What Medical, Urologic, and Radiation Oncologists Want from Molecular Imaging of Prostate Cancer

Leslie K. Ballas[1], Andre Luis de Castro Abreu[2], and David I. Quinn[3]

[1]Department of Radiation Oncology, Keck School of Medicine at USC, USC Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center and Hospital, Los Angeles, California; [2]Department of Urology, Keck School of Medicine at USC, USC Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center and Hospital, Los Angeles, California; and [3]Division of Medical Oncology, Department of Medicine, Keck School of Medicine at USC, USC Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center and Hospital, Los Angeles, California

As molecular imaging better delineates the state of prostate cancer, clinical management will evolve. The currently licensed imaging modalities are limited by lack of specificity or sensitivity for the extent of cancer and for predicting outcome in response to therapy. Clinicians want molecular imaging that—by being more reliable in tailoring treatment and monitoring response for each patient—will become a key facet of precision medicine, surgery, and radiation therapy. Identifying patients who are candidates for specific or novel treatments is important, but equally important is the finding that a given patient may not be a good candidate for single-modality therapy. This article presents prostate cancer scenarios in which managing clinicians would welcome molecular imaging innovations to help with decision making. The potential role of newer techniques that may help fill this wish list is discussed.

Key Words: prostate cancer; molecular imaging; clinical decision making

We summarize areas of clinical need in prostate cancer that could potentially be met with molecular imaging in the next 5 years (Table 1), and we assess recent and potential further progress in these areas.

THE SCREENING SCENARIO

One of the great limitations of prostate-specific antigen (PSA)–based screening is its relative lack of prediction of cancer aggression and cancer-specific mortality. Biopsy data bring more precision, but given the heterogeneity within an individual prostate gland, there are often questions related to sampling and sampling error—a large lesion is easier to biopsy but may contain indolent cancer, whereas a small lesion may carry high-grade or mutant-driven cancer that is more rapidly mortal. For this reason, multiparametric MRI is now commonly used to survey the prostate to assess heterogeneity and index and nonindex lesions. Molecular imaging has a lot of potential in this area, but there are relatively sparse data to support routine use at this point.

Transrectal ultrasound (TRUS) with needle biopsy of the prostate is the current standard of care for prostate cancer diagnosis (*6*). However, when performed in a blind fashion, this technique is subject to systematic and random errors, which may lead to poor sampling and poor cancer characterization. As an invasive method, TRUS with needle biopsy is associated with significant complications (*92*). There are strategies to improve TRUS-guided prostate biopsy performance, including increasing the number of cores (*6*). However, this may increase cost and morbidity and may overdetect clinically insignificant cancers that will not jeopardize the patient's life. As such, it seems more logical to visualize the prostate and then to biopsy suggestive intraprostatic areas with greater precision. As such, the concept of "if we can see, we can target" has been adopted. This approach has the benefit of potentially better characterizing and risk-stratifying prostate cancer, using noninvasive tests that can outperform the current TRUS biopsy strategy.

Over the past few years, MRI has evolved from a tool for staging prostate cancer after biopsy to a risk stratification test capable of predicting clinically significant prostate cancer (*7*). In fact, when combined with TRUS (i.e., MRI/TRUS coregistration), a greater number of clinically significant cancers and fewer clinically insignificant cancers can be detected from only a limited number of sampled cores (*8*). Furthermore, MRI/TRUS-guided biopsies are better able to predict pathology in subsequent radical prostatectomy specimens than TRUS alone (*8*). On this basis, multiparametric MRI/TRUS biopsy is now recommended by the American Urological Association for patients undergoing repeated prostate biopsy (*19*). However, multiparametric MRI may miss up to 20% of clinically significant cancers (*93*). As such, additional efforts have been made to improve or replace multiparametric MRI.

Several radiotracers associated with PET have been tested in an attempt to detect or characterize intraprostatic localized prostate cancer, either as a standalone test or combined with multiparametric MRI in a PET/MRI hybrid system (*1,2,15,16*). Studies correlating gross tumor volume on preoperative ^{11}C-choline PET/CT with tumor volume on radical prostatectomy specimens showed that ^{11}C-choline PET/CT as a standalone test has limited value and failed to correlate with intraprostatic cancer (*20,21*). Similarly, ^{11}C-acetate PET/CT and ^{18}F-FDG PET have questionable utility as independent tests to evaluate localized prostate cancer (*11,13*).

Most promising is hybrid PET/MRI, as this approach combines the strengths of both methods, overcoming the limitations of PET/CT and standalone multiparametric MRI (*1,2*). In fact, studies evaluating ^{11}C-choline PET/CT and apparent diffusion coefficient maps—an

TABLE 1
Clinical Scenarios with Areas of Need That Should Be Addressed with Molecular Imaging

Clinical scenario	Specific clinical questions	References
Screening		
Screening and stratification in patients with no diagnosis of cancer	Identify significant vs. nonsignificant cancer	(1–7)
	Determine predictive value of index and nonindex lesions within intact prostate	(8–21)
Therapy for localized prostate cancer		
Planning therapy for clinically localized cancer	Perform staging to determine whether metastatic disease is present	(22–26)
	Locate disease within pelvic lymph nodes that can be incorporated into radiotherapy field or planned lymph node dissection	(27–35)
Evaluating after definitive local therapy		
Adjuvant therapy	Identify early micrometastatic disease that would eliminate need for radiotherapy	(22,36–43)
PSA elevation after local therapy	Reliably delineate recurrence in patients in whom nadir or PSA rise is lacking after radiotherapy or radical prostatectomy	(43–60)
	Distinguish between M0 hormone-naïve prostate cancer and M0 castration-resistant prostate cancer	(61–63)
Salvage radiotherapy	Identify sites of recurrent disease that can or cannot be targeted by radiation (either in prostate bed or elsewhere)	(64–70)
Metastatic disease		
Oligometastatic prostate cancer	Identify sites of oligometastases to determine whether stereotactic body radiotherapy or resection is appropriate	(40,70–76)
Diffuse metastatic disease	Obtain reliable information on bone metastases for palliative radiotherapy targeting	(67,77–80)
Delineation of metastatic distribution	Determine low- and high-risk patients for selection of systemic therapy	(41,73,78,81,82)
Early imaging response	Predict response to therapy or duration of survival	(42,63,83–91)

