REVIEW PAPER

UROLOGICAL ONCOLOGY

The potential of gallium-68 prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/computed tomography as a main diagnostic tool in prostate cancer staging

Oleksii Pisotskyi[1*], Piotr Petrasz[1*], Piotr Zorga[5], Marcin Gałęski[1], Paweł Szponar[1], Krzysztof Koper[3], Katarzyna Brzeźniakiewicz-Janus[4], Tomasz Drewa[5], Krzysztof Kaczmarek[1], Michał Cezary Czarnogórski[5], Jan Adamowicz[5]

[1]*Urology and Urological Oncology Department, Multidisciplinary Regional Hospital, Gorzow Wielkopolski, Poland*
[2]*Nuclear Medicine Clinical Department, University of Zielona Gora, Multidisciplinary Regional Hospital, Gorzow Wielkopolski, Poland*
[3]*Clinical Oncology and Nursing Department, Collegium Medicum, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Bydgoszcz, Poland*
[4]*Haematology, Oncology, and Radiotherapy Department and Clinic, University of Zielona Gora, Multidisciplinary Regional Hospital, Gorzow Wielkopolski, Poland*
[5]*Department and Chair of Urology and Andrology, University Hospital No. 1 in Bydgoszcz, Ludwik Rydygier's Collegium Medicum in Bydgoszcz, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Torun, Poland*
** These authors contributed equally.*

Citation: Pisotskyi O, Petrasz P, Zorga P, et al. The potential of gallium-68 prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/computed tomography as a main diagnostic tool in prostate cancer staging. Cent European J Urol. 2025; 78: 52-60.

Article history
Submitted: Jan. 17, 2025
Accepted: Feb. 9, 2025
Published online: Mar. 14, 2025

Corresponding authors
Oleksii Pisotskyi,
Piotr Petrasz
Multidisciplinary Regional Hospital,
1 Dekerta St.,
66-400 Gorzów Wielkopolski,
Poland
alexkiev96@gmail.com
piotr.petrasz@szpital.gorzow.pl

Introduction Prostate cancer (PC) remains a significant global health burden, necessitating accurate staging for optimal treatment planning. Conventional imaging methods, including multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (mpMRI), computed tomography (CT), and bone scintigraphy (BS), exhibit limitations in sensitivity and specificity. Gallium-68 prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/computed tomography (^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT) has emerged as a promising alternative, with potential advantages in staging accuracy.

Material and methods A comprehensive review of current literature was conducted to assess the role of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT in primary PC staging. The diagnostic performance of PSMA-PET/CT was compared with conventional imaging techniques in detecting locoregional and distant metastases. Studies evaluating sensitivity, specificity, and clinical utility in treatment decision-making were analyzed.

Results ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT demonstrated superior sensitivity and specificity in detecting lymph node and distant metastases compared to conventional imaging. It enables earlier and more precise disease staging, potentially reducing the need for multiple imaging modalities. Emerging evidence suggests its role in guiding therapeutic strategies, particularly in high-risk and recurrent PC cases. Despite its advantages, limitations such as accessibility, cost, and occasional false-negative findings must be considered.

Conclusions ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT represents a transformative diagnostic tool for PC staging, offering enhanced accuracy compared to traditional imaging. Its integration into clinical practice could streamline diagnostic pathways, improve treatment selection, and potentially optimize patient outcomes. Further research and cost-effectiveness analyses are needed to establish its widespread implementation.

Key Words: prostate cancer ‹› ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT ‹› staging accuracy ‹› imagin comparison

INTRODUCTION

Prostate cancer (PC) is the second-most-prevalent malignancy globally and the fifth leading cause of cancer-related deaths among males [1]. The American Cancer Society predicted approximately 288,300 new cases of PC and 34,700 deaths attributed to the disease in 2023 [2].

For accurate local tumour staging, seminal vesicle (SV) invasion (SVI) and extracapsular extension (ECE) are critical parameters, and prostate magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is the worldwide standard imaging technique [3]. Traditional methods for evaluating locoregional lymph node metastases (LNMs) and remote metastatic spread typically involve computed tomography (CT) and bone scintigraphy (BS). However, the sensitivities of those modalities remain modest at approximately 42% for CT and 79% for BS [4, 5]. Consequently, patients often require multiple imaging procedures before treatment, to precisely evaluate the disease stage.

From a public health perspective, the rising number of new PC cases and, in turn, patients waiting for rapid radiological imaging, demand optimised staging protocols. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the feasibility of single-stage examination of primary PCa with the utilisation of single, novel diagnostic tool. Investigating gallium-68 prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/CT (^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT) presents an encouraging avenue for addressing this question. Leveraging the advanced imaging capabilities of this diagnostic technique potentially offers a feasible solution for conducting a single-stage examination to diagnose primary PC. This cutting-edge technology holds the potential to streamline the diagnostic process, providing valuable insights into the feasibility of a more efficient and comprehensive approach to PCa staging.

