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ABSTRACT

We assessed the value of fusion $^{18}$F-fluoromethylcholine ($^{18}$F-choline) Positron Emission Tomography / Magnetic Resonance Imaging (PET/MRI) for image-guided (targeted) prostate biopsies to detect significant prostate cancer (Gleason $\geq 3+4$) compared to standard (systematic 12-core) biopsies. **Methods:** Within an ongoing prospective clinical trial, hybrid $^{18}$F-choline Positron Emission Tomography / Computed Tomography (PET/CT) and multi-parametric 3T MRI (mpMRI) of the pelvis were performed in 36 subjects with rising prostate specific antigen (PSA) for known (n = 15) or suspected (n = 21) prostate cancer prior to a prostate biopsy procedure. PET and T2-weighted (T2w) Magnetic Resonance (MR) volumes of the prostate were spatially registered using commercially available software. Biopsy targets were selected based on visual appearance on MRI and graded as low, intermediate or high risk for significant disease. Volumes of interest (VOI) were defined for MR-identified lesions. $^{18}$F-choline uptake measures were obtained from the MR-target and a mirrored background VOI. The biopsy procedure was performed after registration of real-time transrectal ultrasound (TRUS) with T2w MR and included image-guided cores plus standard cores. Histological results were determined from standard and targeted biopsy cores, as well as prostatectomy specimens (n = 10). **Results:** Fifteen subjects were ultimately identified with Gleason $\geq 3+4$ prostate cancer, of which targeted biopsy identified significantly more (n = 12) than standard biopsies (n = 5; $p = 0.002$). A total of 52 lesions were identified by mpMRI (19 low; 18 intermediate; 15 high risk), and mpMRI-assigned risk was a strong predictor of final pathology (area under the curve (AUC) = 0.81; $p < 0.001$). Using the mean $^{18}$F-choline target-to-background ratio (TBR), the addition of $^{18}$F-choline to mpMRI significantly improved the prediction of Gleason $\geq 3+4$ cancers over mpMRI alone (AUC = 0.92; $p<0.001$). **Conclusions:** Fusion PET/MRI-TRUS image registration for targeted prostate biopsies is clinically feasible and accurate. The addition of $^{18}$F-choline PET to mpMRI improves identification of significant prostate cancer.
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INTRODUCTION

Several studies have reported superior identification of significant prostate cancer using image-guided (targeted) prostate biopsies compared to non-targeted standard biopsies. Generally, these approaches utilize multi-parametric (mpMRI) as the primary targeting tool or target following fusion with 3-dimensional endorectal ultrasound (1,2). Both methodologies rely on the diagnostic advantages of mpMRI to reliably identify and risk-stratify clinically significant prostate cancer. However, mpMRI is not perfect; there is a need to better risk-stratify intermediate and low-risk targets identified on mpMRI. One potential area of opportunity lies with PET/MRI, in which the multi-parametric advantages of MRI can be combined with the functional advantages of PET. The introduction of hybrid PET/MRI scanners promises optimal spatial and temporal registration of PET and MRI data with the added benefit of functional imaging.

It has been shown that increased choline uptake is associated with significant primary prostate cancer (3) and cancers with elevated tumor cell proliferation markers (MIB-1/Ki67) (4). Although choline uptake is not specific for prostate cancer (i.e., it can be seen in benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) (3)), there is evidence that fusion PET/MRI using a derived parameter (quotient of $^{11}$C-choline lesion standardized uptake value (SUV) and apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) obtained from diffusion-weighted MRI) improves image-contrast for the identification of Gleason $\geq 7$ disease (5). This superior tissue contrast enhances the association of impeded diffusion with intermediate and high-risk cancers (6-10).

Here we present an interim analysis of the first registered ongoing prospective diagnostic trial of fusion PET/MRI for targeted prostate biopsies. Imaging includes $^{18}$F-choline fusion PET/MRI for the diagnosis of prostate cancer using targeted and standard biopsies. The purpose of our study is to determine whether the addition of $^{18}$F-choline PET/CT augments the identification of clinically-significant prostate cancer over MRI alone.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patient Population

We report on the first 36 consecutive subjects of this Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act compliant registered ongoing prospective trial (Clinicaltrials.gov identifier: NCT01751737). The study was conducted in men with rising PSA values with (n = 15) or without (n = 21) biopsy-proven, untreated localized adenocarcinoma of the prostate scheduled to undergo a clinically indicated prostate biopsy. Exclusion criteria were as follows: prostate biopsy performed less than 6 weeks before imaging, previous external radiation treatment of the pelvis, prior malignancy other than basal or squamous cell skin cancers, active inflammatory bowel disease, and acute prostatitis. The institutional ethics committee approved this protocol. Written informed consent was obtained.

