Benign voxels are shown in blue and cancer voxels are in orange, with the overlapping regions in brown. RSI₄-C₁ has less overlap in the distribution of benign and cancer voxels compared to ADC.

Figure 4. Representative axial images of T2-weighted MRI (T2W), conventional ADC, and logistic regression of RSI₄-C₁ (RSI₄-C₁ classifier) for 3 representative subjects. Subject A had a PI-RADS 5 lesion (pink arrow) on MRI, with two subsequent negative biopsies showing only acute and chronic inflammation. Subject B had a small PI-RADS 3 lesion (blue arrow) in the left peripheral zone; he underwent radical prostatectomy and was found to have Gleason 3+4 prostate cancer with focal ECE. Subject C had a PI-RADS 3 lesion (green arrow) in the right transition zone; he underwent prostatectomy and was found to have Gleason 4+3+5 prostate cancer. RSI₄-C₁ classifier maps readily highlight the cancers for subjects B and C. The RSI₄-C₁ classifier map for subject A has no false-positive voxels; it is shown on the same color scale as the maps for subjects B and C.

Discussion

RSI₄-C₁ proved a superior voxel-level classifier for prostate cancer than conventional ADC, yielding significantly improved AUC and reduced false positives. When requiring 90% sensitivity for high-confidence cancer voxels in the cancer patients, conventional ADC performed poorly in control patients, falsely classifying approximately 1 in 5 benign voxels as

cancerous (FPR₉₀: 0.201, 95% CI 0.131-0.300). In contrast, for the same cancer sensitivity, RSI₄-C₁ gave far fewer false positives (FPR₉₀: 0.033, 95% CI 0.009-0.083). This voxel-level classifier can be used to generate quantitative images that can be compared across subjects on the same scale and that highlight cancer with less noise (false positives) than the current imaging standard. These images may have utility in clinical applications such as MRI-guided prostate biopsy^{20–22} and targeted radiotherapy planning^{23–25}.

To develop the RSI model, we selected voxels that were high confidence for either benign prostate or prostate cancer, using all available clinical and pathologic information. Surgical pathology was not available for all patients, but using consecutive patients and allowing heterogeneity in type of pathology specimen avoids the selection bias of a surgery-only group. High-confidence voxels were chosen to avoid introducing errors into the model. Because we used high-confidence voxels, we also expected high model performance, including high sensitivity for detecting these cancer voxels. The choice of FPR₉₀ as a performance metric reflects this expectation: when requiring 90% sensitivity for high-confidence cancer voxels, a useful model will have a low false positive rate.

The discriminatory performance of RSI₄-C₁ relies on the RSI approach of separating the overall diffusion signal into compartments believed to correspond to restricted diffusion, hindered diffusion, free water, and rapid pseudo-diffusion. A prior study demonstrated improved characterization of diffusion signal within the normal prostate and prostate tumors with this four-compartment model, especially within the most diffusion-restricted compartment, C₁¹⁸. By using this most restricted compartment, the vast majority of benign prostate tissue signal is suppressed, and output images have noticeably less noise (**Figure 4**) than conventional ADC maps. Prior studies have also investigated the performance and utility of advanced DWI techniques, including RSI, in prostate cancer detection and characterization^{15,26–29}. However, many of the other studies conducted analysis at the lesion level rather than the voxel level. A voxel-wise classifier permits generation of cancer-detecting images, like those shown in Figure 4, and avoids the need to manually define lesions. Nevertheless, distinguishing malignant and benign lesions is an important clinical problem, as is distinguishing lower and higher-grade lesions.

Future work will apply the voxel-level classifier output to lesion-level analyses in a larger dataset.

Conventional ADC was calculated in this study using the most widely utilized approach consistent with PI-RADS version 2.1⁷, the consensus standard for multi-parametric prostate MRI, which recommends that ADC maps be calculated with b -values less than or equal to 1000 s/mm². Prior studies have reported increased conspicuity of prostate cancer when using b -values greater than 1000 s/mm²^{30–33}, and some centers—including ours—routinely acquire images with stronger diffusion weighting than that required by PI-RADS. However, the objective of the present work was to develop a quantitative, voxel-level classifier for prostate cancer. ADC is the clinical standard for quantitative diffusion MRI and so was chosen as the comparator to the quantitative model developed in this study. The diffusion weighted images, themselves, are typically interpreted qualitatively using subjective, patient-specific window/level settings. High b -value images do not lend themselves readily to a quantitative, voxel-level analysis without a model like the one described in the present work. Indeed, post-hoc analyses of the present dataset confirmed that no b -value yielded adequate voxel-level classification: the FPR₉₀ for high b -value DWI (1000, 2000, and 3000 s/mm²) was well over 0.500 in each case, compared to 0.201 and 0.033 for conventional ADC and RSI₄-C₁, respectively.