The aim of this review is to evaluate the potential of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT as a primary diagnostic tool in prostate cancer staging. Specifically, we aim to compare its diagnostic accuracy with conventional imaging techniques, assess its clinical applications in different stages of prostate cancer, and explore its role in guiding treatment decisions. Additionally, we discuss the limitations and economic implications of integrating PSMA-PET/CT into routine clinical practice.

IMAGING TECHNOLOGIES IN PRIMARY STAGING

T-staging (magnetic resonance imaging)

T2-weighted MRI is the preferred method for local staging, renowned and commonly accepted in international guidelines with standardised protocol. A meta-analysis by Caglic et al. [6] showed that the sensitivity and specificity for extraprostatic extension (EPE) were 0.57 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.49–0.64) and 0.91 (95% CI: 0.88–0.93), respectively. For SVI, the sensitivity was 0.58 (95% CI: 0.47–0.68), and the specificity was 0.96 (95% CI: 0.95–0.97) [6].

N-staging (magnetic resonance imaging and computed tomography)

MRI (T1-T2-weighted) and abdominal CT indirectly evaluate nodal invasion by examining the lymph node (LN) size. Typically, LNs with short axes measuring >8 mm in the pelvic region and >10 mm outside the pelvis are indicative of malignancy. Reducing these threshold values increases the sensitivity but decreases the specificity, making the optimal size threshold uncertain [7, 8]. The sensitivities of CT and MRI for detecting LN involvement are <40% [9, 10]. Significantly, the sensitivity of identifying microscopic LN invasion through CT scans is <1% in patients with International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) grade <4, prostate-specific antigen (PSA) level <20 ng/ml, or localised disease [11–13]. In summary, such methods show limited sensitivity and specificity for N-staging and might not be an optimal option for identifying lymph nodes involvement.

M-staging (bone scintigraphy)

The ^{99m}Tc bone scan (BS) is a widely used conventional imaging technique that exhibits high sensitivity in assessing the pattern of active bone formation across the entire skeleton, aiding in the detection of both malignant and benign diseases. In a meta-analysis assessing its effectiveness, BS demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of 79% and 82%, respectively [14]. Notably, the diagnostic output of BS is significantly affected by factors such as the clinical stage, PSA level, and ISUP grade of the tumour [15]. A retrospective study of 703 patients with newly diagnosed PC who were referred for BS showed the association between age, PSA level, and Gleason score (GS). The findings revealed a substantial increase in the incidence of bone metastases with higher PSA levels and GS [16]. These factors play crucial roles in determining the likelihood of detecting bone metastasis through BS.

PROSTATE-SPECIFIC MEMBRANE ANTIGEN POSITRON EMISSION TOMOGRAPHY/COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY

Biological principles and clinical applications

PSMA-PET/CT is an advanced imaging modality designed to identify PC cells. This technique utilises a radioactive substance that specifically targets PSMA, a protein expressed by PC cells. The PSMA PET precision surpasses that of other imaging modalities com-

monly employed for PC detection. While PSMA expression is evident in both normal prostate epithelium and PC cells, it is also detected in other tissues such as the kidneys, small intestine, and salivary glands. Notably, PSMA expression in PC cells is approximately 1000-fold higher than that in normal tissues [17].

Elevated PSMA expression has been observed in PCa cells, not only in primary focus but also in lymph nodes, soft tissues, and bone metastases [18]. Additionally, PSMA is expressed during the neovascularisation of various tumours and their metastases [19, 20]. While PSMA expression has been noted in benign granulomatous and inflammatory diseases, the precise mechanisms governing PSMA uptake have not been fully elucidated. However, tracer accumulation in neovascular processes, reduced vascular permeability, heightened blood flow during inflammation, and other nonspecific elements may be contributing factors. PSMA expression has also been observed in diverse bone-related illnesses and conditions [21–23]. The positive correlation between increased PSMA expression, higher GS, and the development of metastatic disease further underscores the significance of PSMA as a valuable target in PC imaging [24–26]. In contemporary PCa treatment, urologists are increasingly integrating PSMA-PET/CT as a standard imaging tool. The evolving body of evidence, encompassing its performance across diverse PCa stages, along with the incorporation of insights from new tracers, has fuelled a collective effort among urologists to optimise the application of this technology. While this tool is regularly utilised in metastatic scenarios, where it might outperform traditional imaging methods and potentially guide treatment decisions, interest in extending its utility to localised PC has increased, particularly in high-risk cases [27].

Prostate cancer recurrence detection

Biochemical recurrence (BCR) in PC, i.e. signalling recurrence following curative-intent treatments such as prostatectomy or radiation therapy, is characterised by elevated PSA levels. BCR affects approximately 4 in every 10 patients with PC, with approximately a quarter experiencing clinical recurrence after 7–8 years [28]. Despite advancements in MRI technology, pinpointing specific BCR sites through imaging has proven challenging. The clinical significance of disease detection lies in directing effective treatment planning and minimising the unnecessary treatment and its associated side effects [29].

