PROSTATE CANCER TREATMENT,SCREENING AND EARLY DETECTION

Project Report submitted in partial fulfillment

for the award of the degree of

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MEDICAL LAB TECHNOLOGY

Submitted by

SHAKIL AHMAD
ENROLLMENT NO:- 18021050083
ADMISSION NO:- 18SMAS1050040

IN

DEPARTMENT OF PARAMEDICAL & ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES

SCHOOL OF MEDICAL AND ALLIED SCIENCE

Under the supervision of:

Mr.P.Yashwant Kumar
H.O.D. (MLT)

July-2022

SCHOOL OF MEDICAL AND ALLIED SCIENCE

BONAFIDE CERTIFICATE

Certified that this project report **"TREATMENT, SCREENING AND EARLY DETECTION OF PROSTATE CANCER"** is the bona-fide work of "**SHAKIL AHMAD (ADM.NO. 18SMAS1050040)"** who carried out the project work under my supervision.

SIGNATURE

Prof.(Dr.)P.K.Sharma

Dean,

School of Medical & Allied Sciences

SIGNATURE

Prof.P.Yashwant Kumar

Supervisor

Approval Sheet

This Project entitled (**TREATMENT, SCREENING AND EARLY DETECTION OF PROSTATE CANCER**) by (**SHAKIL AHMAD**) is approved for the degree of (**BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MEDICAL LAB TECHNOLOGY**).

Examiners

1.

2.

Supervisor(s)

1.Prof.P.Yashwant Kumar

HoD

Prof.P.Yashwant Kumar,
Department of Paramedical & Allied Health Sciences
School of Medical and Allied Sciences
Galgotias University

Date:_____

Place:_____

Statement of Project Report Preparation

1. Thesis title: **TREATMENT, SCREENING AND EARLY DETECTION OF PROSTATE CANCER**

2. Degree for which the report is submitted: B.Sc in Medical Lab Technology

3. Project Supervisor was referred to for preparing the report.

4. Specifications regarding thesis format have been closely followed.

5. The contents of the thesis have been organized based on the guidelines.

(Signature of the student)

Name:Shakil Ahmad
Enroll No:18021050083

Statement of Preparation:

Every student have to submit the statement of thesis preparation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

Prostate cancer is the very commonly malignant also greatest reason behind the mortality rate of men.The cure and investigation of prostate cancer are fields regarding study that are constantly varing.All of us intend of viewing and considering contemporary & older works upon the subjects in order of arouse discussion & draw attention to significant issues confronting the urological community. In this study, we review significant literature on targeted drugs, radiotherapy planning, radical prostatectomy versus surveillance methods,& special antigen of prostate screening.Within past,largest number of sufferers undergoing risky radically exposed operative methods that were related with high rates of number of disease & deaths. There's growing evidence which are not entire cases of cancer of prostate gland is the same & these surveillance methods and prostate-specific localisation of therapy are safe strategies to appropriately manage low-grade sickness.

There are still outstanding problems regarding way of correctly stages the suffering & at the end choose the optimal course of treatment.

To effectively choose patients present screening & central cure, precise illness classification is required. TRUS biopsy seems insufficient in these cases.

315 patients, or 54% of the total, had prostate cancer found. Targeted biopsy, when compared to 12-core biopsy, identified 38 (67%) more Gleason 4 + 3 malignancies and consequently Gleason promoting within eighty one 36 percent issues. But 36% of Gleason £3+4 patients were overlooked by targeted biopsy. In contrast, 12-core biopsy improved 67 cases but only found 8% more Gleason 4 Plus 3 cases (26 percent).

As a result, MRI/US fusion-targeted biopsies in this experiment performed better and revealed a greatest Gleason rate in 32% of sufferers than a normal biopsy of twelve core did.

Technology advancements like US fusion techniques and multiparametic MRI give optimism for the future. The technology has not yet undergone all of the necessary standardisation, validation, and optimization processes, nevertheless, which are necessary for its wide-scale implementation.

