

Japanese Journal of Radiology

Multidimensional Analysis of Clinicopathological Characteristics of False-Negative Clinically Significant Prostate Cancers on Multiparametric MRI of the Prostate in Japanese Men --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	RMED-D-18-00178R1
Full Title:	Multidimensional Analysis of Clinicopathological Characteristics of False-Negative Clinically Significant Prostate Cancers on Multiparametric MRI of the Prostate in Japanese Men
Article Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Magnetic Resonance Imaging; Prostate cancer; Tumor detection; Prostate Imaging and Reporting Data System Version 2; Dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging
Corresponding Author:	Ayumu Kido, M.D Kawasaki Medical School Kurashiki, Okayama JAPAN
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Kawasaki Medical School
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Ayumu Kido, M.D
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Ayumu Kido, M.D TSUTOMU TAMADA Naoki Kanomata Akira Yamamoto Yoshiyuki Miyaji Atsushi Nqagai Teruki Sone
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	<p>Purpose To clarify clinicopathological features of false-negative clinically significant prostate cancer (csPC) at multiparametric prostate MRI (mpMRI).</p> <p>Methods 95 patients with 139 csPC undergoing 3T mpMRI before radical prostatectomy were included. Two radiologists were independently evaluated mpMR images using PI-RADS v2. Clinicopathological findings were compared between a) detectable and undetectable lesions using overall mpMRI criteria (o-mpMRI criteria) and b) lesions with early enhancement effect (EEE) and lesions without EEE at DCE-MRI.</p> <p>Results The detection rate of csPS using cutoff value of category 3 or more in PI-RADS v2 for positive lesion was 72.1% (98/136 lesions). In 38 false-negative lesions with less than PI-RADS v2 category 3, the DCE-MRI detected 14 lesions. 17 undetectable lesions on o-mpMR criteria had lower PSA and D'amico risk classification, and higher tumor apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) than those of 118 detectable lesions ($p \leq 0.048$). 89 lesions with EEE showed higher the PSA, tumor size, prostatectomy GS grade, frequency of lesions with GS\geq4+3 and lower tumor ADC than those in 38 lesions without EEE ($p \leq 0.046$).</p> <p>Conclusion Tumor detectability of csPC with PI-RADS v2 was limited compared with o-mpMRI criteria. Moreover, false-negative lesions on o-mpMRI criteria were</p>

characterized as small in size, low risk and low cellularity.

Author Comments:

June 29, 2018

Kazuo Awai, MD
Deputy Editor, Japanese Journal of Radiology

Dear Dr. Kazuo Awai

My colleagues and I wish to thank you and the reviewers for analysis of our manuscript entitled "Multidimensional Analysis of Clinicopathological Characteristics of False-Negative Clinically Significant Prostate Cancers on Multiparametric MRI of the Prostate in Japanese Men" to the Japanese Journal of Radiology (RMED-D-18-00178).

We have followed the suggestions of two reviewers and have made the revisions as shown in the following pages.

We believe that the thoughtful comments have substantially improved the manuscript. We hope that the manuscript will now be acceptable for publication in Japanese Journal of Radiology.

We thank you very much for your kind consideration.

Cordially yours,

Dr. Ayumu Kido
Tel: 81-86-462-1111 (Ext. 44453)
Fax: 81-86-462-1199
E-mail: a-k.24@med.kawasaki-m.ac.jp

Referee's comments and our responses

Reviewer #1

Introduction:

1. Page 5, line 7: "Only a few previous studies... including DCE-MRI [15, 16, 18]." The recent important papers by Truong M (J Urol. 2017;198: 316-321, J Urol. 2018;199: 106-113) should be cited in this connection here.

The suggested papers have been added in the introduction section (Page 5 and 18).

Materials and methods:

2. Page 6, line 36: Why did the authors calculate the ADC values with $b=0$ and 2000 s/mm². The PI-RADS v2 recommends using the highest b-value of 800-1000 s/mm² for ADC maps.

PI-RADS v2 recommends the optimal b-value of 800-1000 s/mm² for qualitative assessment of ADC map. However, optimal b-value for quantitative assessment such as ADC hasn't been decided yet in PI-RADS v2. Furthermore, several papers with utility of high b-value DWI such as 2000 s/mm² for tumor detection and assessment of tumor aggressiveness has been already published from Japan, and the high b-value DWI is used in daily clinical setting of many Japanese institutions. Therefore, we decided to use the ADC calculated from high b-value DWI (ADC map).

Kitajima K, Takahashi S, Ueno Y, Miyake H, Fujisawa M, Kawakami F, Sugimura K. Do

apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) values obtained using high b-values with a 3-T MRI correlate better than a transrectal ultrasound (TRUS)-guided biopsy with true Gleason scores obtained from radical prostatectomy specimens for patients with prostate cancer? Eur J Radiol. 2013 Aug;82(8):1219-26.

Kitajima K, Takahashi S, Ueno Y, Yoshikawa T, Ohno Y, Obara M, Miyake H, Fujisawa M, Sugimura K. Clinical utility of apparent diffusion coefficient values obtained using high b-value when diagnosing prostate cancer using 3 tesla MRI: comparison between ultra-high b-value (2000 s/mm²) and standard high b-value (1000 s/mm²). J Magn Reson Imaging. 2012 Jul;36(1):198-205.

Tamada T, Kanomata N, Sone T, Jo Y, Miyaji Y, Higashi H, Yamamoto A, Ito K. High b value (2,000 s/mm²) diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in prostate cancer at 3 Tesla: comparison with 1,000 s/mm² for tumor conspicuity and discrimination of aggressiveness. PLoS One. 2014 May 6;9(5):e96619.

3. Page 7: Image analysis and data collection: The descriptions of this subsection are somewhat complicated. What's the definition of "overall mpMRI criteria"? How did the authors diminish recall bias between two protocols (PI-RADS and o-mpMRI)? I suggest to rewrite this section substantially in an easy-to-understand way.