There are some limitations to this study. We had a small sample size from a single scanner in order to take advantage of a specialized acquisition protocol, which may limit generalizability. This analysis does not compare the RSI₄ model to other advanced DWI methods or investigate the potential added value of multiple echo times^{14–16,26}; we plan to acquire data adequate for these comparisons for future analyses. As mentioned above, there was also heterogeneity in pathology type, which precluded voxel-level histopathology correlation but is reflective of real-life practice patterns. Relatively few transition zone cancers also precluded subset analysis of classifier performance by prostate zone. The overall excellent performance of our models may be partially attributed to use of majority PI-RADS category 4-5 cancers, which are already conspicuous for experienced radiologists. However, these lesions provided high-confidence training data.

In conclusion, our study demonstrates that RSI₄-C₁ yields a voxel-level classifier of prostate cancer that is superior to conventional ADC. RSI classifier images, with a lower false-positive rate, might be used to assist in accurate detection of prostate cancer. Future work will apply this RSI₄-C₁ classifier to a larger, independent dataset.

References

1. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2018;68(6):394-424. doi:10.3322/caac.21492
2. Hu Y, Ahmed HU, Carter T, et al. A biopsy simulation study to assess the accuracy of several transrectal ultrasonography (TRUS)-biopsy strategies compared with template prostate mapping biopsies in patients who have undergone radical prostatectomy. *BJU Int.* 2012;110(6):812-820. doi:10.1111/j.1464-410X.2012.10933.x
3. Carter HB, Albertsen PC, Barry MJ, et al. Early detection of prostate cancer: AUA Guideline. *J Urol.* 2013;190(2):419-426. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2013.04.119
4. Ahmed HU, El-Shater Bosaily A, Brown LC, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of multi-parametric MRI and TRUS biopsy in prostate cancer (PROMIS): a paired validating confirmatory study. *Lancet (London, England).* 2017;389(10071):815-822. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32401-1
5. Rouvière O, Puech P, Renard-Penna R, et al. Use of prostate systematic and targeted biopsy on the basis of multiparametric MRI in biopsy-naïve patients (MRI-FIRST): a prospective, multicentre, paired diagnostic study. *Lancet Oncol.* 2019;20(1):100-109. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(18)30569-2
6. Ahdoot M, Wilbur AR, Reese SE, et al. MRI-targeted, systematic, and combined biopsy for prostate cancer diagnosis. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(10):917-928. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1910038
7. Turkbey B, Rosenkrantz AB, Haider MA, et al. Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System Version 2.1: 2019 Update of Prostate Imaging Reporting and Data System Version 2. *Eur Urol.* 2019;76(3):340-351. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2019.02.033
8. Kallehauge JF, Tanderup K, Haack S, et al. Apparent Diffusion Coefficient (ADC) as a quantitative parameter in diffusion weighted MR imaging in gynecologic cancer: Dependence on b-values used. *Acta Oncol (Madr).* 2010;49(7):1017-1022. doi:10.3109/0284186X.2010.500305
9. Koh D-M, Takahara T, Imai Y, Collins DJ. Practical aspects of assessing tumors using clinical diffusion-weighted imaging in the body. *Magn Reson Med Sci.* 2007;6(4):211-224.