Conventional imaging methods, such as BS and CT, exhibit limited accuracy in identifying metastases to lymph nodes and bones, particularly among patients with low PSA levels. In this scenario, MRI has emerged as the preferred approach for detecting local recurrence, boasting a sensitivity of approximately 75%. However, even though MRI outperforms conventional imaging, its primary utility lies in identifying local recurrence. For patients with low PSA levels, experiencing BCR, radiation therapy of the prostate bed is the first-line salvage treatment, making the identification of local recurrence a critical but not the sole determinant for treatment adjustments.

In the last 5 years, ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT has become a revolutionary imaging technique for detecting PC relapse. Numerous studies have consistently illustrated that PSMA exhibits superior sensitivity and specificity compared to traditional approaches or choline PET, particularly in identifying tumour recurrence, especially in patients with low PSA levels (<1.0 ng/ml) [30]. While promising results suggest a significant clinical impact in altering approaches based on PSMA PET evaluations of BCR, demonstrating improvements in long-term outcomes is crucial to validate the clinical utility of this transformative molecular imaging technique [31].

While PSMA-PET/CT enhances the detection of metastases in biochemically recurrent prostate cancer, its impact is further underscored by the recognition of metastasis-free survival (MFS) as a validated intermediate endpoint in localised prostate cancer. Recent guidelines highlight MFS as a crucial marker for evaluating the effectiveness of treatment strategies in patients without detectable metastases on conventional imaging but with biochemical recurrence. Incorporating PSMA-PET/CT findings into this framework may refine risk stratification and treatment selection, as discussed in Miszczyk et al. [32].

Detection of lymph node involvement

In a study by Van Leeuwen et al. [33], the main objective was to scrutinise the precision of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT for LN staging in patients diagnosed with intermediate- and high-risk PC. Their findings indicate that ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT is a promising alternative to current imaging techniques for LN staging in patients with PC undergoing radical prostatectomy (RP) [33].

Cytawa et al. [34] used ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT for staging in 82 men with PC. They found PSMA-positive disease in 83% of patients, and 80.5% of primary tumours were visualised. PSMA-avid lymph nodes were present in 20.7% of patients, and distant disease was identified in 17.1% of patients. The maxi-

mum standardised uptake value (SUV_{max}) of primary tumours was weakly correlated with PSA levels and GS. LN metastasis detection had a 35.0% sensitivity, 98.4% specificity, 63.6% positive predictive value (PPV), 95.0% negative predictive value (NPV), and 93.0% accuracy [34].

In another study, patients diagnosed with PC were compared based on whether they underwent ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT or conventional imaging alone. The analysis focused on predicting clinical regional node-positive disease, metastatic disease, and the treatment received. Of 6,139 patients, 14% received a staging PET scan, 40% had conventional imaging without a PET scan, and 45% had no recorded PET or conventional imaging. Over time, the proportion of patients undergoing staging PET increased, especially in the high-risk group. After adjusting for the grade, patients who underwent PET had a higher proportion of cN1 disease, but not cM1 disease, compared to those who had conventional imaging alone [35]. The results suggest an increasing use of PET imaging, particularly for patients with high-risk PC, and hints at its potential contribution to improved nodal disease detection, possibly optimising patient selection for definitive PC treatment.

In summary, ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT has emerged as a valuable staging tool for individuals initially diagnosed with intermediate- to high-risk PC. It demonstrates effectiveness in detecting nodal and distant metastases. Nevertheless, PSMA-PET/CT is constrained in low-risk diseases due to the relatively low occurrence of extraprostatic extension.

COULD PROSTATE-SPECIFIC MEMBRANE ANTIGEN POSITRON EMISSION TOMOGRAPHY/COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY GUIDE THE TREATMENT OF PROSTATE CANCER?

Accurate staging is a critical factor through which PSMA-PET/CT can influence treatment strategies. Traditional imaging modalities, such as BS and CT scans, may sometimes miss small metastatic lesions. In contrast, PSMA-PET/CT has shown superior sensitivity, particularly for detecting LN metastases and distant organ involvement. This enhanced sensitivity can lead to a more precise determination of the extent of the disease, influencing decisions regarding the treatment intensity and modality.

Lima et al. [36] focused on PSMA-PET/CT for the initial assessment of intermediate- and high-risk PC. Patients were categorised based on whether additional imaging modalities were used alongside PSMA-PET/CT. The results of 57 patients were gathered, with 77.2% (n = 44) having a CT scan or bone scan (BS) prior to PSMA-PET/CT. Prostate cancer management strategy was changed in 61.4% (n = 27), when PSMA-PET/CT was performed following CT and BS. BS and CT results were consistent with PSMA-PET/CT in 43.2% and 44.8%, respectively. In 30 cases, a curative strategy was used based on PSMA-PET/CT findings. PSMA-PET/CT revealed a negative predictive value of 95.2% in 23 patients submitted to radical prostatectomy with bilateral pelvic lymphadenectomy. Prostate SUV values on preoperative PSMA-PET/CT correlated with initial PSA, ISUP grade, PC risk staging, and presence of extraprostatic lesions [36].

The superior sensitivity of PSMA-PET/CT in detecting subclinical metastases has notable implications for prostate cancer treatment strategies. This imaging modality often identifies oligometastatic lesions that remain undetected by conventional imaging techniques, leading to a phenomenon known as stage migration. Patients initially considered to have localised disease may be reclassified as oligometastatic, prompting reconsideration of treatment approaches.