We used consensus data including the T2WI score, DWI score, positive or negative for DCE-MRI, and DCE-MRI score by two reviewers to determine the final overall PI-RADS assessment category and the overall mpMRI criteria. Therefore, our study didn't have the recall bias between two protocols. Manuscript has been revised as suggested (Page 8).

4. Page 8, line 15: ", three tumors in the peripheral zone... category determined (Fig. 1)". This should be mentioned in the results section.

The contents has been deleted from the text, since it was included in Figure 1.

5. The exclusions 3 in Fig. 1 (unevaluable of overall mpMRI criteria due to lack of DCE-MRI (n=4)) are not described in the materials and methods section.

The contents has been deleted from the text, since it was included in Figure 1.

5. Page 9, line 44-51: The descriptions of " a moderate or strong EEE on DCE-MRI" here are duplicated.

The contents has been deleted from the materials and methods section as suggested.

7. Most of descriptions in the Statistical analysis subsection should be stated in the Image analysis and data collection subsection.

The image analysis and data collection subsection and the statistical analysis subsection have been revised as suggested (Page 8-9).

Results:

8. Page 10, line 54: ", indicating excellent agreement for all (Fig. 1)". "(Fig. 1)" should be deleted.

The sentence has been revised as suggested (Page 10).

9. Results are too long. The most of results were summarized on the Tables. Avoid the repeated descriptions.

The results section has been revised as suggested (Page 10-12).

Discussion:

10. The main contents of "Discussion" are repeated descriptions of the results.

The discussion section has been revised as suggested as much as possible (Page 12-15).

Reviewer #2

Materials and methods

1. Line 51, Page 7

The word "distinct" seems to be inappropriate. Please change. (Do you mean "well-recognizable"?)

Manuscript has been revised as suggested (Page 7).

Result

2. In discussion, the author described that "DCE-MRI led to a positive result for more false-negative lesions (14/38 lesions) than T2WI (4/38 lesions) and DWI (7/38 lesions)". I could not draw these numbers from results. Please show that clearly in result.

The suggested contents have been already shown in the result section (Page 11).

Discussion

3. In study limitation, the author should add the difference of multiphase DCE-MR sequences in two groups (64 vs. 23 patients)

Manuscript has been revised as suggested (Page 14).

Conclusion

4. It is better to add "in Japanese men" in the end of the first sentence at abstract and text, as follows, "Tumor detectability of csPC with PI-RADS v2 was limited compared with ompMRI criteria in Japanese men" and "tumor detectability of csPC with PI-RADS v2 was limited compared with overall mpMRI criteria in Japanese men".

Manuscript has been corrected as suggested (Page 2 and 15).

Referee's comments and our responses

Reviewer #1

Introduction:

1. Page 5, line 7: "Only a few previous studies... including DCE-MRI [15, 16, 18]." The recent important papers by Truong M (*J Urol.* 2017;198: 316-321, *J Urol.* 2018;199: 106-113) should be cited in this connection here.

The suggested papers have been added in the introduction section (Page 5 and 18).

Materials and methods:

2. Page 6, line 36: Why did the authors calculate the ADC values with $b=0$ and 2000 s/mm^2 . The PI-RADS v2 recommends using the highest b -value of $800\text{-}1000 \text{ s/mm}^2$ for ADC maps.

PI-RADS v2 recommends the optimal b -value of $800\text{-}1000 \text{ s/mm}^2$ for qualitative assessment of ADC map. However, optimal b -value for quantitative assessment such as ADC hasn't been decided yet in PI-RADS v2. Furthermore, several papers with utility of high b -value DWI such as 2000 s/mm^2 for tumor detection and assessment of tumor aggressiveness has been already published from Japan, and the high b -value DWI is used in daily clinical setting of many Japanese institutions. Therefore, we decided to use the ADC calculated from high b -value DWI (ADC map).

Kitajima K, Takahashi S, Ueno Y, Miyake H, Fujisawa M, Kawakami F, Sugimura K. Do apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) values obtained using high b -values with a 3-T MRI correlate better than a transrectal ultrasound (TRUS)-guided biopsy with true Gleason scores obtained from radical prostatectomy specimens for patients with prostate cancer? *Eur J Radiol.* 2013 Aug;82(8):1219-26.

Kitajima K, Takahashi S, Ueno Y, Yoshikawa T, Ohno Y, Obara M, Miyake H, Fujisawa M, Sugimura K. Clinical utility of apparent diffusion coefficient values obtained using high b -value when diagnosing prostate cancer using 3 tesla MRI: comparison between ultra-high b -value (2000 s/mm^2) and standard high b -value (1000 s/mm^2). *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2012 Jul;36(1):198-205.

Tamada T, Kanomata N, Sone T, Jo Y, Miyaji Y, Higashi H, Yamamoto A, Ito K. High b value ($2,000 \text{ s/mm}^2$) diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in prostate cancer at 3 Tesla: comparison with $1,000 \text{ s/mm}^2$ for tumor conspicuity and discrimination of aggressiveness. *PLoS One.* 2014 May 6;9(5):e96619.

3. Page 7: Image analysis and data collection: The descriptions of this subsection are somewhat complicated. What's the definition of "overall mpMRI

criteria"? How did the authors diminish recall bias between two protocols (PI-RADS and o-mpMRI)? I suggest to rewrite this section substantially in an easy-to-understand way.

We used consensus data including the T2WI score, DWI score, positive or negative for DCE-MRI, and DCE-MRI score by two reviewers to determine the final overall PI-RADS assessment category and the overall mpMRI criteria. Therefore, our study didn't have the recall bias between two protocols. Manuscript has been revised as suggested (Page 8).