Introduction

Prostate cancer is the most common malignancy and the second-leading cause of death for men [1]. Postmortem statistics show that the incidence of histology increases proportionally with age, with about 30% of all men in their 40s and 90% of all men in their 80s and 90s being affected [2]. Knowledge in the areas of prostate cancer detection and treatment is dynamic. We plan to review and discuss both recent and older publications on these subjects in order to spark discussion and draw attention to significant issues facing the urological community. Some of them emphasise theories that are already well-established, while others discuss potential future directions in the treatment of prostate cancer. TABLE 1 displays

the abstracts of the twelve articles being considered.

screening for prostate-specific antigens from the ERSPC study

The European Randomized Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer [3] was initiated by randomly assigning 162,388 males between the ages of 55 and 69 to receive or not PSA-based screening. This article reports the most recent prostate cancer mortality after a 13-year follow-up for the study, which comprised patients from eight European countries. Prostate cancer claimed the lives of 355 of the 72,891 men randomly assigned to PSA screening, compared to 89,352 in the control group (0.49 percent). Death rates from prostate cancer were 0.79 (95% CI: 0.69-0.91; p 0.001). According to a comparison of the mortality rates from all causes, 15,369 (21.1%) of the 72,891 patients in the PSA screening group and 19,108 (21.4%) of the 89,352 patients in the control group perished. data reveal that whereas 781 screenings are required to prevent one death from prostate cancer, only 27 diagnoses are required.Of course, it is necessary to take into account the hazards associated with research, overdiagnosis, and overtreatment. The prostate cancer mortality linked to PSA screening has continued to decline when comparing this 2014 update to the prior updates at 9 and 11 years. Several institutions have challenged the claim that there is enough data to show that PSA screening reduces cancer mortality. This claim has been thoroughly examined and refuted. Statistics from the 80,000 patient Finnish component are publicly available.In terms of mortality, there was no discernible difference between the two research arms. [4]. The majority of the survival advantage for PSA screening is also to be found in the GOTEBORG component of the study, which has come under fire for being heterogeneous and having abnormally high rates of primary androgen deprivation therapy in the control arm [7]. Theoretically, a trial would require over 3 million participants with a disease-specific mortality reduction of 30% to result in a 0.7 percent decrease in all-cause mortality; however, given that deaths from prostate cancer represent a relatively small portion of deaths compared to other all-cause mortality, it would not be unexpected if this number were to increase.

Opinion

This is the initial research to demonstrate screening's positive outcome, despite the fact that the use of PSA as a screening method has drawn criticism from numerous sources. According to data from other teams, prostate cancer mortality rates are reduced when more PSA testing is done prior to diagnosis.

3D prostate mapping biopsies

In 180 patients with unilateral prostate cancer who had previously had a 3D prostate mapping biopsy (PDPMB), in which biopsies were carried out using a BT grid each 5 mm along the volume of the prostate the tumours were restaged under TRUS guidance [8].Out of the 180 patients, 110 (61.1%) were categorised as having bilateral sickness, and of those patients, 41 had Gleason scores improve to a 7.23 percent following 3D-PMB, improving their disease status. Only two patients (1.1%) with hematuria needed nocturnal bladder irrigation, while 14 patients (7.7%) needed short-term catheterization. There were just two issues with 3D-PMB. These findings imply that systematic biopsy, as opposed to TRUS biopsy, is more appropriate for assessing the severity of the problem.

Opinion

Accurate disease classification is crucial for selecting patients for active surveillance and specialised treatment. A TRUS biopsy in this instance seems insufficient.

Use of multiparametric MRI

On 582 consecutive patients, prostate cancer was identified using a targeted MRI/US fusion-guided prostate biopsy and a thorough 12-core transrectal ultrasound biopsy. From each diagnostic test, the top Gleason scores were compared. Prostate cancer was identified in 315 patients, or 54% of all patients. In comparison to a 12-core biopsy, targeted biopsy identified 38 (67%) more Gleason 4 + 3 cancers, and it led to a Gleason upgrade in 81 (32%) cases.However, 36% of Gleason £3+4 cases were missed by focused biopsies. On the other hand, 12-core biopsy only improved 67 cases (26%) of the cases while detecting 8% more Gleason 4 Plus 3 tumours. This study discovered that MRI/US fusion-targeted biopsies were more successful than conventional 12-core biopsies and revealed a higher Gleason score in 32% of subjects.