important component of multiparametric MRI—have shown that these tests are likely complementary in detecting the index lesion on primary prostate cancer (3), and other work has suggested that the combination of ^{18}F-fluoroethylcholine PET and endorectal coil MRI best delineates the index cancer focus (94). However, in a 49-patient study assessing the value of ^{11}C-choline PET/CT over T2-weighted MRI in localizing intraprostatic cancer—using whole-mount histopathology sections after radical prostatectomy as the standard—the authors found differential sensitivity (33.5% vs. 77.4%), specificity (94.6% vs. 44.9%), and accuracy (70.2% vs. 61.1%) for T2-weighted MRI versus ^{11}C-choline PET/CT, respectively. When both tests were combined, there was an improvement in sensitivity but a decrease in specificity. The authors concluded that the value of combined ^{11}C-choline PET/CT and T2-weighted MRI is limited (15).

Studies evaluating prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA)–based PET/CT are encouraging (4,16). An interesting study assessed performance in localizing primary prostate cancer by PSMA-based PET/MRI versus multiparametric MRI alone and PET alone in 53 patients undergoing radical prostatectomy. The cancer detection rate was 66% for multiparametric MRI, 92% for PET, and 98% for PET/MRI. Furthermore, in an analysis of area under the receiver operator curve, PET/MRI was found to outperform multiparametric MRI and PET alone for localization of prostate cancer (16).

Although promising and exciting, these technologies should be cautiously analyzed because of the small sample sizes of some studies and the fact that the study populations have already been diagnosed with prostate cancer. The future challenge is for these techniques and technologies to be made broadly reproducible and applicable for biopsy guidance in the population of patients at risk of prostate cancer. Additionally, these technologies should be able to localize and risk-stratify clinically significant prostate cancer while the tumor is still small.

THE LOCALIZED PROSTATE CANCER THERAPY SCENARIO

Is the patient a candidate for definitive surgery, radiation therapy, or a novel local approach? There is no definite benefit to treating the primary cancer in the presence of metastatic prostate cancer. Although this premise will be tested in upcoming trials, currently we try not to visit the morbidity of prostatectomy or prostatic radiation on patients with distant disease unless there are emergent or symptomatic issues that require intervention. On that basis, assessment for metastatic cancer in patients with clinically localized prostate cancer is typically undertaken with CT or MRI of the abdomen and pelvis with a ^{99m}Tc-based bone scan. Additional imaging may have a role when confirmation is needed or results are equivocal.

Newer molecular imaging techniques with choline, amino acids, peptides, PSMA, and sodium fluoride may detect a greater number of distant lesions than conventional staging (22,40–43). Problems arise, however, in assessing the relationship of these lesions to survival and other outcome measures, the false-positive and false-negative rates for these scans, and whether the results can be used to model therapeutic strategies that help patients.

One important area in which molecular imaging may be crucial is when there is lymph node involvement at diagnosis or soon after definitive local therapy. In such cases, it is technically feasible to surgically resect lymph nodes or to treat them with conventional or stereotactically guided radiation (70,95). Patients may experience improvement in surrogates such as serum PSA and have longer disease-free intervals, but prospective data are lacking. Prospective trials are needed in this area, but most importantly, we also need to use molecular imaging modalities in parallel if we are to optimize our progress.

The indications for postoperative radiotherapy after radical prostatectomy are positive surgical margins, extracapsular extension, seminal vesicle invasion, lack of a PSA nadir after radical prostatectomy, or a rising PSA level after radical prostatectomy (36–38). Radiotherapy in this setting is used to eradicate microscopic residual disease in the prostate bed, thereby reducing the risk of biochemical recurrence.

Postoperative radiotherapy to the prostate fossa is not currently used in patients with metastatic disease. Because of this difference in clinical treatment for patients with metastatic disease, identification of early metastatic disease is essential for the postoperative patient. If early metastatic disease could be accurately identified, those patients could avoid postoperative radiotherapy and the treatment could be focused on systemic therapy. Thus, molecular imaging can define the appropriate treatment algorithm.

In the adjuvant setting, detection of residual or recurrent prostate cancer is challenging because the patient's PSA level is typically less than 0.2 ng/mL, reflecting a low burden of disease. Reported outcomes for ^{11}C-choline PET show low detection rates for PSA levels of less than 1 ng/mL, although a shorter PSA doubling time predicts a positive PET study when the PSA level is less than 2.0 ng/mL (46,49,50,53). Giovacchini proposed a PSA threshold of 1.4 ng/mL for ^{11}C-choline PET/CT positivity (49,50), whereas Castellucci proposed a cutoff of 1.05 ng/mL with a PSA doubling time cutoff of 5.95 mo (53). ^{68}Ga-PSMA PET/CT may have better detection rates at lower PSA levels. In some studies, when the PSA level was below 0.5 ng/mL, ^{68}Ga-PSMA detected 50% of lesions, versus 12.5% for ^{18}F-fluoromethylcholine; these percentages compare with around 19% for ^{11}C-choline PET/CT when the PSA level was less than 1 (49,50,59). Moreover, in most studies that do report imaging abnormalities with very low PSA levels, the findings are not linked to pathologic proof of disease because the studies lack biopsy or resected material for correlation.

Finding a reliable and sensitive molecular imaging modality to detect micrometastatic disease in the setting of a very low PSA level could potentially eliminate unnecessary treatment to the pelvis in patients who would not benefit from it. Early detection of tumor recurrence would also be beneficial since the effectiveness of salvage therapy is greater in the setting of lower PSA values.