4. *Page 8, line 15: ", three tumors in the peripheral zone... category determined (Fig. 1)". This should be mentioned in the results section.*

The contents has been deleted from the text, since it was included in Figure 1.

5. *The exclusions 3 in Fig. 1 (unevaluable of overall mpMRI criteria due to lack of DCE-MRI (n=4)) are not described in the materials and methods section.*

The contents has been deleted from the text, since it was included in Figure 1.

5. *Page 9, line 44-51: The descriptions of " a moderate or strong EEE on DCE-MRI" here are duplicated.*

The contents has been deleted from the materials and methods section as suggested.

7. *Most of descriptions in the Statistical analysis subsection should be stated in the Image analysis and data collection subsection.*

The image analysis and data collection subsection and the statistical analysis subsection have been revised as suggested (Page 8-9).

Results:

8. *Page 10, line 54: ", indicating excellent agreement for all (Fig. 1)". "(Fig. 1)" should be deleted.*

The sentence has been revised as suggested (Page 10).

9. *Results are too long. The most of results were summarized on the Tables. Avoid the repeated descriptions.*

The results section has been revised as suggested (Page 10-12).

Discussion:

10. *The main contents of "Discussion" are repeated descriptions of the results.*

The discussion section has been revised as suggested as much as possible (Page 12-15).

Reviewer #2

Materials and methods

1. *Line 51, Page 7*

*The word "distinct" seems to be inappropriate. Please change.
(Do you mean "well-recognizable"?)*

Manuscript has been revised as suggested (Page 7).

Result

2. *In discussion, the author described that "DCE-MRI led to a positive result for more false-negative lesions (14/38 lesions) than T2WI (4/38 lesions) and DWI (7/38 lesions)". I could not draw these numbers from results. Please show that clearly in result.*

The suggested contents have been already shown in the result section (Page 11).

Discussion

3. *In study limitation, the author should add the difference of multiphase DCE-MR sequences in two groups (64 vs. 23 patients)*

Manuscript has been revised as suggested (Page 14).

Conclusion

4. *It is better to add "in Japanese men" in the end of the first sentence at abstract and text, as follows, "Tumor detectability of csPC with PI-RADS v2 was limited compared with mpMRI criteria in Japanese men" and "tumor detectability of csPC with PI-RADS v2 was limited compared with overall mpMRI criteria in Japanese men".*

Manuscript has been corrected as suggested (Page 2 and 15).

**Multidimensional Analysis of Clinicopathological Characteristics of False-Negative
Clinically Significant Prostate Cancers on Multiparametric MRI of the Prostate in
Japanese Men**

Ayumu Kido^{1*}

Tsutomu Tamada¹

Naoki Kanomata²

Akira Yamamoto¹

Yoshiyuki Miyaji³

Atsushi Nagai³

Teruki Sone¹

¹Department of Radiology, Kawasaki Medical School, 577 Matsushima, Kurashiki city, Okayama, 701-0192, Japan.

Address correspondence to A.K., Kawasaki Medical School, 577 Matsushima, Kurashiki city, Okayama, 701-0192, Japan (E-mail: a-k.24@med.kawasaki-m.ac.jp).

²Department of Pathology, Kawasaki Medical School, 577 Matsushima, Kurashiki city, Okayama, 701-0192, Japan

³Department of Urology, Kawasaki Medical School, 577 Matsushima, Kurashiki city, Okayama, 701-0192, Japan.

*Address reprint requests to: A.K., Department of Radiology, Kawasaki Medical School, 577 Matsushima, Kurashiki city, Okayama, 701-0192, Japan
E-mail: a-k.24@med.kawasaki-m.ac.jp

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interests to disclose.

Grants: This study was supported by the Kawasaki Medical School Project; Contract grant number: 29B-044.

Ethical statement: This single-center retrospective study was approved by the local

institutional review board with a waiver of the requirement for written, informed consent.

Original article: 3,366 words

**Multidimensional Analysis of Clinicopathological Characteristics of False-Negative
Clinically Significant Prostate Cancers on Multiparametric MRI of the Prostate in
Japanese Men**

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Purpose To clarify clinicopathological features of false-negative clinically significant prostate cancer (csPC) at multiparametric prostate MRI (mpMRI).

Methods 95 patients with 139 csPC undergoing 3T mpMRI before radical prostatectomy were included. Two radiologists were independently evaluated mpMR images using PI-RADS v2. Clinicopathological findings were compared between a) detectable and undetectable lesions using overall mpMRI criteria (o-mpMRI criteria) and b) lesions with early enhancement effect (EEE) and lesions without EEE at DCE-MRI.

Results The detection rate of csPS using cutoff value of category 3 or more in PI-RADS v2 for positive lesion was 72.1% (98/136 lesions). In 38 false-negative lesions with less than PI-RADS v2 category 3, the DCE-MRI detected 14 lesions. 17 undetectable lesions on o-mpMR criteria had lower PSA and D'amico risk classification, and higher tumor apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) than those of 118 detectable lesions ($p \leq 0.048$). 89 lesions with EEE showed higher the PSA, tumor size, prostatectomy GS grade, frequency of lesions with $GS \geq 4+3$ and lower tumor ADC than those in 38 lesions without EEE ($p \leq 0.046$).

Conclusion Tumor detectability of csPC with PI-RADS v2 was limited compared with o-mpMRI criteria in Japanese men. Moreover, false-negative lesions on o-mpMRI criteria were characterized as small in size, low risk and low cellularity.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Key words Magnetic resonance imaging; Prostate cancer; Tumor detection; Prostate Imaging and Reporting Data System Version 2; Dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

It has been reported that about 161,360 new prostate cancer (PC) cases in the United States and 86,100 new PC cases in the Japan were diagnosed in 2017, and the disease is the second and the sixth leading cause of cancer death for men, respectively [1, 2]. PC has been classified as clinically significant (cs) tumor, for which curative therapies such as radical prostatectomy are indicated, and clinically insignificant (ci) tumor, for which active surveillance using serum prostate-specific antigen (PSA) is indicated [3, 4]. Therefore, accurate pre-biopsy evaluation is essential to efficiently discriminate csPC from ciPC among multicentric PCs in each subject.