Opinion

A potential technical future lies in multiparametric MRI and US fusion methods. Before being used widely, the technology must be completely developed, validated, and standardised, all of which have not yet been accomplished.

Is Gleason 6 cancer?

Long considered to be at extremely low risk, patients with a Gleason score of £6 have a reported 1% If the PSA is also £10 ng/ml, there is a risk of lymph node metastases following radical prostatectomy [10]. Whether this risk actually exists or whether the low probability of lymph node metastasis is a result of histology undergrading is still up for debate. A number of Gleason 3 patterns that were previously classified as Gleason 4 have also been classified as such since 2005 by the International Society of Urological Pathology.As a result, a large number of these tumours that were previously categorised as Gleason 6 have been upgraded. Retrospective analyses were performed on 14,123 radical prostatectomy samples from four major North American hospitals that had previously been reported as Gleason £6 [11]. 19 of the 22 samples from the 14,123 samples analysed that had positive lymph nodes were given access to extra histological testing. The Gleason grading was raised to Gleason 7 for all 19 samples. Retrospective study of over 14,000 samples led researchers due to the absence of the disease, they came to the conclusion that Gleason grade 6 cannot spread to the pelvic lymph nodes.

Watchful waiting versus SPGC4 2002, 2005, 2008, 2011, 2014 radical prostatectomy

Prior to the introduction of PSA monitoring, this randomised A controlled trial contrasted radical prostatectomy (RP) with watchful waiting (WW). between 1989 and 1999 in 14 Scandinavian institutions [13].The relative risk of death following prostatectomy was 0.74 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.56-0.99; p = 0.04) in a cohort of 695 males under the age of 75 with clinically confirmed A life expectancy of greater than 10 years and T1 or T2 illness. This mortality gap between the groups widened over the course of the follow-up period. A single death might be prevented, according to the 2014 update, by treating just 8 people. When only 4 patients needed to be treated, these effects were significantly more pronounced in men under the age of 65.

PIVOT 2012

In the early years of PSA screening in 1994, a randomised regulated trial comparing radical prostatectomy with surveillance in locally advanced prostate cancer was conducted [14]. The inclusion criteria were the same as for the previously described SPGC4 experiment, with the exception that more than 50% of the patients included had clinically impalpable illness (T1c), as opposed to only 12% in the SPGC4 trial. 731 males with a median follow-up of 10 years were assigned at random to radical prostatectomy or observation. In contrast to the 21 patients who underwent radical prostatectomy, 31 men (8.4%) in the observation group passed away from prostate cancer. Prostate cancer mortality or any other causes did not statistically differ in either group (hazard ratio [HR]: 0.88; 95 percent confidence interval]).

Opinion

The utilisation of patients at various stages of the disease is likely an explanation for the contradictory results of these two investigations. In comparison to patients who appear symptomatically, those who undergo a PSA test are considerably more likely to have the clinically incurable illness T1c. As a result, radical prostatectomy may be advantageous for high-risk patients, such as those with a PSA >10, but prostatectomy may have little or no effect on low-risk people. Furthermore, RRP consistently offers better therapeutic outcomes than alternative therapy methods in high-risk and advanced illness, according to retrospective and cohort evaluations [15,16].

Brachytherapy

In the late 1980s, permanent BT for locally advanced prostate cancer was launched. It has just recently (15 years) been published long-term evidence on its efficacy and side-effect profile. The biochemical and disease-specific survival were computed [18] for 1656 consecutive patients who underwent permanent BT treatment and "high-risk" patients who additionally got external beam radiation therapy. There were 473 patients with high-risk diseases, 608 patients with low-risk diseases, and 575 patients with intermediate-risk diseases within the patient group (Mt Sinai guidelines).