The detection of oligometastatic disease has opened new avenues for personalised therapies. Local therapies have shown efficacy in treating oligometastatic lesions, offering potential benefits in delaying disease progression and improving survival outcomes [37, 38]. Furthermore, metastasis-directed therapy (MDT) is increasingly being employed in patients with low-volume metastatic prostate cancer, demonstrating promise in prolonging progression-free survival and delaying the need for systemic treatments. Recent evidence also suggests that MDT can improve clinical outcomes in carefully selected patients with oligometastatic disease, emphasising the role of targeted interventions in this population [39].

By facilitating the identification of patients with limited metastatic burden, PSMA-PET/CT enhances the ability to apply these personalised treatment strategies. The precise detection of metastases allows clinicians to tailor therapeutic interventions more accurately, integrating local and metastasis-directed therapies into the management plans of patients who may have previously been managed with systemic therapy alone. This integration underscores the evolving role of PSMA-PET/CT not only as a diagnostic tool but also as a pivotal component in guiding contemporary prostate cancer treatment.

Taking the abovementioned data into consideration, it may be speculated that indeed PSMA-PET/

CT might in fact guide the therapeutic decisions in PC treatment. However, due to the lack of long-term follow-up of the patients treated based on the PSMA-PET/CT findings, it is still too early for the introduction of this diagnostic modality into the diagnostic algorithms and guidelines.

PROSTATE-SPECIFIC MEMBRANE ANTIGEN POSITRON EMISSION TOMOGRAPHY/COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY AS A SINGLE DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR PROSTATE CANCER STAGING

Prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/computed tomography for T-staging

Precisely evaluating T-staging is vital to determine the most suitable treatment course, thereby enhancing the likelihood of achieving the longest progression-free survival. Comprehension of the spatial correlation among the suspected lesion and nearby critical structures is crucial for effective surgical and intensity-modulated radiotherapy planning. MRI has been the traditional approach [40]. However, detecting subtle signs depends on the subjective evaluation of neurovascular symmetry and focal low-signal intensity in the SV or periprostatic fat.
CT plays a restricted role in primary PC diagnosis and is primarily employed for distant staging in patients with PC or for assessing LNM and bone metastases in metastatic PC cases. Despite its common usage in PC management, CT imaging lacks adequate soft tissue contrast and targeted molecular information [41].
Prostate MRI was initially used for staging in males with known PC before treatment. In this setting, prostate MRI provides information on the presence or absence of ECE or the involvement of the neurovascular bundles and SV, thus helping to differentiate stage T2 disease from locally advanced disease.
Studies have compared PSMA-PET/CT and MRI. Berger et al. [42] compared both techniques with histopathological analysis of prostatectomy specimens. Their findings revealed that PSMA-PET/CT exhibits supreme sensitivity in PCa lesions detection compared to MRI. All 50 histopathologically confirmed index lesions were identified by PSMA-PET/CT, achieving a detection rate of 100%, while MRI detected 47 (94%) lesions. Moreover, PSMA-PET/CT demonstrated superior sensitivity for localising index lesions compared to MRI (81.1% vs 64.8%) [42].
Another study comparing both modalities in patients with intermediate- and high-risk PC found that ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT, MRI, and a combination of both had similar cancer detection rates. However, MRI outperformed ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT in detecting EPE and SVI. In the evaluation of T staging, MRI was the reference imaging modality. In summary, those studies indicate that both modalities have similar accuracies in detecting and localising PC foci. ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT shows better sensitivity and detection rates, whereas MRI performs better at identifying EPE and SVI. Therefore, MRI is still the reference imaging modality for T-staging evaluation [43].
Li et al. [44] conducted a study involving a consecutive cohort of 115 patients who underwent both tools. They showed that ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT exhibits superior diagnostic performance, especially in terms of specificity, compared to MRI in individuals suspected of having PC, with PSA levels of 4–20 ng/ml. Additionally, the uptake values of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT (SUV max or SUV ratio) were positively correlated with the GS, suggesting the potential use of this imaging modality as a noninvasive tool for predicting PC risk and determining malignancy severity. The findings reveal that ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT exhibits a superior sensitivity for detecting ECE in comparison to MRI, while there is no significant difference in detecting SVI [44].
While BS plays an essential role in the overall staging of PC, particularly in identifying bone metastases (M-staging), its direct contribution to T-staging is limited. T-staging is typically performed using other imaging modalities, such as MRI [45].

Prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/computed tomography for N-staging

The N staging of PC involves the assessment of LN involvement. Determining whether PC has spread to nearby LN plays a crucial role in cancer staging that influences treatment decisions and prognosis.
In a randomised controlled trial comparing ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT with conventional CT and BS, G^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT was superior to other tools in LNM detection, both in sensitivity and specificity. Additionally, CT and BS identified more equivocal lesions compared to ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT, and CT and BS resulted in superior radiation exposure than ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT [46].
In a recent meta-analysis that evaluated LNM identification using MRI and 68Ga PSMA-PET/CT, the PSMA-PET/CT exhibited superior sensitivity and comparable specificity. Moreover, 68Ga PSMA-PET/CT has more positive outcomes in detecting smaller LN than MRI [47].
Summarising, there is a growing body of evidence justifying the sole use of PSMA-PET/CT in N-staging of prostate cancer.

Prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/tomography for M-staging

Conventional imaging techniques are valuable for detection of distant metastases, and CT can identify sclerotic bone lesions and metastases in internal organs. Nonetheless, CT has produced positive results in only 14% of cases [48].

Accurately diagnosing bone metastasis in PC is becoming increasingly important for guiding both local and systemic treatments. Globally, both tools are utilised for assessing bone metastases in PC. In a meta-analysis of a high-volume series conducted by Liu et al. [49], the effectiveness of ^{68}Ga PSMA--PET/CT with various radioligands was compared to that of MRI with different parameters. This comprehensive review and network meta-analysis of diagnostic tests, involving 45 studies with 2,843 patients and 4,263 lesions, recommended the use of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT for diagnosing bone metastasis in patients with PC.

^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT surpasses planar BS in detecting affected bone regions and assessing the overall involvement of the bones in patients with PC.

In a comparative study by Pyka et al. [50], bone metastasis was diagnosed in 60% of patients. ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT demonstrated sensitivities and specificities ranging from 98.7% to 100% and 88.2% to 100%, respectively, for overall bone involvement. In contrast, for BS, the values were 86.7–89.3% for sensitivity and 60.8–96.1% for specificity ($p < 0.001$), considering "optimistic" or "pessimistic" classifications of equivocal lesions. A region-based analysis of 1,115 bone regions with 410 metastases showed a PSMA-PET/CT sensitivity and specificity of 98.8–99.0% and 98.9–100%, respectively, while BS demonstrated a sensitivity of 82.4–86.6% and specificity of 91.6–97.9%. ^{68}Ga PSMA PET/CT exhibited superior performance in all subgroups, except for the patient-based analysis of mCRPC [50].

Prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/computed tomography and other diagnostic modalities in high-risk prostate cancer

Hirmas et al. [26] compared the diagnostic efficacy of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT with that of CT, MRI, and BS for the primary staging of 21 patients with high-risk PC. ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT demonstrated a markedly increased concordance rate with BS, MRI, and CT (90%, 75%, and 73%, respectively). It exhibited similar precision to that of MRI in identifying prostate lesions but superior accuracy in detecting suspicious pelvic LNs. It outperformed CT in detecting suspicious pelvic LNs and extra-pelvic LNs, and outperformed BS in detecting bone lesions. Utilisation of ^{68}Ga PSMA--PET/CT resulted in management changes for 11 patients. Those findings suggest potential advantages of using ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT over other modalities in PC diagnosis and staging, particularly in terms of specificity, accuracy in detecting LNs, and impact on patient management. However, further research and larger populations are needed for confirmation.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS

Several studies have explored the cost implications of utilising PSMA-PET/CT in different healthcare settings. Holzgreve et al. [51] found that in Europe and the US, PSMA-PET/CT is generally associated with increased costs. Notably, the scan duration plays a significant role in determining the cost-effectiveness. Despite the higher upfront costs, the expenses related to achieving an accurate diagnosis through ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT appear to be reasonable when compared to the potential downstream costs associated with inaccurate diagnosis [51].

LIMITATIONS OF PROSTATE-SPECIFIC MEMBRANE ANTIGEN POSITRON EMISSION TOMOGRAPHY/COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY

Although it is a rapid and noninvasive imaging modality, it has limitations and potential side effects. The efficacy of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT can be influenced by various factors, such as dual-time-point acquisition, androgen deprivation therapy, forced diuresis, and hydration. Although patients undergoing ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT are subjected to radiation, the dose is relatively low [52]. Notably, the risk of cancer mortality due to serial radiation exposure through CT, estimated at approximately 2% over 30 consecutive years of annual exposure, is considered negligible for most patients who undergo several ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT scans during their lifetime [53].

Difficulties in interpreting ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT images may occur for patients who have trouble remaining still during the scan, possibly necessitating repeat imaging or sedation to improve the image quality. Additionally, variations in the timing of tracer administration and SUV measurements can introduce interdepartmental and international differences [54, 55].

Clinically, the effectiveness of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT for detecting PC has been extensively documented, with positive scans observed in most patients with suspected cancer (approximately 83%), demonstrating high specificity.

Despite its high accuracy compared to that of cross-sectional imaging, ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT has limitations, such as occurrence of false-negative results, especially in detecting small nodal metastases below the spatial resolution of PET [55]. Mannweiler et al. [56] found that 5% of primary PC and 15% of PC metastases show negativity for PSMA on immunohistochemistry. Moreover, the concept of stage migration, impacted by the precision of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT, has become a topic of interest. Patients who experience upstaging may now represent a more favourable disease state than others in the updated stage classification. While survival rates have improved, no impact on individual patient outcomes is evident – a phenomenon commonly referred to as the "Will Rogers phenomenon".