Study participants, 64 ± 5.3 years of age (range 56 – 77), had 1.7 ± 1.4 (range 0 – 6) biopsy procedures prior to entering the trial (Supplemental Table 1). The mean time interval from the last biopsy to study enrollment was 21.2 ± 17.7 months, within a range of 3 to 96 months. Prior biopsy results included 12 subjects with Gleason 3+3 prostate cancer, 2 with low-volume Gleason 3+4 prostate cancer, and 17 with no prior prostate cancer diagnosis. In all cases (including prior outside biopsies), tissue obtained was reviewed by the study pathologist blinded to the imaging results. Four subjects did not have a prior biopsy. PSA levels at study entry ranged from 3.0 to 153 ng/mL (mean: 13.8 ± 24.7).

Multi-sequence MRI

In vivo MRI pelvis examinations of the prostate gland with and without contrast material were performed prior to biopsy. All imaging was performed on the same 3T MR unit (Ingenia, Philips Healthcare, Andover, MA, U.S.) without an endorectal coil using a 16-channel phased array coil. Details of sequences acquired are given in supplementary methods (available online...
at http://jnm.snmjournals.org). Images were reviewed on a PACS workstation (McKesson, San Francisco, CA, U.S.). Lesion classification was made based on a 3-point Likert scale corresponding to the ‘3’ (low), ‘4’ (intermediate), and ‘5’ (high) risk scores of a typical 5-point scale by one fellowship-trained expert genitourinary radiologist with 5 years’ experience interpreting multi-parametric prostate MRI. At the time of study conception, the Prostate Imaging – Reporting and Data System (PI-RADS) version 2 (11) was not available and therefore was not used, although Likert scales have been shown to have similar diagnostic performance to the PI-RADS schema (12,13). While PI-RADS version 1 was available at the time, it was not sufficiently validated and not generally accepted locally or nationally.

\[ ^{18}\text{F}-\text{choline PET/CT} \]

\[ ^{18}\text{F}-\text{choline} \] was synthesized as described in supplemental methods (14). MRI and \[ ^{18}\text{F}-\text{choline PET/CT} \] were acquired separately within 7 ± 12 days; in many cases (n = 28) on the same day (range 0 – 44 days). MRI was used for clinical decision-making and selection of biopsy targets only. PET/CT was performed on a Biograph TrueV mCT scanner with extended field of view and a 40-channel helical CT (Siemens Medical Solutions, Malvern, PA) with an intrinsic axial resolution of 4.1 mm FWHM and time-of-flight reconstruction (15). After obtaining a low-dose CT transmission scan, a 10 minute emission scan of the lower abdomen and pelvis followed 20 minutes after injecting 233 ± 8 MBq of \[ ^{18}\text{F}-\text{choline} \]. Image reconstruction parameters are provided in supplemental methods.

**Image Registration Tasks and Target Selection**

PET data were registered onto 3D T2w MR using commercially available software (MIM Maestro, Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.). Registration of in vivo modalities (PET/CT onto T2w MRI) was generally achieved without difficulties. The result of rigid registrations was visually assessed using pelvic bones as landmarks. MRI was performed without endorectal coil and patients were
asked to fully empty their bladder for scanning, which limited deformation of the prostate. If rectal content or bladder filling shifted the position of the prostate, a constrained intensity-based, free-form deformable registration was added to register the prostate on MRI and PET (16). Such registration was possible using the outline of the bladder base and internal prostatic structures (such as BPH nodules) identified on both imaging as landmarks.

Lesion borders were drawn by the radiologists on a T2w 3D sequence to define one or more volume(s) of interest (VOI) as biopsy target(s). This target VOI was mirrored to the contralateral side of the prostate to create a background VOI for later data analysis. In one case (identifier [ID] 36 [Supplemental Table 1]), the target was located in the midline near the base, requiring a caudal (rather than lateral) shift in the mirrored background VOI to a similar anterior location.