Radiotherapy is the standard salvage treatment in men with persistently detectable PSA or a delayed rise in PSA without evidence of metastasis after prostatectomy. Additional information that can affect postoperative radiotherapy is the identification of residual or recurrent disease within the pelvis. If the patient requires salvage radiotherapy, identification of disease within the pelvis allows for more targeted therapy and appropriate radiation dosing. In retrospective studies examining the effects of molecular imaging on treatment decision making, ^{11}C-choline PET/CT changed radiation treatment planning to include lymph node stations in 13% of patients (66). One group found that the therapeutic strategy was altered in about a third of patients after the results of ^{11}C-choline PET/CT were known (67), and another group found that the PSMA PET findings caused a change in radiotherapy management in 46% of cases (69). As technology and treatment techniques improve, it is hoped that these imaging modalities will not only better define treatment decisions but also allow for modification of radiotherapy field sizes.

THE METASTATIC DISEASE SCENARIO

Delineation of sites of metastatic prostate cancer is important for a variety of reasons.

Oligometastatic disease presents a unique clinical scenario in which patients have a limited number of metastases. There have been many preliminary studies that have evaluated aggressive therapy for oligometastatic disease (74–76). The goal of aggressive therapy combined with effective systemic therapy in this scenario is to prevent further progression of disease and possibly improve survival. Stereotactic body radiotherapy uses higher doses of radiation per treatment to ablate tumor cells and offers a greater potential for cell kill than standard fractionated treatment. A key component to using stereotactic body radiotherapy for oligometastatic disease is the proper identification of metastatic sites of disease and identification of whether the picture is an oligometastatic one. Imaging is critical not only in identifying the number of metastatic foci but also in determining whether the radiotherapy can safely be delivered to the metastases.

Defining boney metastatic sites has traditionally involved correlation of clinical symptoms and ^{99m}Tc-based bone scanning. Radiation has been given to prevent imminent spinal cord compression, and in this instance the extent of the boundary and number of discrete lesions to be treated may vary with the sensitivity and specificity of the imaging technique. More recently, radiation has been used as a part of combination therapies for oligometastatic disease. Patients who have multiple bone metastases may be selected for different therapies. For example, a patient with diffuse bone metastases and some symptoms may be offered radionuclide therapy with [223]Ra either instead of external-beam radiation or after it (96).

The distribution of metastases in advanced prostate cancer is prognostic. Patients with visceral involvement, especially liver metastases, have a poorer survival than patients with bone metastases, whereas patients with only lymph node involvement have the best outcome when given standard therapies (97). Among patients with bone metastases, the distribution and most likely number of metastases in the axial and appendicular skeleton is prognostic (98).

Recent data from the CHAARTED trial suggest that patients with high-risk disease defined by either a high-risk distribution or a high-risk number of bone metastases or visceral metastases benefit from the addition of docetaxel chemotherapy to standard androgen deprivation therapy at the first evidence of metastases (99). The advent of more sensitive scans in this context raises interesting questions: Will patients with more sensitive scans have earlier detection of metastases, when the metastatic burden is lower, and be considered at low risk and not likely to benefit from addition of chemotherapy? Or will patients diagnosed with a lower burden of bone metastases on ^{99m}Tc-based

bone scans now have more metastatic disease defined by sodium fluoride PET and be considered at high risk and candidates for the addition of docetaxel to androgen deprivation therapy?

Patients who have a PSA elevation on androgen deprivation therapy but no metastases on imaging with conventional bone scintigraphy and CT (so-called M_0 castration-resistant prostate cancer) may be found to have evidence of metastases if imaged with a more sensitive and specific technique (22,43,46,53,80). These patients may then be candidates for therapy with an earlier androgen receptor pathway blockade, using agents such as enzalutamide or abiraterone acetate, or for immunotherapy with sipuleucel-T. Several lines of evidence suggest that prolonged progression-free and overall survival may be a benefit of earlier therapy in this setting, albeit with an extra cost when the hormonal agents are required (100,101).

Clinicians would very much like to know whether patients with metastatic disease are benefiting from therapy within 1 mo of starting it. The knowledge that a patient is unlikely to benefit from further use of a given therapy would decrease unnecessary costs and toxicity from a nonefficacious treatment. For nonimaging modalities, many surrogates of survival have been tested with limited success, leading to the formation of an international group to examine and define intermediate endpoints in advanced prostate cancer to make trials more efficient (102).

Several blood-based tests have value when they indicate changes over the first 3–4 wk of therapy in prostate cancer, including serum PSA, lactate dehydrogenase, alkaline phosphate, and other bone markers and circulating tumor cells (103). Although the Food and Drug Administration does not accept the possibility that changes in PSA level indicate an altered prognosis necessitating a change in therapy, and the Prostate Cancer Working Group defines progression as clinical symptoms or unequivocal radiologic progression, many clinicians use serum PSA level as their major determinant of whether to change therapy in advanced prostate cancer. When changes in PSA level have been investigated as an intermediate endpoint, they have failed to definitively meet surrogacy criteria even though a small number of patients who show a major PSA increase after 4 wk of hormonal therapy are destined for rapid progression and a likely early death unless switched to a different effective therapy (104,105). Prospective studies are now under way to look at switching patients with a suboptimal early biomarker response to another therapy or continuing with the original treatment to determine any disease control or survival advantage. If successful, these studies will provide high-level evidence for such an approach. Other studies look at this question slightly differently based on sequencing of agents. For example, the PRIMCAB study enrolls patients with early progression on a novel androgen receptor pathway inhibitor and randomizes them to either another androgen receptor pathway blocker or chemotherapy (https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT02379390). In the ARMOR3 trial, patients who progress on initial androgen deprivation therapy are screened for the presence of a resistance marker on circulating tumor cells called AR-V7—a truncation of the androgen receptor ligand binding domain at the site where both endogenous androgens and first- and second-generation androgen receptor blockers bind (106,107). The study entails randomizing patients with this resistance marker to either a conventional blocker of the androgen receptor binding domain (enzalutamide) or a drug that acts by binding at a different site in the N terminus of the androgen receptor (galeterone) (108,109). The TAXYNERGY study looks at changing the type of chemotherapy on the basis of early-response markers, including circulating tumor cell number and cellular androgen receptor distribution (110). These studies will initially

determine whether this approach is feasible and then seek to change practice. They are demanding and resource-intense but, hopefully, can be pivotal to optimal therapeutic use.