In recent years, prostate multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (mpMRI) has become the best diagnostic imaging tool for detecting csPCs [5, 6]. Moreover, in 2015, the Prostate Imaging and Reporting Data System Version 2 (PI-RADS v2) was standardized for the assessment of the probability (PI-RADS assessment category) of csPC using prostate mpMRI [3]. As a feature of PI-RADS v2, dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI (DCE-MRI) plays a minor role in mpMRI for determining the PI-RADS assessment category [3], because it is said that absence of the early enhancement effect (EEE) within a lesion usually adds little information [3]. That is, this may mean lack of clinical knowledge of the difference between PCs with the EEE and PCs without the EEE. On the other hand, PI-RADS v2 shows a higher rate of false-negative results for csPC detection within the low PI-RADS assessment category [7-12]. In addition, in usual clinical practice, we often see csPCs with a false-negative result showing a low PI-RADS assessment category that could detect the lesion using the conventional overall assessment using mpMRI including T2-weighted fast spin-echo (FSE) imaging (T2WI), diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI), and DCE-MRI, not

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

PI-RADS v2. On the other hand, a fraction of csPCs that are not detected by the overall assessment using mpMRI also exist; that is, they are undetectable by all three sequences. [6, 13-17]. Only a few previous studies have assessed the clinical and biological differences between detectable and undetectable csPCs on mpMRI including DCE-MRI [15, 16, 18-20]. In particular, the differences between csPCs with the EEE and csPCs without the EEE remain unclear [16]. Accordingly, a multidimensional analysis to understand such characteristics in csPCs showing false-negative results on mpMRI may provide useful information for the next revision of PI-RADS to further improve the diagnostic accuracy of csPC.

Therefore, the aim of this study was to clarify the clinicopathological features of false-negative clinically significant PC (csPC) on mpMRI.

Materials and Methods

Patient selection

35 This single-center retrospective study was approved by the local institutional review
36 board with a waiver of the requirement for written, informed consent.
37
38

39 A total of 100 consecutive patients with biopsy-proven prostate
40 adenocarcinoma who underwent prostate mpMRI followed by radical prostatectomy at
41 our institution were initially identified. Then, 143 PCs with tumor diameter larger than 5
42 mm and Gleason score (GS) $\geq 3+3$ were identified from detailed diagrams mapping the
43 location of tumors within the prostate at the time of radical prostatectomy. In addition, a
44 lesion with GS ≥ 7 and tumor size ≥ 5 mm or a lesion with GS=3+3 and tumor size ≥ 0.5
45 mL (tumor size ≥ 8 mm in diameter) was considered a csPC, which was the focus of this
46 study. Of these, 4 PCs with GS=3+3 and tumor size < 0.5 mL were excluded. These
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

exclusions resulted in a final study cohort of 95 patients with 139 PCs (Fig. 1). No patient had undergone any treatment for PC at the time of the prostate MRI examination. The clinicopathological features of the study population are summarized in Table 1.

MRI

After intramuscular administration of buscopan or glucagon to decrease intestinal peristalsis, all MRI examinations were performed under the fasting condition using a 3-T scanner with a 16-channel phased-array coil (Toshiba Medical Systems, Tochigi, Japan).

MRI protocols included axial T1-weighted FSE imaging, axial and coronal T2WI, axial fat-suppressed single-shot echo-planar DWI, and axial DCE-MRI. DWI was acquired with motion-probing gradient (MPG) pulses applied sequentially along three orthogonal orientations following acquisition at b values of 0 and 2000 s/mm². ADC maps were reconstructed by calculating the ADC in each pixel of each slice, and the ADC values were calculated by a mono-exponential fitting for a pair of b values (0 and 2000 s/mm²). Data acquisition for DCE-MRI began simultaneously with the start of intravenous injection of a gadolinium-based contrast medium of 0.1 mmol/kg body weight at a rate of 3 mL/s (meglumine gadoterate (Magnescope; Guerbet Japan, Tokyo, Japan) or gadopentetate dimeglumine (Magnevist; Bayer Schering Pharma, Osaka, Japan)) or 1.5 mL/s (gadobutrol (Gadovist; Bayer Schering Pharma)) via a power injector, followed by a 40-mL saline flush at the same rate as contrast medium injection. Multiphase DCE-MRI images were obtained every 30 seconds for 180 seconds (six phases) in 64 patients with 94 lesions or every 7 seconds for 210 seconds (30 phases) in 23 patients with 33 lesions without breath-holding. T2WI and DWI were acquired in all

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

95 patients with 139 lesions, while DCE-MRI was performed in 88 patients with 127 lesions (Fig. 1). The detailed technical parameters of the mpMRI pulse sequences are shown in Table 2.

Histopathologic examination

The radical prostatectomy specimens underwent standard step sections at 4 to 6-mm intervals, with subsequent hematoxylin-eosin staining. A uropathologist with 22 years of experience who was blinded to the MRI findings recorded tumor location, tumor diameter, and the GS of all tumor foci, and the locations of extraprostatic extension (EPE) on a standardized diagram of the prostate. EPE was defined histopathologically as the presence of cancer cells beyond the prostatic capsular margin, extending into the periprostatic adipose tissue [21]. The GS of each tumor was evaluated according to the 2014 International Society of Urological Pathology Modified Gleason Grading System [22].