**Target T2w MRI and Real-time 3D TRUS Registration**

The biopsy procedure was performed 16 ± 10 (range 3 – 56) days after PET/CT imaging using a 3D ultrasound system equipped with a magnetic navigation option (General Electric Logiq E9, Aurora, OH, U.S.). The ultrasound transducer was inserted into the rectum under local anesthesia. TRUS-MRI registration requires technical skill and additional time (~10-15 minutes) for suitable targeting. The 3D T2w MR sequence with embedded target information was loaded into the ultrasound system and rigidly fused with real-time 3D ultrasound. We used a semi-automated 3-point registration system in which at least 3 definable intra-prostatic structures (e.g., cysts, BPH nodules) were identified and marked on both MR and endorectal ultrasound images in real-time image space at the time of biopsy to permit rigid registration to occur. We subjectively rated the registration quality (0 = no registration, 1 = poor, 2 = adequate, 3 = excellent). Adequate or better registration was achieved in the majority (28 of 36) of cases. If registration attempts failed, a cognitive registration was attempted by targeting a lesion on ultrasound that appeared to be in the vicinity of the MRI-identified lesion (17,18). After targeted biopsies,
standard (systematic 12-core) prostate biopsies using an 18-gauge biopsy needle loaded in a spring-action biopsy device were obtained.

**Pathological Evaluation**

Biopsy samples and whole mount sections after prostatectomy were processed for routine histological assessment (hematoxylin/eosin stain) using the paraffin embedding process and 3 µm sections. Each tumor focus was assigned a primary and secondary Gleason grade and staged according to American Joint Committee on Cancer guidelines (19). Final pathology was defined as the highest Gleason score of any cancer detected (per side of the prostate gland) from any (reviewed) tissue (prior biopsy, standard and targeted biopsy, or – if available – prostatectomy specimen as gold standard). For this study, significant prostate cancer was defined conservatively as any Gleason \( \geq 3+4 \) cancer, including low-volume disease (20).

**Registration of T2w Ex Vivo Prostate Specimen onto Pathology**

Following a methodology described earlier (21), the prostate specimen underwent a 3T ex vivo MRI scan. The images were the basis for an accurate segmentation of the prostate (Vitrea, Vital Images, Minnetonka, MN, U.S.) for subsequent 3D-printing of a plastic mold (Dimension Elite 3D, Stratasys, Eden Prairie, MN, U.S.) to support precise sectioning. Following complete fixation, the specimen was placed into the custom-built mold for a second high-resolution specimen MRI. Then, the prostate was gross-sectioned within the mold in 3 mm intervals. Volumetric 3 mm stacks of histology sections were then registered onto ex vivo MRI to allow a consistent registration of the ex vivo MRI to pathology (22).

**Registration of Pathology onto In Vivo T2w PET/MRI**

All foci of prostate cancer, including the dominant “index nodule”, were outlined by the pathologist on whole mount hematoxylin/eosin slides and registered back into the ex vivo and in
vivo MR and PET image volumes, allowing the retrospective verification whether a) in vivo imaging correctly identified all tumor lesions and whether b) targeted lesions were missed at the time of biopsy.

**PET/CT Data Analysis**

From mpMRI-defined target and mirrored background VOIs, we calculated the $^{18}$F-choline TBR. Five $^{18}$F-choline PET parameters (${\text{SUV}}_{\text{max}}$, ${\text{SUV}}_{\text{mean}}$, ${\text{SUV}}_{\text{mean}} \times \text{volume}$, ${\text{SUV}}_{\text{max}} \ TBR$, and ${\text{SUV}}_{\text{mean}} \ TBR$) were determined for further analysis.