In terms of imaging studies, standard CT and ^{99m}Tc-based bone scanning do not predict outcome until at least 12 wk after the start of therapy, with the presence of new bone metastases on either modality, or both, being associated with a poorer survival, as is most likely due to RECIST progression in soft-tissue lesions (lymph nodes or viscera) (84). Because few novel molecular imaging techniques have been tested in parallel with these conventional techniques, there is a deficit of high-level evidence on which to base practice. In addition, because of the logistics of tissue acquisition in advanced prostate cancer, there are few studies that have characterized lesions histologically or provide molecular analysis. We are left with using observations from phase II studies to try to guide practice.

What do we know from molecular imaging in these situations? First, in patients with a rising PSA level and negative findings on conventional CT and ^{99m}Tc bone scanning, a positive ^{11}C-choline PET/CT scan is associated with worse overall survival (87). Second, adaptation of conventional imaging modalities such as ^{99m}Tc bone scanning and MRI may allow assessment of response and progression in bone, but broader application to centers with less technologic expertise will represent a challenge (111–113). Third, ^{18}F-FDG PET in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer is useful for following individual lesions on treatment and for determining whether there are relatively more metabolically active foci in the patient (42,91,112,114). However, whereas ^{18}F-FDG PET parameters at baseline correlate with survival, changes may be of limited value in predicting outcome. For example, changes in SUV for the sum of all lesions early in treatment do not appear to be associated with outcome, although further analyses of several cohorts are in longer-term follow-up (42). And finally, specific scanning targets such as the androgen receptor, PSMA, bombesin receptors, and other molecules may provide information that could indicate potential for early response prediction and therapeutic change (55,73,79–81,91,115). These targets will need to be tested in a series of prospective studies (116–118).

CONCLUSION

There is so much that molecular imaging can add to the modern treatment of prostate cancer. Molecular imaging is critical, and will become even more so, in the management of all stages of prostate cancer treatment.

DISCLOSURE

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

REFERENCES

1. Chang JH, Lim Joon D, Lee ST, et al. Diffusion-weighted MRI, ^{11}C-choline PET and ^{18}F-fluorodeoxyglucose PET for predicting the Gleason score in prostate carcinoma. *Eur Radiol.* 2014;24:715–722.
2. Chang JH, Lim Joon D, Davis ID, et al. Comparison of [^{11}C]choline positron emission tomography with T2- and diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging for delineating malignant intraprostatic lesions. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2015;92:438–445.
3. Hernández-Argüello M, Quiceno H, Pascual I, et al. Index lesion characterization by ^{11}C-choline PET/CT and apparent diffusion coefficient parameters at 3 tesla MRI in primary prostate carcinoma. *Prostate.* 2016;76:3–12.
4. Rowe SP, Gage KL, Faraj SF, et al. ^{18}F-DCFBC PET/CT for PSMA-based detection and characterization of primary prostate cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2015;56:1003–1010.

5. Mottaghy FM, Heinzel A, Verburg FA. Molecular imaging using PSMA PET/CT versus multiparametric MRI for initial staging of prostate cancer: comparing apples with oranges? *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2016;43:1397–1399.

6. Heidenreich A, Bastian PJ, Bellmunt J, et al. EAU guidelines on prostate cancer. Part 1: screening, diagnosis, and local treatment with curative intent—update 2013. *Eur Urol.* 2014;65:124–137.

7. Fütterer JJ, Briganti A, De Visschere P, et al. Can clinically significant prostate cancer be detected with multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging? A systematic review of the literature. *Eur Urol.* 2015;68:1045–1053.

8. Siddiqui MM, Rais-Bahrami S, Turkbey B, et al. Comparison of MR/ultrasound fusion-guided biopsy with ultrasound-guided biopsy for the diagnosis of prostate cancer. *JAMA.* 2015;313:390–397.

9. El-Shater Bosaily A, Parker C, Brown LC, et al. PROMIS: Prostate MR imaging study—a paired validating cohort study evaluating the role of multi-parametric MRI in men with clinical suspicion of prostate cancer. *Contemp Clin Trials.* 2015;42:26–40.

10. Ahmed HU, El-Shater Bosaily A, Brown LC, et al. The PROMIS study: a paired-cohort, blinded confirmatory study evaluating the accuracy of multi-parametric MRI and TRUS biopsy in men with an elevated PSA [abstract]. *J Clin Oncol.* 2016;34(suppl):5000.

11. Watanabe H, Kanematsu M, Kondo H, et al. Preoperative detection of prostate cancer: a comparison with ^{11}C-choline PET, ^{18}F-fluorodeoxyglucose PET and MR imaging. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2010;31:1151–1156.

12. Jambor I, Borra R, Kemppainen J, et al. Improved detection of localized prostate cancer using co-registered MRI and ^{11}C-acetate PET/CT. *Eur J Radiol.* 2012;81:2966–2972.

13. Mena E, Turkbey B, Mani H, et al. ^{11}C-acetate PET/CT in localized prostate cancer: a study with MRI and histopathologic correlation. *J Nucl Med.* 2012;53:538–545.

14. Shiiba M, Ishihara K, Kimura G, et al. Evaluation of primary prostate cancer using ^{11}C-methionine-PET/CT and ^{18}F-FDG-PET/CT. *Ann Nucl Med.* 2012;26:138–145.

15. Van den Bergh L, Koole M, Isebaert S, et al. Is there an additional value of ^{11}C-choline PET-CT to T2-weighted MRI images in the localization of intraprostatic tumor nodules? *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2012;83:1486–1492.