Despite its diagnostic superiority, PSMA-PET/CT faces several practical limitations. Accessibility remains a major challenge because this technology is not uniformly available across healthcare systems, particularly in low-resource settings. Additionally, the high costs associated with PSMA ligands and PET imaging infrastructure can limit widespread adoption. Economic analyses, such as the research by Holzgreve et al. [51], highlight that although PSMA-PET/CT may reduce downstream costs by improving diagnostic accuracy, the upfront expenses are significantly higher compared to conventional imaging modalities. These factors necessitate a balanced consideration of cost-effectiveness and resource allocation when integrating PSMA-PET/CT into routine clinical practice.

CONCLUSIONS

The advent of PSMA-PET/CT imaging for the primary staging of PC presents transformative potential for refining diagnostic accuracy and treatment planning. Traditional methods, including MRI, CT, and BS, have sensitivity limitations, which leads to the necessity of multiple imaging procedures to comprehensively assess the disease stage, therefore prolonging the time-to-treat, which potentially exacerbates oncological outcomes. Integrating PSMA-PET/CT, with its high specificity for prostate-specific membrane antigens, with traditional methods holds promise for a more efficient and precise staging examination.

The question posed regarding the feasibility of a single-stage examination for primary PC before RP determines the potential of PET/PSMA imaging. This technology offers a comprehensive and efficient approach for T-, N-, and M-staging, potentially streamlining the diagnostic pathway. However, ongoing research and economic evaluations are essential to determine the feasibility of its widespread clinical application and optimal integration of PSMA-PET/CT into the evolving landscape of PC staging protocols.

Economic evaluations underline the possible cost-effectiveness of ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT, especially when considering its impact on treatment outcomes and avoidance of futile approaches. The demonstrated accuracy of PSMA-PET/CT in guiding treatment decisions, as reflected in its superior sensitivity and specificity compared to those of traditional methods, supports its role in optimising patient selection for definitive treatment.

Retrospective studies offer compelling evidence that integrating ^{68}Ga PSMA-PET/CT into the diagnostic pathway potentially leads to changes in tactics for managing patients diagnosed with PC. The ability to identify lesions that may be missed by other imaging modalities, coupled with their impact on treatment decisions, positions PSMA-PET/CT as a transformative tool in the clinical landscape of PC.

In essence, PSMA has emerged not only as a diagnostic powerhouse but also as a driver of change in treatment strategies. As research continues to validate its long-term impact on patient outcomes, PSMA-PET/CT remains a pivotal player in the pursuit of precision medicine for PC management. Whilst PSMA-PET/CT has significant advantages in detecting PC, its limitations include technical challenges, radiation exposure, and potential clinical implications, such as false-negative results and stage migration. The overall effects of those limitations on patient outcomes and survival rates require careful consideration.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

FUNDING

This research received no external funding.

ETHICS APPROVAL STATEMENT

The ethical approval was not required.