**Statistics**

Analyses were conducted using the R statistical package (23) as described in supplemental methods.
RESULTS

Patient-based Biopsy Results

Targeted biopsies were obtained from one (n = 20) or two (n = 16) mpMRI identified lesions, with an average of 5.0 ± 3.2 targeted biopsy cores per patient. As shown in the Supplemental Table 1, targeted prostate biopsies on a patient basis resulted in detection of significantly more Gleason ≥ 3+4 prostate cancer (n = 12, permutation based odds ratio = 705.7) compared to non-targeted standard biopsies (n = 5; odds ratio = 12.7; p = 0.002). In 9 cases, significant prostate cancer was found by targeted biopsies only; in 3 cases only standard biopsies (including one prior biopsy) were positive for Gleason ≥ 3+4 disease; in 3 cases, both methods were positive for Gleason ≥ 3+4 disease. Final pathology from prostatectomy (n = 10) revealed that image-guided biopsy of a Gleason 3+4 prostate cancer missed the target that was correctly identified by mpMRI (ID 26 [Supplemental Table 1]). Targeting increased the maximum percent biopsy core involvement for any detected cancer to 64 ± 26 % (range 30 - 100 %) compared to 25 ± 26 % (range 5 – 85 %) for standard cores (p = 0.011). The number of low-risk cancers (Gleason = 3+3) found at standard biopsies was not statistically different from targeted biopsies (p = 0.49).

Lesion-based Results

A total of 52 lesions were identified by mpMRI: 19 low risk, 18 intermediate risk, and 15 high risk. Overall, mpMRI was a strong predictor for significant cancer (odds ratio = 6.29; p < 0.001). If only mpMRI-assigned high-risk lesions are considered “positive”, mpMRI would have resulted in 33 true negative (TN), 11 true positive (TP), 4 false positive (FP), and 4 false negative (FN) cases (AUC 0.81). Many of the 15 individual significant cancer lesions found in this patient population were a) located in the anterior gland (n = 5), b) close to the very apex of the gland (n = 3), or c) small volume lesions less than 0.5 cm³ (n = 7) [Fig. 1].
We assessed whether the addition of $^{18}$F-choline PET/CT would improve the accuracy of mpMRI for the diagnosis of significant cancer. From the following PET parameters tested (lesion $SUV_{\text{max}}$, $SUV_{\text{mean}}$, $SUV_{\text{mean}} \times$ lesion volume, $SUV_{\text{max}}$ TBR, $SUV_{\text{mean}}$ TBR), stepwise regression analysis identified the $SUV_{\text{mean}}$ TBR as the most predictive parameter (Supplemental Table 2A/B). Adding the $SUV_{\text{mean}}$ TBR to mpMRI in the statistical model significantly improved the odds to detect Gleason $\geq 3+4$ prostate cancer (Likelihood ratio = 24.04; $p < 0.001$). The optimal threshold for $SUV_{\text{mean}}$ TBR for mpMRI-identified lesions was determined to be 1.583, which as an individual parameter on all MRI-identified lesions resulted in 33 TN, 12 TP, 4 FP, and 3 FN cases (AUC 0.92). When $SUV_{\text{mean}}$ TBR was assessed as a combined synthetic criterion (PET/MRI), this improved the prediction for Gleason $\geq 3+4$ cancers to 31 TN, 15 TP, 6 FP, and 0 FN (AUC 0.93).

Pathology results from prostatectomy specimens confirmed the biopsy results for Gleason $\geq 3+4$ cancers (combined standard and targeted) in 9 of 10 cases. In one discordant case (ID 35 [Supplemental Table 1]), standard and targeted biopsies were negative, but a prior biopsy had shown low-volume Gleason 3+4 prostate cancer that was confirmed to be 0.14 cm$^3$ on whole-mount histology. Given the small lesion volume, it was not surprising that neither mpMRI nor $^{18}$F-choline $SUV_{\text{mean}}$ TBR were prospectively or retrospectively abnormal at this location. In another case (ID 10 [Supplemental Table 1]), a different type of error occurred. The standard biopsy was positive for Gleason 4+3 prostate cancer (5% maximum core involvement), but targeted biopsies from two targets were negative. Co-registration of histology with in vivo imaging identified that a relatively large (2.1 cm$^3$) transitional zone cancer was not identifiable by either imaging modality. The lesion presented with heterogeneous signal on T2w images, did not show restricted diffusion and was undistinguishable from nearby BPH nodules on $^{18}$F-choline PET.
DISCUSSION

Our study yielded a number of key findings: A) Fusion PET/MRI-TRUS image registration for targeted prostate biopsies is clinically feasible. B) The addition of mpMRI-based targeted biopsies to standard biopsies significantly increased the number of identified Gleason ≥ 3+4 lesions. C) The MRI risk classification was a strong predictor of significant (Gleason ≥ 3+4) disease. D) The addition of the SUV\textsubscript{mean} TBR to mpMRI further improved the identification of Gleason ≥ 3+4 cancers over mpMRI alone.