The estimates of OS and disease-specific survival in this retrospective study were based on 12-year follow-up data at 72.6 and 98.2 percent, respectively. The biochemical progression-free survival rates for patients with low, intermediate,

and high risk were 98.6, 96.5, and 90%, respectively.

Opinion

Long-term statistics suggest that the outcomes of BT and the other whole gland radical treatments are comparable. More information from randomised controlled studies is needed to compare the long-term prognoses for cancer and quality of life of radical prostatectomy with minimally invasive targeted therapies. Intensive treatment A minimally invasive (typically percutaneous) technique called focal treatment is used to eliminate tumour tissue while keeping the surrounding healthy tissue unharmed [19].

featuring ultrasound therapy

Serious genitourinary and rectal side effects can occur with treatment for prostate cancer in the whole gland. In this study [20], 42 patients who underwent high-intensity focused ultrasound at a single hospital to all known cancer lesions within a margin of healthy tissue were assessed for morbidity. The specification included PSA.

Table 1. List of the studies included in this paper with details of study type and main outcome.

Year of Study	Type of Study	Coming output	Reference
Schro¨ der et al. (2014)	RCT	reduction in disease-specific mortality that is significant	[3]
Onik et al. (2009)	Cohort	When compared to 3D prostate mapping biopsies, TRUS biopsies provide an erroneous indication of the severity of the disease.	[8]
Siddiqui et al. (2013)	Cohort	Compared to 12-core biopsy, Prostate biopsies with an MRI/US target improve and reveal a higher Gleason score in 32% of patients.	[9]
Ross et al. (2012)	Retrospective cohort	14,123 samples classified as Gleason 6 samples had no metastases.	[10]
Bill-Axelson et al. (2005)	RCT	In men with cT1-2 prostate cancer, radical prostatectomy reduced overall mortality.	[13]
Wilt et al. (2012)	RCT	In terms of all-cause mortality, radical prostatectomy had no discernible impact. (The vast majority of people have type 1 diabetes)	[14]
Bolla et al. (2012)	RCT	In contrast to overall survival, chemically free survival has greatly improved.	[17]

Taira et al. (2011)	Retrospective cohort	After 12 years, disease-specific survival was 98.2 percent and overall survival was 72.6%.	[18]
Ahmed et al. (2012)	Cohort	After four patients got re-treatment, the treatment was well tolerated, and after six months, there was no histological evidence of cancer in 30 of 39 patients (77 percent), and there was no new illness on multiparametric MRI in 39 of 41 patients (95 percent) of the patients.	[20]
Bahn et al. (2012)	Retrospective cohort	Repeat biopsies done at 12 months revealed that 2 percent of the 48 individuals still exhibited ipsilateral disease in the lobe that had been treated. But 12 out of 48 (25% of the population) had untreated contralateral lobe disease.	[21]
Culp et al. (2013)	Retrospective cohort	For patients receiving RP, BT, and NSR treatments, respectively, the 5-year overall survival rates were found to be 67.4, 52.6, and 22.5 percent.	[22]
Beer et al. (2014)	RCT	A significant reduction in radiographic advancement and a 29 percent lower risk of death were also seen after 12 months' follow-up as a result of the treatment.	[23]
ERSPC stands for the European Randomised Study of Prostate Cancer Screening. High-intensity focused ultrasound, or HIFU NSR: No radiation or surgery; Prostate-specific antigen, or PSA Radiotherapy; RCT (randomised controlled trial).			

Focal cryotherapy

In a single-center retrospective analysis, 73 patients with clinically unilateral, low- to intermediate-risk prostate cancer underwent cryosurgery using sextant and targeted ultrasound-guided biopsies [21]. The results are shown here after a median follow-up of 3.7 years. The initial Gleason scores were 30 (41%) Gleason 3 + 3, 25 (34%) Gleason 3 + 4, and 18 (25%) Gleason 4+3. Before cryotherapy, the average PSA level was 5.9 ng/ml; after the treatment, it was 1.6 ng/ml. No patients passed away or experienced metastases during the follow-up period. 48 patients between 6 and 12 months after their cryotherapy treatment were given the go-ahead for a post-treatment biopsy. Poor outcomes were encountered by 36 of these individuals (or 75% of the patients), with 12 of these incidents occurring in the treated ipsilateral lobe and one in the untreated lobe.