10. White NS, McDonald CR, Farid N, et al. Diffusion-weighted imaging in cancer: Physical foundations and applications of restriction spectrum imaging. *Cancer Res.* 2014;74(17):4638-4652. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-13-3534
11. Hoeks CMA, Barentsz JO, Hambrock T, et al. Prostate Cancer: Multiparametric MR Imaging for Detection, Localization, and Staging. *Radiology.* 2011;261(1):46-66. doi:10.1148/radiol.11091822
12. Hoeks CMA, Vos EK, Bomers JGR, Barentsz JO, Hulsbergen-Van De Kaa CA, Scheenen TW. Diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in the prostate transition zone: Histopathological validation using magnetic resonance-guided biopsy specimens. *Invest Radiol.* 2013;48(10):693-701. doi:10.1097/RLI.0b013e31828eeaf9
13. Mehralivand S, Bednarova S, Shih JH, et al. Prospective Evaluation of PI-RADS™ Version 2 Using the International Society of Urological Pathology Prostate Cancer Grade Group System. *J Urol.* 2017;198(3):583-590. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2017.03.131
14. Panagiotaki E, Walker-Samuel S, Siow B, et al. Noninvasive Quantification of Solid Tumor Microstructure Using VERDICT MRI. *Cancer Res.* 2014;74(7):1902-1912. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-13-2511
15. Chatterjee A, Bourne RM, Wang S, et al. Diagnosis of Prostate Cancer with Noninvasive Estimation of Prostate Tissue Composition by Using Hybrid Multidimensional MR Imaging: A Feasibility Study. *Radiology.* 2018;287(3):864-873. doi:10.1148/radiol.2018171130
16. Felker ER, Raman SS, Shakeri S, et al. Utility of restriction spectrum imaging among men undergoing first-time biopsy for suspected prostate cancer. *Am J Roentgenol.* 2019;213(2):365-370. doi:10.2214/AJR.18.20836
17. White NS, Dale AM. Distinct effects of nuclear volume fraction and cell diameter on high b-value diffusion MRI contrast in tumors. *Magn Reson Med.* 2014;72(5):1435-1443. doi:10.1002/mrm.25039
18. Conlin CC, Feng CH, Rodríguez-Soto AE, et al. Improved characterization of diffusion in normal and cancerous prostate tissue through optimization of the restriction spectrum imaging signal model. *medRxiv.* March 2020:2020.03.27.20042069. doi:10.1101/2020.03.27.20042069
19. Holland D, Kuperman JM, Dale AM. Efficient correction of inhomogeneous static

- magnetic field-induced distortion in Echo Planar Imaging. *Neuroimage*. 2010;50(1):175-183. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19944768>.
20. Tewes S, Peters I, Tiemeyer A, et al. Evaluation of MRI/Ultrasound Fusion-Guided Prostate Biopsy Using Transrectal and Transperineal Approaches. *Biomed Res Int*. 2017;2017:2176471. doi:10.1155/2017/2176471
21. Marks L, Young S, Natarajan S. MRI-ultrasound fusion for guidance of targeted prostate biopsy. *Curr Opin Urol*. 2013;23(1):43-50. doi:10.1097/MOU.0b013e32835ad3ee
22. Kongnyuy M, George AK, Rastinehad AR, Pinto PA. Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Ultrasound Fusion-Guided Prostate Biopsy: Review of Technology, Techniques, and Outcomes. *Curr Urol Rep*. 2016;17(4):32. doi:10.1007/s11934-016-0589-z
23. Murray LJ, Lilley J, Thompson CM, et al. Prostate stereotactic ablative radiation therapy using volumetric modulated arc therapy to dominant intraprostatic lesions. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2014;89(2):406-415. doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2014.01.042
24. Bauman G, Haider M, Van der Heide UA, Ménard C. Boosting imaging defined dominant prostatic tumors: a systematic review. *Radiother Oncol J Eur Soc Ther Radiol Oncol*. 2013;107(3):274-281. doi:10.1016/j.radonc.2013.04.027
25. McDonald AM, Dobelbower MC, Yang ES, et al. Prostate Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy With a Focal Simultaneous Integrated Boost: Acute Toxicity and Dosimetry Results From a Prospective Trial. *Adv Radiat Oncol*. 2018;4(1):90-95. doi:10.1016/j.adro.2018.09.007
26. Le Bihan D, Breton E, Lallemand D, Aubin ML, Vignaud J, Laval-Jeantet M. Separation of diffusion and perfusion in intravoxel incoherent motion MR imaging. *Radiology*. 1988;168(2):497-505. doi:10.1148/radiology.168.2.3393671
27. Johnston EW, Bonet-Carne E, Ferizi U, et al. VERDICT MRI for Prostate Cancer: Intracellular Volume Fraction versus Apparent Diffusion Coefficient. *Radiology*. 2019;291(2):391-397. doi:10.1148/radiol.2019181749
28. Chatterjee A, Harmath C, Oto A. New prostate MRI techniques and sequences. *Abdom Radiol*. 2020. doi:10.1007/s00261-020-02504-8
29. Rakow-Penner RA, White NS, Parsons JK, et al. Novel technique for characterizing prostate cancer utilizing MRI restriction spectrum imaging: proof of principle and initial clinical experience with extraprostatic extension. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis*.