16. Eiber M, Weirich G, Holzapfel K, et al. Simultaneous ^{68}Ga-PSMA HBED-CC PET/MRI improves the localization of primary prostate cancer. *Eur Urol.* January 18, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

17. Fendler WP, Schmidt DF, Wenter V, et al. ^{68}Ga-PSMA-HBED-CC PET/CT detects location and extent of primary prostate cancer. *J Nucl Med.* June 3, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

18. Rahbar K, Weckesser M, Huss S, et al. Correlation of intraprostatic tumor extent with ^{68}Ga-PSMA distribution in patients with prostate cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2016;57:563–567.

19. Rosenkrantz AB, Verma S, Choyke P, et al. Prostate MRI and MRI-targeted biopsy in patients with a prior negative biopsy: a consensus statement of the American Urological Association and the Society of Abdominal Radiology's Prostate Cancer Disease-Focused Panel. *J Urol.* June 16, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

20. Grosu AL, Weirich G, Wendl C, et al. ^{11}C-choline PET/pathology image co-registration in primary localized prostate cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2014;41:2242–2248.

21. Yoneyama T, Tateishi U, Terauchi T, Inoue T. Correlation of metabolic tumor volume and ^{11}C-choline uptake with the pathology of prostate cancer: evaluation by use of simultaneously recorded MR and PET images. *Jpn J Radiol.* 2014;32:155–163.

22. Jadvar H, Desai B, Ji L, et al. Prospective evaluation of ^{18}F-NaF and ^{18}F-FDG PET/CT in detection of occult metastatic disease in biochemical recurrence of prostate cancer. *Clin Nucl Med.* 2012;37:637–643.

23. Haseebuddin M, Dehdashti F, Siegel BA, et al. ^{11}C-acetate PET/CT before radical prostatectomy: nodal staging and treatment failure prediction. *J Nucl Med.* 2013;54:699–706.

24. Budäus L, Leyh-Bannurah SR, Salomon G, et al. Initial experience of ^{68}Ga-PSMA PET/CT imaging in high-risk prostate cancer patients prior to radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol.* 2016;69:393–396.

25. Dewes S, Schiller K, Sauter K, et al. Integration of ^{68}Ga-PSMA-PET imaging in planning of primary definitive radiotherapy in prostate cancer: a retrospective study. *Radiat Oncol.* 2016;11:73.

26. Herlemann A, Wenter V, Kretschmer A, et al. ^{68}Ga-PSMA positron emission tomography/computed tomography provides accurate staging of lymph node regions prior to lymph node dissection in patients with prostate cancer. *Eur Urol.* January 19, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

27. Scattoni V, Picchio M, Suardi N, et al. Detection of lymph-node metastases with integrated [^{11}C]choline PET/CT in patients with PSA failure after radical retropubic prostatectomy: results confirmed by open pelvic-retroperitoneal lymphadenectomy. *Eur Urol.* 2007;52:423–429.

28. Rigatti P, Suardi N, Briganti A, et al. Pelvic/retroperitoneal salvage lymph node dissection for patients treated with radical prostatectomy with biochemical recurrence and nodal recurrence detected by [^{11}C]choline positron emission tomography/computed tomography. *Eur Urol.* 2011;60:935–943.

29. Schiavina R, Scattoni V, Castellucci P, et al. ^{11}C-choline positron emission tomography/computerized tomography for preoperative lymph-node staging in intermediate-risk and high-risk prostate cancer: comparison with clinical staging nomograms. *Eur Urol.* 2008;54:392–401.

30. Budiharto T, Joniau S, Lerut E, et al. Prospective evaluation of ^{11}C-choline positron emission tomography/computed tomography and diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging for the nodal staging of prostate cancer with a high risk of lymph node metastases. *Eur Urol.* 2011;60:125–130.

31. Contractor K, Challapalli A, Barwick T, et al. Use of [^{11}C]choline PET-CT as a noninvasive method for detecting pelvic lymph node status from prostate cancer and relationship with choline kinase expression. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2011;17:7673–7683.

32. Heck MM, Souvatzoglou M, Retz M, et al. Prospective comparison of computed tomography, diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging and [^{11}C]choline positron emission tomography/computed tomography for pre-operative lymph node staging in prostate cancer patients. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2014;41:694–701.

33. Van den Bergh L, Lerut E, Haustermans K, et al. Final analysis of a prospective trial on functional imaging for nodal staging in patients with prostate cancer at high risk for lymph node involvement. *Urol Oncol.* 2015;33:109.e23–109.e31.

34. Maurer T, Gschwend JE, Rauscher I, et al. Diagnostic efficacy of [68]gallium-PSMA positron emission tomography compared to conventional imaging for lymph node staging of 130 consecutive patients with intermediate to high risk prostate cancer. *J Urol.* 2016;195:1436–1443.

35. Rauscher I, Maurer T, Beer AJ, et al. Value of ^{68}Ga-PSMA HBED-CC PET for the assessment of lymph node metastases in prostate cancer patients with biochemical recurrence: comparison with histopathology after salvage lymphadenectomy. *J Nucl Med.* June 3, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

36. Bolla M, van Poppel H, Collette L, et al. Postoperative radiotherapy after radical prostatectomy: a randomised controlled trial (EORTC trial 22911). *Lancet.* 2005;366:572–578.

37. Thompson IM Jr, Tangen CM, Paradelo J, et al. Adjuvant radiotherapy for pathologically advanced prostate cancer: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA.* 2006;296:2329–2335.

38. Wiegel T, Bartkowiak D, Bottke D, et al. Adjuvant radiotherapy versus wait-and-see after radical prostatectomy: 10-year follow-up of the ARO 96-02/AUO AP 09/95 trial. *Eur Urol.* 2014;66:243–250.

39. Nanni C, Schiavina R, Brunocilla E, et al. ^{18}F-fluciclovine PET/CT for the detection of prostate cancer relapse: a comparison to ^{11}C-choline PET/CT. *Clin Nucl Med.* 2015;40:e386–e391.

40. Iagaru A, Young P, Mittra E, Dick DW, Herfkens R, Gambhir SS. Pilot prospective evaluation of ^{99m}Tc-MDP scintigraphy, [18]F NaF PET/CT, ^{18}F FDG PET/CT and whole-body MRI for detection of skeletal metastases. *Clin Nucl Med.* 2013;38:e290–e296.