Opinion

Both cryotherapy and high-intensity focused ultrasound have positive short- to medium-term effects for localised diseases. Nevertheless, due to the short follow-up times and likely reliance on multiparametric MRI, caution must be applied

when interpreting the clinical disease-free survival. Patients are drawn to this form of therapy because it has few side effects and allows for follow-up treatments—two benefits that no other radical treatment option can now match. Further research will shed more light on the true efficacy of these cutting-edge treatment options for patients with localised prostate cancer.

definitive care for a primary tumour with a metastatic condition

Patients with metastatic prostate cancer who received successful treatment for the primary tumour were studied by Culp et al. to determine their survival rates (stage IV) [22]. The Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results database was used to do an analysis from the past. The estimated disease-specific survival and 5-year OS were calculated based on the therapies each patient group received. Total patient numbers were 8185. A total of 7811 of them underwent no surgery or radiotherapy, 245 underwent radical prostatectomy, and 129 underwent BT.

It was found that the 5-year rates for radial prostatectomy, BT, no surgery or radiotherapy, and the 5-year overall survival were 67.4, 52.6, and 22.5 percent, respectively. A higher death rate was linked to high-grade disease, a PSA level of 20 ng/ml, being over 70, and pelvic lymphadenopathy. This retrospective study found that prostate surgery may carry certain hazards.

Opinion

Despite earlier small-scale human and animal studies showing remission of prostate cancer metastatic illness, it has never been used to larger medical studies. It is hoped that recent efforts to improve the effectiveness of cell reduction surgery or treatment for prostate cancer would be successful when more information from database research becomes available.

Both renal cell carcinoma and non-urological cancers like colon adenocarcinoma have successfully used these techniques in the past.

Prior to chemotherapy, enzalutamide is used in metastatic prostate cancer. Enzalutamide works by inhibiting androgen receptors. The objectives of this Phase III trial were to evaluate the quality of life, OS, and radiographic progression-free survival in chemotherapy-naive patients with metastatic castration-resistant disease [23]. Enzalutamide or a placebo was randomly administered to 1717 people. Since active medication was obviously beneficial, the experiment was stopped after 540 recorded fatalities. When compared to the treatment group's incidence of 14%, radiographic advancement occurred in the placebo group at a rate of 65% at the 12-month follow-up. In the therapeutic and placebo groups, the proportion of patients who had passed away at a median follow-up for survival of 22 months was 241 of 872 patients (28%) versus 299 of 845 patients, respectively (35 percent). The drug reduced the fatality risk by 29 percent.

Opinion

Patients with metastatic castration-resistant disease should have their usage of novel anticancer medications, such as enzalutamide, evaluated both during and after treatment. Enzalutamide treatment has the potential to improve quality of life for many patients with metastatic castration-resistant illness by allowing them to postpone the initiation of chemotherapy for a lengthy period of time.Randomized controlled trials have found strong support for abiraterone (an inhibitor of testosterone production), which similarly significantly boosts survival in metastatic prostate cancer [24].

Expert analysis and a five-year outlook

Prostate cancer detection & treatment are rapidly evolving. Uncertainty has been raised regarding the best technique of using PSA for detection & investigation of cancer of prostate due to conflicting results from screening trials and expert panels. Work is still being done on calculators of danger named PLCO [25] & MSKCC, lab tests named PCA-3 [26], EPCA-2, and other tools for enablimg better patient choosing of biopsies.

We are now able to precisely risk-stratify a patient's condition because of improvements in investigative techniques including multiparametric MRI, multiparametric ultrasound, MRI-fusion approaches, and tree dimensional

template mapping biopsy. Therefore, we may look closely at the therapy alternatives that are available.