- 2015;18(1):81-85. doi:10.1038/pcan.2014.50
30. Grant KB, Agarwal HK, Shih JH, et al. Comparison of calculated and acquired high b-value diffusion weighted imaging in prostate cancer. *Abdom Imaging*. 2015;40(3):578. doi:10.1007/S00261-014-0246-2
31. Tamada T, Kanomata N, Sone T, et al. High b Value (2,000 s/mm²) Diffusion-Weighted Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Prostate Cancer at 3 Tesla: Comparison with 1,000 s/mm² for Tumor Conspicuity and Discrimination of Aggressiveness. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(5). doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0096619
32. Maas MC, Fütterer JJ, Scheenen TWJ. Quantitative Evaluation of Computed High b Value Diffusion-Weighted Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the Prostate. *Invest Radiol*. 2013;48(11):779-786. doi:10.1097/RLI.0b013e31829705bb
33. Metens T, Miranda D, Absil J, Matos C. What is the optimal b value in diffusion-weighted MR imaging to depict prostate cancer at 3T? *Eur Radiol*. 2012;22(3):703-709. doi:10.1007/s00330-011-2298-9
34. Armstrong AJ, Victor AD, Davis BJ, et al. *NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2019 Prostate Cancer*.; 2019. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf.

Table 1. Characteristics of cases with prostate cancer. Clinical risk groups were designated per NCCN guidelines³⁴ for favorable intermediate risk (FIR), unfavorable intermediate risk (UIR), high risk (HR), and very high risk (VHR).

Case	Age	PI-RADS v2	Lesion Location	PSA (ng/mL)	Gleason Grade Group	Pathology Specimen Type	Stage	Clinical Risk Group
1	59	5	Right Transitional & Peripheral Zones	7.77	2	Systematic Biopsy	cT1cN0	FIR
2	54	5	Right Peripheral Zone	10.6	3	Systematic Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT3aN0	UIR
3	71	5	Right Peripheral & Transitional Zones	4.04	5	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT3aN0	HR
4	72	5	Right Peripheral Zone	5.7	2	Systematic Biopsy	cT2bN0	UIR
5	54	5	Right Peripheral Zone	7.3	3	Systematic Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT3aN0	HR
6	63	5	Right Peripheral Zone	16.83	3	Systematic Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT3aN0	HR
7	74	5	Right Peripheral Zone	29.3	5	Systematic Biopsy	cT2cN0	HR
8	53	4	Left Peripheral Zone	8	1	Systematic Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT2cN0	FIR
9	66	4	Right Peripheral Zone	8.66	3	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy	cT1cN0	UIR
10	67	5	Left Peripheral Zone	4.6	2	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy	cT1cN0	FIR
11	62	5	Left Peripheral Zone	13.97	3	Systematic Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT3aN0	HR
12	74	4	Left Peripheral Zone	4.4	3	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT2aN0	UIR
13	50	3	Left Peripheral Zone	4.3	2	Systematic Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT3aN0	HR
14	65	4	Right Transitional Zone	8	1	Systematic Biopsy	cT1cN0	LR
15	81	5	Anterior Transitional Zone	8.5	2	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy	cT2aN0	FIR
16	77	5	Right Peripheral Zone	3.47	4	Biopsy (Systematic), Radical Prostatectomy	ypT2aN0	HR
17	70	4	Left Peripheral Zone	7.43	2	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy	cT1cN0	FIR
18	58	4	Left Peripheral Zone	7.42	2	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	mpT2cN0	UIR
19	62	4	Left Peripheral Zone	5	1	Systematic Biopsy	cT1cN0	LR
20	68	4	Right Peripheral Zone	5.9	5	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	mpT2cN0	HR
21	64	5	Midline to Right Transitional Zone	8.63	2	Systematic and Targeted Biopsy	cT1cN0	FIR
22	51	5	Diffuse Peripheral Zone	33	5	Systematic Biopsy	ypT3bN0	VHR
23	51	3	Right Transitional Zone	5.42	3	Systematic Biopsy, Radical Prostatectomy	pT2bN0	UIR