References

1. Rawla P. Epidemiology of Prostate Cancer. World J Oncol. 2019; 10: 63-89.
2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Wagle NS, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2023. CA Cancer J Clin. 2023; 73: 17-48.
3. Brizmohun Appayya M, Adshead J, Ahmed HU, et al. National implementation of multi-parametric magnetic resonance imaging for prostate cancer detection – recommendations from a UK consensus meeting. BJU Int. 2018; 122: 13-25.
4. Turpin A, Girard E, Baillet C, Pasquier D, Olivier J, Villers A, et al. Imaging for Metastasis in Prostate Cancer: A Review of the Literature. Front Oncol. 2020; 10: 55.
5. Oesterling JE, Martin SK, Bergstralh EJ, Lowe FC. The Use of Prostate-Specific Antigen in Staging Patients With Newly Diagnosed Prostate Cancer. JAMA. 1993; 269: 57-60.
6. Caglic I, Kovac V, Barrett T. Multiparametric MRI – Local staging of prostate cancer and beyond. Radiol Oncol. 2019; 53: 159-170.
7. Abuzallouf S, Dayes I, Lukka H. Baseline staging of newly diagnosed prostate cancer: A summary of the literature. J Urol. 2004; 171: 2122-2127.
8. Kiss B, Thoeny HC, Studer UE. Current Status of Lymph Node Imaging in Bladder and Prostate Cancer. Vol. 96, Urology. 2016; 96: 1-7.
9. Harisinghani MG, Barentsz J, Hahn PF, et al. Noninvasive Detection of Clinically Occult Lymph-Node Metastases in Prostate Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2003; 348: 2491-2499.
10. Hövels AM, Heesakkers RAM, Adang EM, et al. The diagnostic accuracy of CT and MRI in the staging of pelvic lymph nodes in patients with prostate cancer: a meta-analysis. Clin Radiol. 2008; 63: 387-395.
11. Flanigan RC, McKay TC, Olson M, Shankey TV, Pyle J, Waters WB. Limited efficacy of preoperative computed tomographic scanning for the evaluation of lymph node metastasis in patients before radical prostatectomy. Urology. 1996; 48: 428-432.
12. Tiguert R, Gheiler EL, Tefilli MV, et al. Lymph node size does not correlate with the presence of prostate cancer metastasis. Urology. 1999; 53: 367-371.
13. Spevack L, Killion LT, West JC, Rooker GM, Brewer EA, Cuddy PG. Predicting the patient at low risk for lymph node metastasis with localized prostate cancer: An analysis of four statistical models. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 1996; 34: 543-547.
14. Shen G, Deng H, Hu S, Jia Z. Comparison of choline-PET/CT, MRI, SPECT, and bone scintigraphy in the diagnosis of bone metastases in patients with prostate cancer: a meta-analysis. Skeletal Radiol. 2014; 43: 1503-1513.
15. Briganti A, Passoni N, Ferrari M, et al. When to Perform Bone Scan in Patients with Newly Diagnosed Prostate Cancer: External Validation of the Currently Available Guidelines and Proposal of a Novel Risk Stratification Tool. Eur Urol. 2010; 57: 551-558.
16. Lin Y, Mao Q, Chen B, et al. When to perform bone scintigraphy in patients with newly diagnosed prostate cancer? A retrospective study. BMC Urol 2017; 17: 41.
17. Kwon DH, Velazquez AI, De Kouchkovsky I. PSMA PET Scan. JAMA Oncol. 2022; 8: 1860.
18. Lauri C, Chiurchioni L, Russo VM, Zannini L, Signore A. PSMA Expression in Solid Tumors beyond the Prostate Gland: Ready for Theranostic Applications? J Clin Med. 2022; 11: 6590.
19. Heitkötter B, Steinestel K, Trautmann M, et al. Neovascular PSMA expression is a common feature in malignant neoplasms of the thyroid. Oncotarget. 2018; 9: 9867-9874.
20. Jiao D, Li Y, Yang F, et al. Expression of prostate-specific membrane antigen in tumor-associated vasculature predicts poor prognosis in hepatocellular carcinoma. Clin Transl Gastroenterol. 2019; 10: 1-7.
21. Bilgin R, Ergül N, Çermik TF. Incidental meningioma mimicking metastasis of prostate adenocarcinoma in 68Ga-labeled PSMA ligand PET/CT. Clin Nucl Med. 2016; 41: 956-958.
22. Zacho HD, Nielsen JB, Dettmann K, Hjulskov SH, Petersen LJ. 68Ga-PSMA PET/CT uptake in intramuscular myxoma imitates prostate cancer metastasis. Clin Nucl Med. 2017; 42: 487-488.
23. Malik D, Basher RK, Sood A, Devana SK, Bhattacharya A, Mittal BR. Herniated thoracic spleen mimicking lung metastasis on 68Ga-labeled prostate-specific membrane antigen pet/ct in a patient with prostate cancer. Clin Nucl Med. 2017; 42: 485-486.
24. Wu SY, Boreta L, Shinohara K, et al. Impact of Staging 68 Ga-PSMA-11 PET Scans on Radiation Treatment Plansin Patients With Prostate Cancer. Urology. 2019; 125: 154-162.
25. Fuccio C, Castellucci P, Schiavina R, et al. Role of 11C-choline PET/CT in the restaging of prostate cancer patients showing a single lesion on bone scintigraphy. Ann Nucl Med. 2010; 24: 485-492.
26. Hirmas N, Al-Ibraheem A, Herrmann K, et al. [68Ga]PSMA PET/CT Improves Initial Staging and Management Plan of Patients with High-Risk Prostate Cancer. Mol Imaging Biol. 2019; 21: 574-581.
27. Hoffman A, Amiel GE. The Impact of PSMA PET/CT on Modern Prostate Cancer Management and Decision Making – The Urological Perspective. Cancers (Basel) 2023; 15: 3402.
28. Kotb AF, Elabbady AA. Prognostic Factors for the Development of Biochemical Recurrence after Radical Prostatectomy. Prostate Cancer. 2011; 2011: 485189.
29. Heidenreich A, Bastian PJ, Bellmunt J, et al. EAU guidelines on prostate cancer. Part II: Treatment of advanced, relapsing, and castration-resistant prostate cancer. Eur Urol. 2014; 65: 467-479.
30. Caroli P, Sandler I, Matteucci F, et al. 68 Ga-PSMA PET/CT in patients with recurrent prostate cancer after radical treatment: prospective results in 314 patients. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2018; 45: 2035-2044.
31. Houshmand S, Lawhn-Heath C, Behr S. PSMA PET imaging in the diagnosis and management of prostate cancer. Abdom Radiol (NY). 2023; 48: 3610-3623.
32. Miszczyk M, Rajwa P, Fazekas T, et al. The State of Intermediate Clinical Endpoints as Surrogates for Overall Survival in Prostate Cancer in 2024. Eur Urol Oncol. 2024; 7: 1195-1198.
33. van Leeuwen PJ, Emmett L, Ho B, et al. Prospective evaluation of 68Gallium-prostate-specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography/computed tomography for preoperative lymph node

staging in prostate cancer. BJU Int. 2017; 119: 209-215.

34. Cytawa W, Seitz AK, Kircher S, et al. 68Ga-PSMA I&T PET/CT for primary staging of prostate cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2020; 47: 47: 168-177.

