

1 **REPLY TO LETTER TO THE EDITOR: The importance of an adequate surgical**
2 **template during salvage lymph node dissection for node-recurrent prostate cancer**

3

4 Authors: Wolfgang Peter Fendler¹, Andrea Farolfi^{1,2}

5

6 Institutions:

7 (1) Department of Nuclear Medicine, University Hospital Essen, Essen, Germany

8 (2) Nuclear Medicine Unit, IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna, Bologna,
9 Italy

10

11 Address for correspondence:

12 Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Fendler, Klinik für Nuklearmedizin, Universitätsklinikum Essen,

13 Hufelandstr. 55, 45147 Essen, Germany. Phone: +49 201 723 2033. Fax +49 201 723 5964.

14 Email address: wolfgang.fendler@uk-essen.de

15

16 Reply:

17 In line with the response by Bravi et al, PSMA PET demonstrated low sensitivity but high
18 specificity and negative predictive value for the detection of pelvic nodal metastases
19 compared to histopathology in a multicenter prospective phase III imaging study employing
20 blinded independent central reads (1). PSMA PET detection inversely correlates with size of
21 tumor deposits and thus PET is prone to miss micro-metastatic disease (2). Despite
22 underestimation on a single-lesion level (3), PSMA PET positivity raises a red flag for
23 diseased regions (4). As nodal spread follows lymph drainage anatomy, PSMA PET
24 guidance towards regions at risk seems feasible. The ongoing prospective ProSTone trial
25 (NCT04271579) will assess whether unilateral pelvic lymph node dissection on the PSMA
26 PET-positive side will lead to improved efficacy toxicity trade-off by sparing potentially
27 undiseased contralateral nodal regions. We agree with Bravi and colleagues suggesting the
28 adoption of an adequate template will be key to maximize the benefit for patients undergoing
29 local salvage therapy. In addition, standardized reporting of PSMA PET using a rationale
30 anatomic framework together with implementation into clinical trials on local therapy will be
31 key to define the future role of PSMA PET for treatment guidance (5).

32

33 **References**

- 34 1. Hope TA, Armstrong WR, Murthy V, Lawhn Heath C, Behr S, Barbato F, et al. Accuracy
35 of 68Ga-PSMA-11 for pelvic nodal metastasis detection prior to radical prostatectomy
36 and pelvic lymph node dissection: A multicenter prospective phase III imaging study. J
37 Clin Oncol. 2020 May 20;38(15_suppl):5502-5502.
- 38 2. Jilg CA, Drendel V, Rischke HC, Beck TI, Reichel K, Krönig M, et al. Detection Rate of
39 18F-Choline PET/CT and 68Ga-PSMA-HBED-CC PET/CT for Prostate Cancer Lymph
40 Node Metastases with Direct Link from PET to Histopathology: Dependence on the Size
41 of Tumor Deposits in Lymph Nodes. J Nucl Med. 2019 Jul;60(7):971-7.
- 42 3. Horn T, Krönke M, Rauscher I, Haller B, Robu S, Wester H-J, et al. Single Lesion on
43 Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen-ligand Positron Emission Tomography and Low
44 Prostate-specific Antigen Are Prognostic Factors for a Favorable Biochemical Response
45 to Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen-targeted Radioguided Surgery in Recurrent
46 Prostate Cancer. Eur Urol. 2019 Oct;76(4):517-23.
- 47 4. Farolfi A, Ilhan H, Gafita A, Calais J, Barbato F, Weber M, et al. Mapping prostate
48 cancer lesions pre/post unsuccessful salvage lymph node dissection using repeat
49 PSMA-PET. J Nucl Med. 2019 Dec 5;
- 50 5. Eiber M, Herrmann K, Calais J, Hadaschik B, Giesel FL, Hartenbach M, et al. Prostate
51 Cancer Molecular Imaging Standardized Evaluation (PROMISE): Proposed miTNM
52 Classification for the Interpretation of PSMA-Ligand PET/CT. J Nucl Med. 2018
53 Mar;59(3):469-78.

54