There is now a large body of evidence that transrectal targeted biopsies using MRI-TRUS fusion improves the detection rate of significant prostate cancer compared to standard biopsies (1,24). In fact for the detection of significant disease, transrectal MRI-guided biopsies are as accurate as transperineal biopsies (25), which—until recently—was considered the reference standard for prostate biopsy procedures. Both the PI-RADS system and generic Likert scales have shown significant positive correlations between the assigned suspicion score and the probability of clinically significant cancer (12,13).

While mpMRI-guided prostate biopsies appear to be a clear improvement over standard biopsies alone, mpMRI has limitations. A recent study of 235 consecutive patients who underwent mpMRI at 3T with risk-stratification by PI-RADS scoring resulted in an AUC of 0.81 for the detection of clinically significant prostate cancer (26). Our mpMRI data without \textsuperscript{11}C/\textsuperscript{18}F-choline PET are similar to these results. Other recent reports on the detection of significant prostate cancer indicate a high sensitivity, but limited specificity (27,28). A larger study including 170 patients undergoing 3T mpMRI with PI-RADS scoring including subsequent pathological proof (based on prostatectomy) resulted in a sensitivity of 77% and a specificity of 68% for TRUS-MRI guided fusion biopsies regarding the detection of significant disease (13).
Unlike the data supporting the use of mpMRI for clinically-significant prostate cancer detection, the reported performance of $^{11}$C/$^{18}$F-choline PET for primary prostate cancer has been mixed. Results from earlier studies indicated suitable sensitivity, but limited specificity for the identification of prostate cancer (see review (29)). Since the $^{11}$C/$^{18}$F-choline uptake of the prostate is often inhomogeneously increased in the central gland, absolute choline uptake measures ($\text{SUV}_{\text{mean}}$, $\text{SUV}_{\text{max}}$) can be ambiguous as predictors of pathology, and normalization by a suitable background appears to be beneficial (4). We further attribute possible discrepancies in the identification of primary prostate cancer by $^{11}$C/$^{18}$F-choline PET in part to uncertainties regarding lesion co-localization on imaging compared to pathology due to the relatively poor spatial resolution of PET (21), expected elevated uptake within benign BPH nodules (29,30), and a failure to discriminate between clinically significant vs. insignificant prostate cancer (as recognized in (3-5)). Our exclusion criteria carefully avoided false positive inflammatory lesions (for instance due to a recent prostate biopsy or acute prostatitis (31)). When $^{11}$C-choline PET/CT and MRI have been co-registered with whole mount histology utilizing ex vivo MRI of the prostate specimen, tumor lesions (VOIs) can be defined based on true pathology rather than imaging co-localization (22). This technique has been used with a previous PET/CT scanner generation (effective axial reconstructed PET image resolution between 8.5 – 9 mm), and it was shown that TBR was significantly increased in primary Gleason 4 pattern disease and associated with increased expression of MIB-1/Ki67, a marker of tumor cell proliferation (4). Without robust co-registration methods, $^{11}$C-choline uptake failed to correlate with Gleason scoring and MIB-1/Ki67 expression in primary prostate cancer (32). More recently, combining $^{18}$F-fluoroethylcholine PET/CT and endorectal MRI improved lesion characterization of primary prostate cancer over each modality alone as verified at prostatectomy (3). Also, parametric fusion PET/MRI employing the quotient of $^{11}$C-choline uptake over ADC (called $P_{\text{CHOL/ADC}}$) improved lesion to background contrast of significant cancers to preferentially identify high-risk disease (Gleason $\geq 3+4$) (5).
Here we found that both mpMRI and $^{18}$F-choline PET/CT using the TBR to mirrored contralateral prostate tissues were strong predictors of Gleason $\geq 3+4$ prostate cancer. More importantly, the addition of $^{18}$F-choline (as SUV$_{\text{mean}}$ TBR) further improved the odds to correctly predict presence of significant disease over mpMRI alone. When combined as a synthetic PET/MRI parameter, mpMRI with $^{18}$F-choline SUV$_{\text{mean}}$ TBR improved the predictive value of imaging without any false negative (FN) cases for MRI-identified lesions (AUC 0.93). However, Gleason $\geq 3+4$ prostate cancer that is low-volume (ID 35 [Supplemental Table 1]), or that presents with uncharacteristic imaging features in unfavorable locations (ID 10 [Supplemental Table 1]), may still escape detection.

