

Comparison of ^{68}Ga -PSMA-11 PET/CT and ^{18}F -Fluciclovine PET/CT in a Case Series of 10 Patients with Prostate Cancer Recurrence: Interesting, but Far from Definitive

TO THE EDITOR: We read with great interest the article by Calais and colleagues: “Head-to-head comparison of ^{68}Ga -PSMA-11 PET/CT and ^{18}F -fluciclovine PET/CT in a case series of 10 patients with prostate cancer recurrence” (1). We consider it important that the data presented be interpreted appropriately.

The authors’ enthusiasm is admirable; however, claiming that this was a “head-to-head comparison” and concluding that the findings “suggest a superior detection rate” for ^{68}Ga -PSMA strikes us as inappropriate, overstated and misleading. By definition, “head-to-head” should only be used to describe a comparison of two entities directly against one other and subject to the same rules and conditions. In medical research, this is typically a randomized, controlled clinical trial. In our opinion, it is never appropriate to apply this description to a series of 10 case reports, with biases and methodological concerns that include:

Patient selection bias: 10 patients were retrospectively selected from a large 288 patient prospective study, with the authors noting “Patients likely had negative ^{18}F -fluciclovine PET/CT studies and were therefore referred for ^{68}Ga -PSMA-11 PET/CT.”

Sequencing bias: the ^{18}F -fluciclovine scan was always performed first.

Time interval between scans: up to 4.2 months.

Pre-scan PSA levels: in all 10 patients the PSA level was greater before the ^{68}Ga -PSMA scan, with an important difference in the mean levels; the PSA range prior to ^{68}Ga -PSMA scanning was twice that before ^{18}F -fluciclovine scanning.

^{18}F -fluciclovine image acquisition: Performed at multiple sites and not standardized.

Image interpretation: The “experienced” reader was not blinded; ^{68}Ga -PSMA imaging included a diagnostic CT examination; ^{18}F -fluciclovine PET/CT did not.

Finally, pathological correlates, considered the standard of truth, were not available to rule out false positive results with ^{68}Ga -PSMA, as have been reported with all PSMA agents currently under investigation (2).

Axumin® (fluciclovine F 18) is approved by the US Food and Drug Administration as the first ^{18}F -labelled PET imaging agent for localization of recurrent prostate cancer. The safety and efficacy of ^{18}F -fluciclovine has been reported in almost 600 patients, across a broad, multinational experience (3). In contrast, all current PSMA agents are currently considered investigational. The detection rate of ^{18}F -fluciclovine is 68%, not 20%, as suggested by Calais et al (1). Importantly, even in patients with a low PSA (<0.79ng/mL), the detection rate for ^{18}F -fluciclovine is >40% (3). Also, an on-going NIH-funded, randomized, controlled clinical trial (NCT01666808) has reported the utility of ^{18}F -fluciclovine in post-prostatectomy radiation therapy planning, with augmentation of the target volumes in 30 of 41 patients

(4). Interim data from the prospective FALCON (NCT02578940) trial demonstrate a revision in therapeutic management following ^{18}F -fluciclovine imaging in 52 of 85 (61.2%) patients (5).

As suggested by Calais and colleagues, ^{18}F -fluciclovine is the reference standard for PET imaging in prostate cancer in the US and is now included in the American College of Radiology (ACR) Appropriateness Criteria[®] as “usually appropriate” for follow-up in prostate cancer patients’ post-prostatectomy and after non-surgical local and pelvic treatments, when there is clinical concern for residual or recurrent disease (6).

While there is a need to evaluate the relative merits of different imaging tools in men with prostate cancer, such studies should be conducted with scientific rigor. We remain confident in and encouraged by the documented performance of ^{18}F -fluciclovine at this time. We are also very optimistic about the future potential of several PSMA agents, currently under investigation, and the role of advanced PET imaging, in general, for patients with prostate cancer.

REFERENCES

1. Calais J, Fendler WP, Herrmann K, et al. Head-to-head comparison of ^{68}Ga -PSMA-11 PET/CT and ^{18}F -fluciclovine PET/CT in a case series of 10 patients with prostate cancer recurrence. *J Nucl Med*. Published online Dec. 14, 2017; doi:10.2967/jnumed.117.203257
2. Sheikhabaei S, Afshar-Oromich A, Eiber M, et al. Pearls and pitfalls in clinical interpretation of prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA)-targeted PET imaging. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2017;44:2117-36
3. Bach-Gansmo T, Nanni C, Nieh PT, et al. Multisite experience of the safety, detection rate and diagnostic performance of fluciclovine (^{18}F) positron emission tomography imaging in the staging of biochemically recurrent prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2017;197:676-83
4. Schreibmann E, Schuster DM, Rossi PJ, et al. Image guided planning for prostate carcinomas with incorporation of anti-3- ^{18}F FACBC (fluciclovine) positron emission tomography: workflow and initial findings from a randomized trial. *Int J Radiation Oncol Biol Phys* 2016;96:206-13
5. Teoh E, Bottomley D, Scarsbrook A, et al. Impact of ^{18}F -fluciclovine PET/CT on clinical management of patients with recurrent prostate cancer: results from the Phase 3 FALCON trial. *Int J Radiation Oncol Biol Phys* 2017;99:1316-7
6. ACR Appropriateness Criteria[®]: Post-treatment follow-up of prostate cancer 2017. <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/69369/Narrative>; Accessed February 5, 2018

Bela Denes*
Peter Gardiner
*Blue Earth Diagnostics, Inc.
25 Burlington Mall Road, Suite #404
Burlington MA 01803
E-mail: b.denes@blueearthdx.com