41. Even-Sapir E, Metser U, Flusser G, et al. Assessment of malignant skeletal disease: initial experience with ^{18}F-fluoride PET/CT and comparison between ^{18}F-fluoride PET and ^{18}F-fluoride PET/CT. *J Nucl Med.* 2004;45:272–278.

42. Jadvar H, Desai B, Ji L, et al. Baseline ^{18}F-FDG PET/CT parameters as imaging biomarkers of overall survival in castrate-resistant metastatic prostate cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2013;54:1195–1201.

43. Minamimoto R, Hancock S, Schneider B, et al. Pilot comparison of ^{68}Ga-RM2 PET and ^{68}Ga-PSMA-11 PET in patients with biochemically recurrent prostate cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2016;57:557–562.

44. Eiber M, Maurer T, Souvatzoglou M, et al. Evaluation of hybrid ^{68}Ga-PSMA ligand PET/CT in 248 patients with biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy. *J Nucl Med.* 2015;56:668–674.

45. Schilling D, Schlemmer HP, Wagner PH, et al. Histological verification of ^{11}C-choline-positron emission/computed tomography-positive lymph nodes in patients with biochemical failure after treatment for localized prostate cancer. *BJU Int.* 2008;102:446–451.

46. Castellucci P, Fuccio C, Nanni C, et al. Influence of trigger PSA and PSA kinetics on ^{11}C-choline PET/CT detection rate in patients with biochemical relapse after radical prostatectomy. *J Nucl Med.* 2009;50:1394–1400.

47. Seppälä J, Seppanen M, Arponen E, Lindholm P, Minn H. Carbon-11 acetate PET/CT based dose escalated IMRT in prostate cancer. *Radiother Oncol.* 2009;93:234–240.

48. Breeuwsma AJ, Pruim J, van den Bergh AC, et al. Detection of local, regional, and distant recurrence in patients with psa relapse after external-beam radiotherapy using ^{11}C-choline positron emission tomography. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2010;77:160–164.

49. Giovacchini G, Picchio M, Briganti A, et al. [¹¹C]choline positron emission tomography/computerized tomography to restage prostate cancer cases with biochemical failure after radical prostatectomy and no disease evidence on conventional imaging. *J Urol.* 2010;184:938–943.

50. Giovacchini G, Picchio M, Coradeschi E, et al. Predictive factors of [¹¹C]choline PET/CT in patients with biochemical failure after radical prostatectomy. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2010;37:301–309.

51. Chang JH, Lim Joon D, Lee ST, et al. Intensity modulated radiation therapy dose painting for localized prostate cancer using ¹¹C-choline positron emission tomography scans. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2012;83:e691–e696.

52. Giovacchini G, Picchio M, Garcia-Parra R, et al. [¹¹C]choline positron emission tomography/computerized tomography for early detection of prostate cancer recurrence in patients with low increasing prostate specific antigen. *J Urol.* 2013;189:105–110.

53. Castellucci P, Ceci F, Graziani T, et al. Early biochemical relapse after radical prostatectomy: which prostate cancer patients may benefit from a restaging ¹¹C-choline PET/CT scan before salvage radiation therapy? *J Nucl Med.* 2014;55:1424–1429.

54. Ceci F, Herrmann K, Castellucci P, et al. Impact of ¹¹C-choline PET/CT on clinical decision making in recurrent prostate cancer: results from a retrospective two-centre trial. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2014;41:2222–2231.

55. Nanni C, Schiavina R, Brunocilla E, et al. ¹⁸F-FACBC compared with ¹¹C-choline PET/CT in patients with biochemical relapse after radical prostatectomy: a prospective study in 28 patients. *Clin Genitourin Cancer.* 2014; 12:106–110.

56. Karnes RJ, Murphy CR, Bergstralh EJ, et al. Salvage lymph node dissection for prostate cancer nodal recurrence detected by ¹¹C-choline positron emission tomography/computerized tomography. *J Urol.* 2015;193:111–116.

57. Schumacher MC, Radecka E, Hellstrom M, Jacobsson H, Sundin A. [¹¹C]acetate positron emission tomography-computed tomography imaging of prostate cancer lymph-node metastases correlated with histopathological findings after extended lymphadenectomy. *Scand J Urol.* 2015;49:35–42.

58. Ceci F, Uprimny C, Nilica B, et al. ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA PET/CT for restaging recurrent prostate cancer: which factors are associated with PET/CT detection rate? *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2015;42:1284–1294.

59. Morigi JJ, Stricker PD, van Leeuwen PJ, et al. Prospective comparison of ¹⁸F-fluoromethylcholine versus ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA PET/CT in prostate cancer patients who have rising PSA after curative treatment and are being considered for targeted therapy. *J Nucl Med.* 2015;56:1185–1190.

60. Schiavina R, Ceci F, Romagnoli D, et al. ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-PET/CT-guided salvage retroperitoneal lymph node dissection for disease relapse after radical prostatectomy for prostate cancer. *Clin Genitourin Cancer.* 2015;13:e415–e417.

61. Kukuk D, Reischl G, Raguin O, et al. Assessment of PET tracer uptake in hormone-independent and hormone-dependent xenograft prostate cancer mouse models. *J Nucl Med.* 2011;52:1654–1663.

62. Fuccio C, Castellucci P, Schiavina R, et al. Role of ¹¹C-choline PET/CT in the re-staging of prostate cancer patients with biochemical relapse and negative results at bone scintigraphy. *Eur J Radiol.* 2012;81:e893–e896.

63. Giovacchini G, Picchio M, Garcia-Parra R, et al. ¹¹C-choline PET/CT predicts prostate cancer-specific survival in patients with biochemical failure during androgen-deprivation therapy. *J Nucl Med.* 2014;55:233–241.