Invasive surgical procedures with high rates of morbidity and mortality were once often done by patients, regardless of risk.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that not all occurrences of prostate cancer are the same & this less-level illness cold be effectively arranged using screening approaches.

Additional improvements in targeted treatments have also provided opportunities for targeted illness management. The treatment of the clinically important or "index lesion," which is the objective, is to spare healthy prostatic tissue and clinically insignificant sickness. While preserving favourable oncological results, this will lessen the patient's unfavourable effects. Two recently discovered modalities that are increasingly used for localised treatment are cryotherapy and high-intensity focused ultrasound. Focal cryotherapy may perhaps result in the development of anti-tumor antibodies as a secondary immunological effect, increasing cancerous management [27]. This suggests that less radical prostatectomies are being conducted thanks to improved surveillance and the new minimally invasive technologies that are increasingly being used in clinical settings.

To date, there are no published randomised studies contrasting radical with focused therapy. The study analysed above indicates that there is no proof that radical prostatectomy is a better course of treatment for very low-risk localised illness. Radial prostatectomy does appear to greatly lower the chance of metastasis and to raise the likelihood of survival in patients of high-risk localised disease. For younger patients in particular, it is possible to take into account the timing of postoperative radiation. A new set of patients will likely qualify for treatment due to the growing body of research and demand for managing severe and metastatic sickness.

Disclosure of assets and competing interests

The writers have no financial ties to any organisations or entities with which they have a conflict of interest, nor do they have a financial interest in the topics or materials mentioned in the text. This includes contracts for work, honoraria, consultancy services, grants of stock or options, stock ownership or testimony from experts, grants of patents that have been granted or are pending, and royalties. There was no literary assistance used to produce this manuscript.

Key issues:

- The most efficient methods for detecting and review of prostate cancer by utilizing special antigen of prostate are highly debatable.
- There is mounting evidence that surveillance techniques can effectively manage low-grade illness. The majority of prostate cancer cases were previously treated with surgery.
- Within one precise critics rating patient condition can active screening & locally tailored therapy must taken into account.
- A patient's sickness may be accurately risk-stratified using magnetic resonance imaginf mixing procedures and tree dimensional template biopsies mapping.Specific local treatments method with the significance of simply dealing with the breakdown in index, which reduces danger of rudery & debility in comparison to radical prostatectomies.Localized therapies have the advantage of simply treating the index lesion in comparison to radical prostate removal, which reduces the risk of incontinence and impotence.
- To compare drastic and focused therapy, randomised controlled trials are necessary.
- The timing of radiation treatment and the usage of novel anti-androgen medicines continue to raise questions.

To reflect the most recent developments within investigation & therapy of of cancer of prostate, new guidelines shall be necessary as additional knowledge becomes available.

References:

1. CAT. Whitehead S. Prostate cancer: the most common cancer among men in England. 2010 2. Franks LM. Latent carcinoma of the prostate. J Pathol Bacteriol 1954;68(2): 603-16
3. Schro¨der FH, Hugosson J, Roobol MJ, et al. Screening and prostate cancer mortality: results of the European Randomised Study of Screening for Prostate Cancer (ERSPC) at 13 years of follow-up. Lancet 2014. [Epub ahead of print]
4. Kilpela¨inen TP, Tammela TL, Malila N, et al. Prostate cancer mortality in the Finnish randomized screening trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 2013;105(10):719-25
5. Chou R, Croswell JM, Dana T, et al. Screening for prostate cancer: a review of the evidence for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Ann Intern Med 2011;155(11): 762-71
6. Haines IE, Gabor Miklos GL. Prostate-specific antigen screening trials and prostate cancer deaths: the androgen deprivation connection. J Natl Cancer Inst 2013;105(20):1534-9
7. Haines IE, Miklos GLG. Response. J Natl Cancer Inst 2014;106(5):081
8. Onik G, Miessau M, Bostwick DG. Three-dimensional prostate mapping biopsy has a potentially significant impact on prostate cancer management. J Clin Oncol 2009;27(26):4321-6 9. Siddiqui MM, Rais-Bahrami S, Truong H, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging/ ultrasound-fusion biopsy significantly upgrades prostate cancer versus systematic 12-core transrectal ultrasound biopsy. Eur Urol 2013;64(5):713-19
10. Ross HM, Kryvenko ON, Cowan JE, Simko JP. Do adenocarcinomas of the prostate with Gleason score (GS) £6 have the potential to metastasize to lymph nodes? Am J Surg Pathol 2012;36(9):1346-52
11. Eifler JB, Feng Z, Lin BM, et al. An updated prostate cancer staging nomogram (Partin tables) based on cases from 2006 to 2011. BJU Int 2013;111(1):22-9
12. Eggener SE, Scardino PT, Walsh PC. Predicting 15-year prostate cancer specific mortality after radical prostatectomy. J Urol 2011;185(3):869-75
13. Bill-Axelson A, Holmberg L, Ruutu M, et al. Radical prostatectomy versus watchful waiting in early prostate cancer. N Engl J Med 2005;352(19):1977-84
14. Wilt TJ, Brawer MK, Jones KM, et al. Radical prostatectomy versus observation for localized prostate cancer. N Engl J Med 2012;367(3):203-13

15. Zelefsky MJ, Eastham JA, Cronin AM, et al. Metastasis after radical prostatectomy or external beam radiotherapy for patients with clinically localized prostate cancer: a comparison of clinical cohorts adjusted for case mix. J Clin Oncol 2010;28(9):1508-13
16. Cooperberg MR, Vickers AJ, Broering JM, et al. Comparative risk-adjusted mortality outcomes after primary surgery, radiotherapy, or androgen-deprivation therapy for localized prostate cancer. Cancer 2010;116(22):5226-34
17. Bolla M, van H, Poppel B. Postoperative radiotherapy after radical prostatectomy for high-risk prostate cancer: long-term results of a randomised controlled trial (EORTC trial 22911). Lancet 2012;380(9858): 2018-27
18. Taira AV, Merrick GS, Butler WM, et al. Long-term outcome for clinically localized prostate cancer treated with permanent interstitial brachytherapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2011;79(5):1336-42
19. Lindner U, Trachtenberg J, Lawrentschuk N. Focal therapy in prostate cancer: modalities, findings and future considerations. Nat Rev Urol 2010;7(10): 562-71
20. Ahmed AH, Hindley RG, Dickinson L, et al. Focal therapy for localised unifocal and multifocal prostate cancer: a prospective development study. Lancet Oncol 2012; 13(6):622-32
21. Bahn D, de Castro Abreu AL, Gill IS, et al. Focal cryotherapy for clinically unilateral, low-intermediate risk prostate cancer in 73 men with a median follow-up of 3.7 years. Eur Urol 2012;62(1):55-63
22. Culp SH, Schellhammer PF, Williams MB. Might men diagnosed with metastatic prostate cancer benefit from definitive treatment of the primary tumor? A SEER-based study. Eur Urol 2014;65(6): 1058-66
23. Beer TM, Armstrong AJ, Rathkopf DE, et al. Enzalutamide in metastatic prostate cancer before chemotherapy. N Engl J Med 2014;371(5):424-33
24. de Bono JS, Logothetis CJ, Molina A, et al. Abiraterone and increased survival in metastatic prostate cancer. N Engl J Med 2011;364(21):1995-2005
25. Andriole GL, Crawford ED, Grubb RL, et al. Mortality results from a randomized prostate-cancer screening trial. N Engl J Med 2009;360(13):1310-19
26. Bussemakers MJ, van Bokhoven A, Verhaegh GW, et al. DD3: a new prostate-specific gene, highly overexpressed in prostate cancer. Cancer Res 1999;59(23): 5975-9
27. Sabel MS. Cryo-immunology: a review of the literature and proposed mechanisms for stimulatory versus suppressive immune responses. Cryobiology 2009;58(1):1-11