35. Papa N, Perera M, Murphy DG, et al. Patterns of primary staging for newly diagnosed prostate cancer in the era of prostate specific membrane antigen positron emission tomography: A population-based analysis. J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol. 2021; 65: 649-654.

36. Lima JP, Carvalho J, Quaresma V, et al. The role of Ga-68-PSMA PET/CT in the initial staging of prostate cancer – a single center 4 year experience. Res Rep Urol. 2021;13: 479-485.

37. Burdett S, Boevé LM, Ingleby FC, et al. Prostate Radiotherapy for Metastatic Hormone-sensitive Prostate Cancer: A STOPCAP Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Eur Urol. 2019; 76: 115-124.

38. Fizazi K, Foulon S, Carles J, et al. Abiraterone plus prednisone added to androgen deprivation therapy and docetaxel in de novo metastatic castration-sensitive prostate cancer (PEACE-1): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, phase 3 study with a 2×2 factorial design. Lancet. 2022; 399: 1695-1707.

39. Miszczyk M, Rajwa P, Yanagisawa T, et al. The Efficacy and Safety of Metastasis-directed Therapy in Patients with Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Prospective Studies. Eur Urol. 2024; 85: 125-138.

40. Barentsz JO, Richenberg J, Clements R, et al. ESUR prostate MR guidelines 2012. Eur Radiol. 2012; 22: 746-757.

41. Daryanani A, Turkbey B. Recent Advancements in CT and MR Imaging of Prostate Cancer. Semin Nucl Med. 2022; 52: 365-373.

42. Berger I, Annabattula C, Lewis J, et al. 68Ga-PSMA PET/CT vs. mpMRI for locoregional prostate cancer staging: Correlation with final histopathology. Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis. 2018; 21: 204-211.

43. Sonni I, Felker ER, Lenis AT, et al. Head-to-head comparison of 68Ga-PSMA-11 PET/CT and mpMRI with histopathology gold-standard in the detection, intra-prostatic localization and local extension of primary prostate cancer: results from a prospective single-center imaging trial. J Nucl Med. 2022; 63: 847-854.

44. Li Y, Han D, Wu P, Ren J, Ma S, Zhang J, et al. Comparison of 68Ga-PSMA-617 PET/CT with mpMRI for the detection of PCa in patients with a PSA level of 4–20 ng/ml before the initial biopsy. Sci Rep. 2020; 10: 10963.

45. Oprea-Lager DE, Cysouw MCF, Boellaard R, et al. Bone Metastases Are Measurable: The Role of Whole-Body MRI and Positron Emission Tomography. Front Oncol. 2021; 11: 772530.

46. Hofman MS, Lawrentschuk N, Francis RJ, et al. Prostate-specific membrane antigen PET-CT in patients with high-risk prostate cancer before curative-intent surgery or radiotherapy (proPSMA): a prospective, randomised, multicentre study. Lancet. 2020; 395: 1208-1216.

47. Wang X, Wen Q, Zhang H, Ji B. Head-to-Head Comparison of 68Ga-PSMA-11 PET/CT and Multiparametric MRI for Pelvic Lymph Node Staging Prior to Radical Prostatectomy in Patients With Intermediate to High-Risk Prostate Cancer: A Meta-Analysis. Front Oncol. 2021; 11: 737989.

48. Kane CJ, Amling CL, Johnstone PAS, et al. Limited value of bone scintigraphy and computed tomography in assessing biochemical failure after radical prostatectomy. Urology. 2003; 61: 607-611.

49. Liu F, Dong J, Shen Y, et al. Comparison of PET/CT and MRI in the Diagnosis of Bone Metastasis in Prostate Cancer Patients: A Network Analysis of Diagnostic Studies. Front Oncol. 2021; 11: 736654.

50. 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. 2016; 43: 2114-2121.

51. Holzgreve A, Unterrainer M, Calais J, et al. Is PSMA PET/CT cost-effective for the primary staging in prostate cancer? First results for European countries and the USA based on the proPSMA trial. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2023; 50: 3750-3754.

52. Fendler WP, Eiber M, Beheshti M, et al. 68Ga-PSMA PET/CT: Joint EANM and SNMMI procedure guideline for prostate cancer imaging: version 1.0. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2017; 44: 1014-1024.

53. Brenner DJ, Elliston CD. Estimated radiation on risks potentially associated with full-body CT screening. Radiology. 2004; 232: 735-738.

54. Kapoor M, Kasi A. PET Scanning. StatPearls [Internet]. 2022 Oct 3. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK559089/.

55. Afshar-Oromieh A, Malcher A, Eder M, et al. Pet imaging with a [68ga]gallium-labelled psma ligand for the diagnosis of prostate cancer: Biodistribution in humans and first evaluation of tumour lesions. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2013; 40: 486-495.

56. Mannweiler S, Amersdorfer P, Trajanoski S, Terrett JA, King D, Mehes G. Heterogeneity of prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA) expression in prostate carcinoma with distant metastasis. Pathol Oncol Res. 2009; 15: 167-172. ■