64. van Leeuwen PJ, Emmett L, Ho B, et al. Prospective evaluation of ⁶⁸gallium-PSMA positron emission tomography/computerized tomography for preoperative lymph node staging in prostate cancer. *BJU Int.* May 21, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

65. van Leeuwen PJ, Stricker P, Hruby G, et al. ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA has a high detection rate of prostate cancer recurrence outside the prostatic fossa in patients being considered for salvage radiation treatment. *BJU Int.* 2016;117:732–739.

66. Souvatzoglou M, Krause BJ, Purschel A, et al. Influence of ¹¹C-choline PET/CT on the treatment planning for salvage radiation therapy in patients with biochemical recurrence of prostate cancer. *Radiother Oncol.* 2011;99:193–200.

67. Jereczek-Fossa BA, Rodari M, Bonora M, et al. [¹¹C]choline PET/CT impacts treatment decision making in patients with prostate cancer referred for radiotherapy. *Clin Genitourin Cancer.* 2014;12:155–159.

68. Incerti E, Fodor A, Mapelli P, et al. Radiation treatment of lymph node recurrence from prostate cancer: is ¹¹C-choline PET/CT predictive of survival outcomes? *J Nucl Med.* 2015;56:1836–1842.

69. Shakespeare TP. Effect of prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography on the decision-making of radiation oncologists. *Radiat Oncol.* 2015;10:233.

70. Henkenberens C, von Klot CA, Ross TL, et al. ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA ligand PET/CT-based radiotherapy in locally recurrent and recurrent oligometastatic prostate cancer: early efficacy after primary therapy. *Strahlenther Onkol.* 2016;192:431–439.

71. Iagaru A, Mittra E, Dick DW, Gambhir SS. Prospective evaluation of ⁹⁹ᵐTc MDP scintigraphy, ¹⁸F NaF PET/CT, and ¹⁸F FDG PET/CT for detection of skeletal metastases. *Mol Imaging Biol.* 2012;14:252–259.

72. Kitajima K, Murphy RC, Nathan MA, et al. Detection of recurrent prostate cancer after radical prostatectomy: comparison of ¹¹C-choline PET/CT with pelvic multiparametric MR imaging with endorectal coil. *J Nucl Med.* 2014; 55:223–232.

73. Verburg FA, Pfister D, Heidenreich A, et al. Extent of disease in recurrent prostate cancer determined by [⁶⁸Ga]PSMA-HBED-CC PET/CT in relation to PSA levels, PSA doubling time and Gleason score. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2016;43:397–403.

74. Milano MT, Katz AW, Zhang H, Okunieff P. Oligometastases treated with stereotactic body radiotherapy: long-term follow-up of prospective study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2012;83:878–886.

75. Salama JK, Hasselle MD, Chmura SJ, et al. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for multisite extracranial oligometastases: final report of a dose escalation trial in patients with 1 to 5 sites of metastatic disease. *Cancer.* 2012;118:2962–2970.

76. Tong CC, Ko EC, Sung MW, et al. Phase II trial of concurrent sunitinib and image-guided radiotherapy for oligometastases. *PLoS One.* 2012;7:e36979.

77. Picchio M, Spinapolice EG, Fallanca F, et al. [¹¹C]choline PET/CT detection of bone metastases in patients with PSA progression after primary treatment for prostate cancer: comparison with bone scintigraphy. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2012;39:13–26.

78. Wetter A, Lipponer C, Nensa F, et al. Quantitative evaluation of bone metastases from prostate cancer with simultaneous [¹⁸F] choline PET/MRI: combined SUV and ADC analysis. *Ann Nucl Med.* 2014;28:405–410.

79. Jadvar H. PSMA PET in prostate cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2015;56:1131–1132.

80. Pyka T, Okamoto S, Dahlbender M, et al. Comparison of bone scintigraphy and ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA PET for skeletal staging in prostate cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* June 12, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

81. Pyka T, Weirich G, Einspieler I, et al. ⁶⁸Ga-PSMA-HBED-CC PET for differential diagnosis of suggestive lung lesions in patients with prostate cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2016;57:367–371.

82. Rowe SP, Mana-Ay M, Javadi MS, et al. PSMA-based detection of prostate cancer bone lesions with ¹⁸F-DCFPyL PET/CT: a sensitive alternative to ⁹⁹ᵐTc-MDP bone scan and Na¹⁸F PET/CT? *Clin Genitourin Cancer.* 2016; 14:e115–e118.

83. Parker SJ, Pond GR, Agarwal N, Alex A, Heilbrun ME, Sonpavde G. Integration of bone and computed tomography scans to assess bone metastasis in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Clin Genitourin Cancer.* May 27, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

84. Sonpavde G, Pond GR, Templeton AJ, et al. Association between RECIST changes and survival in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer receiving docetaxel. *Eur Urol.* 2016;69:980–983.

85. Fuccio C, Schiavina R, Castellucci P, et al. Androgen deprivation therapy influences the uptake of ¹¹C-choline in patients with recurrent prostate cancer: the preliminary results of a sequential PET/CT study. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2011;38:1985–1989.

86. Yu EY, Muzi M, Hackenbracht JA, et al. C11-acetate and F-18 FDG PET for men with prostate cancer bone metastases: relative findings and response to therapy. *Clin Nucl Med.* 2011;36:192–198.

87. Giovacchini G, Incerti E, Mapelli P, et al. [¹¹C]choline PET/CT predicts survival in hormone-naive prostate cancer patients with biochemical failure after radical prostatectomy. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2015;42:877–884.

88. Evans MJ, Smith-Jones PM, Wongvipat J, et al. Noninvasive measurement of androgen receptor signaling with a positron-emitting radiopharmaceutical that targets prostate-specific membrane antigen. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2011; 108:9578–9582.

89. Pandit-Taskar N, O'Donoghue JA, Durack JC, et al. A phase I/II study for analytic validation of ⁸⁹Zr-J591 immunoPET as a molecular imaging agent for metastatic prostate cancer. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2015;21:5277–5285.