Image analysis and data collection

Two blinded radiologists (Blinded, with fellowship-trained abdominal radiologists with 5 and 19 years of experience in prostate MRI) and the same uropathologist reviewed all MRI examinations in conjunction with the standardized diagrams of the prostate and determined the location of each tumor indicated by histopathology on multiparametric MRI, mainly T2WI. If a tumor was indistinct on T2WI, DWI and DCE-MRI were used to localize the lesion. This matching was performed by taking into account the tumor size and overall position in the craniocaudal, anteroposterior, and left-right planes on both the MR images and pathologic maps.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The same two radiologists independently assessed the mpMRI of each tumor using PI-RADS v2. These radiologists had two years of experience in image interpretation using PI-RADS v2 prior to this study. Each radiologist assigned each tumor a score of 1 to 5 for T2WI, a score of 1 to 5 for DWI, positive or negative for DCE-MRI, and the overall PI-RADS assessment category according to PI-RADS v2 [3]. Next, the reviewers reassessed in consensus the mpMRI of tumors for which the score of each sequence and PI-RADS assessment category were discrepant for a given outcome, and they determined the final score of the three sequences and the final PI-RADS assessment category. In addition, on DCE-MRI, the degree of the EEE to 90 seconds after contrast medium administration in each tumor was classified as none (score 0), weak (score 1), moderate (score 2), or strong (score 3) enhancement using a four-point scale. Furthermore, the reviewers determined the presence or absence of EPE according to previously described criteria [23]. These consensus data including the T2WI score, DWI score, positive or negative for DCE-MRI, and EEE score on DCE-MRI were used to determine the final overall PI-RADS assessment category and the overall mpMRI criteria. For tumor detection using the final overall PI-RADS assessment category after consensus reading, categories 1 and 2 were considered negative, and categories 3, 4, and 5 were considered positive. For tumor detection using the overall mpMRI criteria, if each tumor showed positive findings (score 4 or 5 on T2WI, score 4 or 5 on DWI, and EEE score 2 or 3 on DCE-MRI in consensus data mentioned above) on at least one of the three MRI sequences including T2WI, DWI, and DCE-MRI, the lesion was classified as detectable tumor [24]. The remaining lesions were classified as undetectable tumors. The ADC of each tumor was also measured using the region of interest (ROI) placement technique for the ADC map by the same

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

two radiologists by consensus. Each ROI was a circle or oval and was chosen to be as large as possible. The volume and mean ADC value of each ROI were recorded.

Clinical data collection

A study coordinator (blinded) reviewed the medical and pathology records. Clinical data included age at MRI, initial serum PSA level, prostate volume by preoperative transrectal ultrasound (TRUS), PSA density (ng/mL/cm³), tumor size, tumor location (PZ, central zone (CZ), and transition zone (TZ)), prostatectomy GS, D'Amico risk classification, and pathological staging (T stage, N stage, and M stage).

Statistical analysis

All statistical tests were performed at the 5% significance level using SPSS for Windows v. 24.0 software (SPSS, Chicago, IL). For the statistical analysis, it was assumed that the multiple lesions per subject were independent. The kappa statistic was used to estimate the inter-reader agreement of the scores for T2WI, DWI, and DCE-MRI and the PI-RADS assessment category between two reviewers. Kappa values of less than 0.20 indicated poor agreement, 0.21–0.40 indicated fair agreement, 0.41–0.60 indicated moderate agreement, 0.61–0.80 indicated good agreement, and 0.81 or higher indicated excellent agreement. The clinical and MRI characteristics were compared a) between undetectable PCs on overall mpMRI criteria and detectable PCs on overall mpMRI criteria and b) between undetectable PCs on DCE-MRI (EEE score 0 or 1) and detectable PCs on DCE-MRI (EEE score 2 or 3) using Fisher's exact test, the χ^2 test, and the Mann-Whitney U test, as appropriate. Age, PSA level, PSA density, prostate volume on TRUS, tumor size, prostatectomy GS grade (GS=3+3, grade 1;

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

GS=3+4, grade 2; GS=4+3, grade 3; GS=3+5, grade 4; GS=4+4, grade 5; GS=4+5, grade 6), D'Amico risk classification (low=1, intermediate=2, high=3), tumor ADC, ROI size on tumor ADC measurement, T2WI score, DWI score, and overall PI-RADS assessment category were compared using the Mann-Whitney U test. The frequency of tumor location (PZ or TZ), prostatectomy Gleason score 1 (GS=3+3 or GS \geq 3+4), prostatectomy Gleason score 2 (GS \leq 3+4 or GS \geq 4+3), pathological T stage (pT2 or pT3), and suspected EPE (yes or no) were compared using Fisher's exact test or the χ^2 test. A tumor in CZ was included as PZ tumor for the statistical analysis of tumor location. The significance of the difference in the EEE score between tumors with GS=3+3, tumors with GS=3+4, and tumors with GS \geq 4+3 was assessed using the Kruskal-Wallis test. If the *p* value from the Kruskal-Wallis test was less than 0.05, pairwise comparisons between groups of two were performed using the Mann-Whitney U test.

Results

Inter-reader agreement for assessment of mpMRI using PI-RADS v2

For inter-reader agreement between two readers, the kappa value was 0.888 for the T2WI score, 0.951 for the DWI score, 0.929 for the DCE-MRI score, and 0.960 for the overall PI-RADS assessment category, indicating excellent agreement for all.