We did not test the predictive value of $^{18}$F-choline PET/CT independently of mpMRI because we were not attempting to supplant mpMRI with PET/CT. Choline PET/CT without mpMRI is often misleading because $^{18}$F-choline uptake can be focally increased in benign tissue, particularly in BPH nodules (3,29), which are better characterized on mpMRI (33). Also, $^{11}$C- and $^{18}$F-choline PET lacks the tissue contrast and spatial resolution typical of mpMRI. In this study, we assessed $^{18}$F-choline PET/CT uptake parameters of mpMRI-identified prostatic lesions; therefore, the highly predictive SUV$_{\text{mean}}$ TBR of $^{18}$F-choline was not evaluated as an independent PET parameter, nor was that parameter evaluated prospectively without mpMRI information available. Therefore, the improvement in lesion characterization for the diagnosis of significant prostate cancer can only be expected from a combination of both modalities ($^{18}$F-choline PET/MRI). The benefit of hybrid imaging over fusion PET/MRI as done in this study is twofold. First, it eliminates the necessity of additional fusion between methodologies with minor drawbacks described below. Secondly and more importantly, only simultaneous hybrid imaging will permit (cross-modality) parametric PET/MRI imaging (5) on a voxel-by-voxel basis, which may offer further improvements in characterization of small lesions.
One important limitation of this study is related to the uncertainty of the “true” histology of targeted lesions, particularly when resulting as benign or low-grade disease due to targeting errors. Also, mpMRI may have entirely missed an existing cancer, which would have precluded a targeted biopsy of that site. We accounted for these errors — at least in part — by combining targeted and standard biopsies. Nonetheless, we have evidence for both types of error as verified in our small subset of patients undergoing prostatectomy.

Multiple registration tasks were required in this study, each of which has task-specific uncertainties. The first registration task (registration of PET onto T2w MRI) was generally performed without difficulties using rigid registration and additional deformable registration when needed. This registration method is clinically applied and well validated for radiation treatment planning of prostate cancer (34). The second registration of the T2w MR (including embedded target information) onto real-time TRUS is more difficult and dependent on many factors such as configuration and size of the prostate gland and patient cooperation. Given that the ultrasound system used in this study required multi-point registration (instead of boundary-based registration), visibility of intraprostatic features on both ultrasound and MRI was key for successful registration. The accuracy of the TRUS-MRI fusion could therefore only be assessed visually. Despite these issues, our data as well as other studies have shown substantial improvement in the identification of significant prostate cancer by targeted prostate biopsies using TRUS-MRI fusion. The third registration task — the registration of a stacked whole-mount histology volume onto co-registered PET/MR using ex vivo prostate MRI — has been previously described (21). This method verified detection of significant cancers missed on targeted biopsy and it uncovered limitations of imaging to detect significant prostate cancer with unfavorable imaging characteristics.
CONCLUSION

Fusion PET/MRI-TRUS image registration for targeted prostate biopsies is clinically feasible, accurate, and improves identification of clinically significant prostate cancer over mpMRI alone. If the $\text{SUV}_{\text{mean}}$ TBR threshold of 1.58 we found in this study is verified in an independent patient population, a combination of mpMRI and $^{18}$F-choline PET may be able to challenge the current clinical diagnostic strategy.
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Fig. 1

Axial 2D T2w fast spin echo MRI (A), \(^{18}\text{F}\)-choline PET (25 - 30 min post injection, SUV range 0 - 12) (B), fusion PET/MRI (C) showing a 0.68 cm\(^3\) left anterior transitional zone lesion that was confirmed to be Gleason 3+4 prostate cancer on targeted biopsy. A magnified view of the PET/MRI is displayed with target lesion (magenta) and respective mirrored (blue) background VOIs (D). This patient (ID 24 [Supplemental Table 1]) underwent 3 prior prostate biopsy procedures without a cancer diagnosis.
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