90. Schlenkhoff CD, Gaertner F, Essler M, Hauser S, Ahmadzadehfar H. ⁶⁸Ga-labeled anti-prostate-specific membrane antigen peptide as marker for androgen deprivation therapy response in prostate cancer. *Clin Nucl Med.* 2016;41:423–425.

91. Vargas HA, Wassberg C, Fox JJ, et al. Bone metastases in castration-resistant prostate cancer: associations between morphologic CT patterns, glycolytic activity, and androgen receptor expression on PET and overall survival. *Radiology.* 2014;271:220–229.

92. Loeb S, van den Heuvel S, Zhu X, Bangma CH, Schröder FH, Roobol MJ. Infectious complications and hospital admissions after prostate biopsy in a European randomized trial. *Eur Urol.* 2012;61:1110–1114.

93. Ahmad AE, Finelli A. Should prebiopsy multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging be offered to all biopsy-naive men undergoing prostate biopsy? *Eur Urol.* 2016;69:426–427.

94. Hartenbach M, Hartenbach S, Bechtloff W, et al. Combined PET/MRI improves diagnostic accuracy in patients with prostate cancer: a prospective diagnostic trial. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2014;20:3244–3253.

95. Hijazi S, Meller B, Leitsmann C, et al. Pelvic lymph node dissection for nodal oligometastatic prostate cancer detected by ^{68}Ga-PSMA-positron emission tomography/computerized tomography. *Prostate.* 2015;75:1934–1940.

96. Parker C, Nilsson S, Heinrich D, et al. Alpha emitter radium-223 and survival in metastatic prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;369:213–223.

97. Halabi S, Kelly WK, Ma H, et al. Meta-analysis evaluating the impact of site of metastasis on overall survival in men with castration-resistant prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2016;34:1652–1659.

98. Hussain M, Tangen CM, Berry DL, et al. Intermittent versus continuous androgen deprivation in prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;368:1314–1325.

99. Sweeney CJ, Chen YH, Carducci M, et al. Chemohormonal therapy in metastatic hormone-sensitive prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2015;373:737–746.

100. Beer TM, Armstrong AJ, Rathkopf DE, et al. Enzalutamide in metastatic prostate cancer before chemotherapy. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;371:424–433.

101. Ryan CJ, Smith MR, de Bono JS, et al. Abiraterone in metastatic prostate cancer without previous chemotherapy. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;368:138–148.

102. Sweeney C, Nakabayashi M, Regan M, et al. The development of Intermediate Clinical Endpoints in Cancer of the Prostate (ICECaP). *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2015;107:djv261.

103. Scher HI, Heller G, Molina A, et al. Circulating tumor cell biomarker panel as an individual-level surrogate for survival in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2015;33:1348–1355.

104. Petrylak DP, Ankerst DP, Jiang CS, et al. Evaluation of prostate-specific antigen declines for surrogacy in patients treated on SWOG 99-16. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2006;98:516–521.

105. Rescigno P, Lorente D, Bianchini D, et al. Prostate-specific antigen decline after 4 weeks of treatment with abiraterone acetate and overall survival in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Eur Urol.* March 7, 2016 [Epub ahead of print].

106. Antonarakis ES, Lu C, Luber B, et al. Androgen receptor splice variant 7 and efficacy of taxane chemotherapy in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. *JAMA Oncol.* 2015;1:582–591.

107. Antonarakis ES, De Bono JS, Ferrante KJ, et al. Randomized, open-label, multi-center, controlled study of galeterone vs enzalutamide in men with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC) expressing AR-V7 splice variant (ARMOR3-SV) [abstract]. *J Clin Oncol.* 2016;34(suppl):TPS5085.

108. Yu Z, Cai C, Gao S, Simon NI, Shen HC, Balk SP. Galeterone prevents androgen receptor binding to chromatin and enhances degradation of mutant androgen receptor. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2014;20:4075–4085.

109. Montgomery B, Eisenberger MA, Rettig MB, et al. Androgen Receptor Modulation Optimized for Response (ARMOR) phase I and II studies: galeterone for the treatment of castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2016;22:1356–1363.

110. Tagawa ST, Antonarakis ES, Saad F, et al. TAXYNERGY: randomized trial of early switch from first-line docetaxel (D) to cabazitaxel (C) or vice versa with circulating tumor cell (CTC) biomarkers in patients (pts) with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC) [abstract]. *J Clin Oncol.* 2016;34(suppl):5007.

111. Dennis ER, Jia X, Mezheritskiy IS, et al. Bone scan index: a quantitative treatment response biomarker for castration-resistant metastatic prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2012;30:519–524.

112. Meirelles GS, Schoder H, Ravizzini GC, et al. Prognostic value of baseline [^{18}F] fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography and ^{99m}Tc-MDP bone scan in progressing metastatic prostate cancer. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2010;16:6093–6099.

113. Padhani AR, Makris A, Gall P, Collins DJ, Tunariu N, de Bono JS. Therapy monitoring of skeletal metastases with whole-body diffusion MRI. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2014;39:1049–1078.

114. Jadvar H, Groshen SG, Quinn DI. Association of overall survival with glycolytic activity of castrate-resistant prostate cancer metastases. *Radiology.* 2015;274:624–625.

115. Jadvar H. Molecular imaging of prostate cancer: PET radiotracers. *AJR.* 2012;199:278–291.

116. Scher HI, Morris MJ, Stadler WM, et al. Trial design and objectives for castration-resistant prostate cancer: updated recommendations from the Prostate Cancer Clinical Trials Working Group 3. *J Clin Oncol.* 2016;34:1402–1418.

117. Gillessen S, Omlin A, Attard G, et al. Management of patients with advanced prostate cancer: recommendations of the St Gallen Advanced Prostate Cancer Consensus Conference (APCCC) 2015. *Ann Oncol.* 2015;26:1589–1604.

118. Scher HI, Halabi S, Tannock I, et al. Design and end points of clinical trials for patients with progressive prostate cancer and castrate levels of testosterone: recommendations of the Prostate Cancer Clinical Trials Working Group. *J Clin Oncol.* 2008;26:1148–1159.