Tumor detection ability in prostate cancer using PI-RADS v2

Table 3 demonstrates the results of assessment of mpMRI using PI-RADS v2 in 136 csPCs (95 patients) (Fig. 1). In lesion-based and patient-based analyses using a PI-RADS assessment category cutoff of 3 or more for positive tumor detection on mpMRI, the detection rates were 72.1% (98/136 lesions) and 83.2% (79/95 patients),

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

respectively. In 38 lesions with a PI-RADS assessment category less than 3, 4 lesions (all PZ), 7 lesions (all TZ), and 14 lesions (PZ in 6 and TZ in 8) showed positive MRI findings on T2WI (score 4 or 5), DWI (score 4 or 5), and DCE-MRI (moderate or strong EEE), respectively (Figs. 2 and 3). Among the 38 lesions, two lesions with a DWI score less than 3 in PZ were not assessed for the overall PI-RADS assessment category due to lack of DCE-MRI. Of the remaining 36 lesions, 22 (PZ in 9 and TZ in 13) (PI-RADS assessment category 1 in 9, category 2 in 13) (61.1%) had a positive MRI finding on at least one of the three MRI sequences. On the other hand, in subgroup analyses using 103 lesions with $GS \geq 3+4$ (81 patients) and 95 lesions with $GS \geq 3+4$ and diameter ≥ 8 mm (≥ 0.5 cc) (76 patients), the tumor detection rates were 75.7% (78/103 lesions) and 77.9% (74/95 lesions), respectively.

Clinicopathological features of prostate cancers showing undetectable tumor on mpMRI

The results of the comparisons of clinical, pathological, and MRI characteristics between PCs with detectable tumor (detectable mpMRI group) and with undetectable tumor (undetectable mpMRI group) on overall mpMRI criteria are summarized in Table 4 (Figs. 1 and 4). The PSA, PSA density, and D'Amico risk classification were significantly lower in the undetectable mpMRI group than in the detectable mpMRI group, suggesting lower risk tumor in the undetectable mpMRI group ($p=0.042$ to 0.048) (Table 4). In addition, the tumor ADC was significantly higher in the undetectable mpMRI group than in the detectable mpMRI group, suggesting lower cellularity in the undetectable mpMRI group ($p<0.001$).

Clinicopathological features of prostate cancers with the EEE on DCE-MRI

Table 5 shows the results of the comparisons of clinical, pathological, and MRI characteristics between PCs with (early enhancement group) and without (no early enhancement group) the EEE on DCE-MRI in 88 patients with 127 lesions (Fig. 1). In comparisons between the groups, there were significant differences in the PSA, tumor size, mean prostatectomy GS grade, prostatectomy GS 2 ($GS \leq 3+4$ vs. $GS \geq 4+3$), and tumor ADC ($p=0.001$ to 0.046), suggesting larger size, more aggressive tumor, such as $GS \geq 4+3$, and higher cellularity in the early enhancement group. In addition, the T2WI score, DWI score, PI-RADS assessment category, and frequency of suspected EPE were significantly higher in the early enhancement group than in the no early enhancement group, suggesting that tumors with the EEE were easy to detect on T2WI and DWI ($p < 0.001$ to 0.034). The EEE score was significantly greater for tumors with $GS \geq 4+3$ than for tumors with $GS=3+3$ and tumors with $GS=3+4$ ($p=0.003$ and 0.022 , respectively), but no significant difference between tumors with $GS=3+3$ and tumors with $GS=3+4$ ($p=0.437$) (Table 6).

Discussion

First, the ability of PI-RADS v2 to detect csPC was evaluated using radical prostatectomy as the reference standard. The false-negative rate was 27.9% on a per-lesion basis. However, the use of overall mpMRI criteria detected 61.1% (22/36 lesions) of lesions with a false-negative result (PI-RADS assessment category 1 or 2). In particular, DCE-MRI, which has a minor role for the determination of the PI-RADS v2 assessment category, led to a positive result for more false-negative lesions than T2WI and DWI [3]. Therefore, the present results showed that further revision of PI-RADS

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

including re-evaluation of DCE-MRI is warranted to improve the diagnostic accuracy for the detection of csPCs [11]. In addition, the remaining 14 lesions were not detected (10.1%; 14/139 lesions) even with these assessments. Therefore, particularly on initial prostate biopsy, in addition to MRI-ultrasound fusion targeted prostate biopsy for lesions with highly suspicious mpMRI, conventional systematic biopsy for lesions that are undetectable on either mpMRI sequence will need to be performed for reliable detection of csPCs [25-27]. On the other hand, the false-negative rate for the detection of csPCs using PI-RADS v2 was higher in the present study than in previous reports (27.9% vs. 2.7% (11/410 lesions [8]) to 9.3% (15/162 lesions [9]). This difference may be the result of differences in the definition of csPC, age of onset, biological aggressiveness, and tumor size in PC between Western countries and Japan [28-31] and the acquisition methods of mpMRI. However, in the subgroup analyses of present study, the false-negative rate decreased by loosening the definition of csPC.

Next, the 17 undetectable tumors on overall mpMRI criteria were characterized by relatively low-risk PC, in comparison with the detectable tumors. In addition, the undetectable tumors tended to be small in size and low prostatectomy Gleason grade, with marginally significant differences ($p=0.074$ and 0.061 , respectively) (Table 4). Moreover, the lower cellularity with high tumor ADC values was also an important pathological characteristic of the undetectable tumors, indicating less aggressive PC [32-35]. With respect to tumor ADC using DWI with acquisition at b values of 0 and 2000 s/mm² with a 3-T scanner, the mean ADC value of 1.04×10^{-3} mm²/s in the undetectable tumors was equivalent to that of low-risk cancers with Gleason score ≤ 6 , since a previous study presented an ADC cut-off value of 0.92×10^{-3} mm²/s for differentiating between low-risk cancers with Gleason score ≤ 6 and intermediate or

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

high-risk cancers with Gleason score ≥ 7 [36]. Thus, although these undetectable tumors on mpMRI were classified as csPCs in the present study, an undetectable tumor on mpMRI with such features may be included in the category of ciPC by considering its biologic behavior. Further investigations will need to clarify the pathological and prognostic characteristics of such undetectable tumors on mpMRI to accurately differentiate between csPC and ciPC.

Finally, the tumors with the EEE tended to be larger in size, more aggressive, and detectable lesions even on T2WI and DWI, in comparison with the tumors without the EEE. In these results, interestingly, the difference in the prostatectomy Gleason grade between the groups was associated with the difference in the degree of tumors with $GS \leq 3+4$ and tumors with $GS \geq 4+3$, but not between tumors with $GS=3+3$ and tumors with $GS \geq 3+4$. In addition, there was a significant difference in the degree of the EEE between low-risk ($GS=3+3$) or intermediate-risk tumor ($GS=3+4$) and high-risk tumor ($GS \geq 4+3$). Thus, the neovascularization in PC may develop rapidly at the stage of high-risk tumor. Moreover, past studies showed that discriminating PCs with $GS \leq 3+4$ from PCs with $GS \geq 4+3$ is effective for patient prognosis and patient selection for active surveillance [37, 38]. Thus, the EEE on DCE-MRI in addition to tumor ADC, which has high discrimination ability between PCs with $GS \leq 3+4$ and PCs with $GS \geq 4+3$, may be a new predictor for determination of risk stratification in PC [28, 34].

There are several limitations in this study. First, it was performed retrospectively in a single institution with a relatively limited sample size. Second, this study included only patients who underwent radical prostatectomy, suggesting patient selection bias. Third, we had two different kinds of multiphase DCE-MR sequences. Thus, the difference might have been influenced for assessment of DCE-MRI. Forth,

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

only pathologically true-positive lesions were used for csPC in this study. Therefore, diagnostic ability such as detection specificity and ROC analysis could not be assessed. Finally, detailed pathological assessments such as of the epithelium, stroma, and luminal space to clarify biologic features in false-negative csPCs on mpMRI were not performed in the present study.

In conclusion, tumor detectability of csPC with PI-RADS v2 was limited compared with overall mpMRI criteria in Japanese men. Moreover, false-negative lesions on overall mpMRI criteria were characterized as small in size, low-risk, and low cellularity. These observations demonstrate that further modification of PI-RADS is warranted to improve the detectability of csPCs. DCE-MRI may become a predictor of tumor aggressiveness in PC.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

1. American Cancer Society. Cancer facts and figures 2017.
<https://www.cancer.org/content/dam/cancer-org/research/cancer-facts-and-statistics/annual-cancer-facts-and-figures/2017/cancer-facts-and-figures-2017.pdf#search=%271.+American+Cancer+Society+%282017%29+Cancer+facts+and+figures+2017.%27>. Accessed March 29, 2018
2. Center for Cancer Control and Information Services, National Cancer Center Japan. Projected Cancer Statistics, 2017.
https://ganjoho.jp/en/public/statistics/short_pred.html. Accessed March 28, 2018
3. Weinreb JC, Barentsz JO, Choyke PL, Cornud F, Haider MA, Macura KJ, et al. PI-RADS Prostate Imaging - Reporting and Data System: 2015, Version 2. *Eur Urol.* 2016;69:16-40.
4. Mottet N, Bellmunt J, Bolla M, Briers E, Cumberbatch MG, De Santis M, et al. (2016) EAU-ESTRO-SIOG guidelines on prostate cancer. Part 1: screening, diagnosis, and local treatment with curative intent. *Eur Urol.* 71:618-629.
5. Hoeks CM, Barentsz JO, Hambrock T, Yakar D, Somford DM, Heijmink SW, et al. Prostate cancer: multiparametric MR imaging for detection, localization, and staging. *Radiology.* 2011;261:46-66.
6. Ahmed HU, El-Shater Bosaily A, Brown LC, Gabe R, Kaplan R, Parmar MK, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of multi-parametric MRI and TRUS biopsy in prostate cancer (PROMIS): a paired validating confirmatory study. *Lancet.* 2017;389:815-822.
7. Auer T, Edlinger M, Bektic J, Nagele U, Herrmann T, Schäfer G, et al. Performance of PI-RADS version 1 versus version 2 regarding the relation with histopathological results. *World J Urol.* 2017;35:687-693.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

8. Greer MD, Shih JH, Lay N, Barrett T, Kayat Bittencourt L, Borofsky S, et al. Validation of the Dominant Sequence Paradigm and Role of Dynamic Contrast-enhanced Imaging in PI-RADS Version 2. *Radiology*. 2017;285:859-869.
9. Borofsky S, George AK, Gaur S, Bernardo M, Greer MD, Mertan FV, et al. What Are We Missing? False-Negative Cancers at Multiparametric MR Imaging of the Prostate. *Radiology*. 2018;286:186-195.
10. Seo JW, Shin SJ, Taik Oh Y, Jung DC, Cho NH, Choi YD, et al. PI-RADS Version 2: Detection of Clinically Significant Cancer in Patients With Biopsy Gleason Score 6 Prostate Cancer. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2017;209:W1-W9.
11. Rosenkrantz AB, Babb JS, Taneja SS, Ream JM. Proposed Adjustments to PI-RADS Version 2 Decision Rules: Impact on Prostate Cancer Detection. *Radiology*. 2017;283:119-129.
12. Park SY, Jung DC, Oh YT, Cho NH, Choi YD, Rha KH, et al. Prostate Cancer: PI-RADS Version 2 Helps Preoperatively Predict Clinically Significant Cancers. *Radiology*. 2016;280:108-116.
13. Fütterer JJ, Briganti A, De Visschere P, Emberton M, Giannarini G, Kirkham A, 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.
14. de Rooij M, Hamoen EH, Fütterer JJ, Barentsz JO, Rovers MM. Accuracy of multiparametric MRI for prostate cancer detection: a meta-analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2014;202:343-351.
15. Le JD, Tan N, Shkoliar E, Lu DY, Kwan L, Marks LS, et al. Multifocality and prostate cancer detection by multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging:

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

correlation with whole-mount histopathology. *Eur Urol.* 2015;67:569-76.

16. Rosenkrantz AB, Mendrinos S, Babb JS, Taneja SS. Prostate cancer foci detected on multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging are histologically distinct from those not detected. *J Urol.* 2012;187:2032-2038.
17. Turkbey B, Pinto PA, Mani H, Bernardo M, Pang Y, McKinney YL, et al. Prostate cancer: value of multiparametric MR imaging at 3 T for detection--histopathologic correlation. *Radiology.* 2010;255:89-99.
18. Tan N, Margolis DJ, Lu DY, King KG, Huang J, Reiter RE, et al. Characteristics of Detected and Missed Prostate Cancer Foci on 3-T Multiparametric MRI Using an Endorectal Coil Correlated With Whole-Mount Thin-Section Histopathology. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2015;205:W87-92.
19. Truong M, Hollenberg G, Weinberg E, Messing EM, Miyamoto H, Frye TP. Impact of Gleason Subtype on Prostate Cancer Detection Using Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Correlation with Final Histopathology. *J Urol.* 2017;198:316-321.
20. Truong M, Feng C, Hollenberg G, Weinberg E, Messing EM, Miyamoto H, et al. A Comprehensive Analysis of Cribriform Morphology on Magnetic Resonance Imaging/Ultrasound Fusion Biopsy Correlated with Radical Prostatectomy Specimens. *J Urol.* 2018;199:106-113.
21. Ohori M, Kattan M, Scardino PT, Wheeler TM. Radical prostatectomy for carcinoma of the prostate. *Mod Pathol.* 2004;17:349-359.
22. Epstein JI, Egevad L, Amin MB, Delahunt B, Srigley JR, Humphrey PA ; Grading Committee. The 2014 International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) Consensus Conference on Gleason Grading of Prostatic Carcinoma: Definition of

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Grading Patterns and Proposal for a New Grading System. *Am J Surg Pathol.* 2016;40:244-252.

23. Tamada T, Sone T, Kanomata N, Miyaji Y, Kido A, Jo Y, et al. Value of preoperative 3T multiparametric MRI for surgical margin status in patients with prostate cancer. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2016;44:584-593.
24. Tamada T, Sone T, Higashi H, Jo Y, Yamamoto A, Kanki A, et al. Prostate cancer detection in patients with total serum prostate-specific antigen levels of 4-10 ng/mL: diagnostic efficacy of diffusion-weighted imaging, dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI, and T2-weighted imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2011;197:664-670.
25. Radtke JP, Schwab C, Wolf MB, Freitag MT, Alt CD, Kesch C, et al. Multiparametric Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and MRI-Transrectal Ultrasound Fusion Biopsy for Index Tumor Detection: Correlation with Radical Prostatectomy Specimen. *Eur Urol.* 2016;70:846-853.
26. Boesen L, Nørgaard N, Løgager V, Thomsen HS. Clinical Outcome Following Low Suspicion Multiparametric Prostate Magnetic Resonance Imaging or Benign Magnetic Resonance Imaging Guided Biopsy to Detect Prostate Cancer. *J Urol.* 2017;198:310-315.
27. Cash H, Günzel K, Maxeiner A, Stephan C, Fischer T, Durmus T, et al. Prostate cancer detection on transrectal ultrasonography-guided random biopsy despite negative real-time magnetic resonance imaging/ultrasonography fusion-guided targeted biopsy: reasons for targeted biopsy failure. *BJU Int.* 2016;118:35-43.
28. Tamada T, Prabhu V, Li J, Babb JS, Taneja SS, Rosenkrantz AB. Assessment of prostate cancer aggressiveness using apparent diffusion coefficient values: impact

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- of patient race and age. *Abdom Radiol (NY)*. 2017;42:1744-1751.
29. Zhou CK, Check DP, Lortet-Tieulent J, Laversanne M, Jemal A, Ferlay J, et al. Prostate cancer incidence in 43 populations worldwide: An analysis of time trends overall and by age group. *Int J Cancer*. 2016;138:1388-400.
30. Cook LS, Goldoft M, Schwartz SM, Weiss NS. Incidence of adenocarcinoma of the prostate in Asian immigrants to the United States and their descendants. *J Urol*. 1999;161:152-155.
31. Hsing AW, Tsao L, Devesa SS. International trends and patterns of prostate cancer incidence and mortality. *Int J Cancer*. 2000;85:60-67.
32. Zelhof B, Pickles M, Liney G, Gibbs P, Rodrigues G, Kraus S, et al. Correlation of diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance data with cellularity in prostate cancer. *BJU Int*. 2009;103:883-888.
33. De Cobelli F, Ravelli S, Esposito A, Giganti F, Gallina A, Montorsi F, et al. Apparent diffusion coefficient value and ratio as noninvasive potential biomarkers to predict prostate cancer grading: comparison with prostate biopsy and radical prostatectomy specimen. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2015;204:550-557.
34. Tamada T, Prabhu V, Li J, Babb JS, Taneja SS, Rosenkrantz AB. Prostate Cancer: Diffusion-weighted MR Imaging for Detection and Assessment of Aggressiveness-Comparison between Conventional and Kurtosis Models. *Radiology*. 2017;284:100-108.
35. Tamada T, Dani H, Taneja SS, Rosenkrantz AB. The role of whole-lesion apparent diffusion coefficient analysis for predicting outcomes of prostate cancer patients on active surveillance. *Abdom Radiol (NY)*. 2017;42:2340-2345.
36. Tamada T, Kanomata N, Sone T, Jo Y, Miyaji Y, Higashi H, et al. High b value

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(2,000 s/mm²) diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in prostate cancer at 3 Tesla: comparison with 1,000 s/mm² for tumor conspicuity and discrimination of aggressiveness. *PLoS One*. 2014;9:e96619.

37. Klotz L, Zhang L, Lam A, Nam R, Mamedov A, Loblaw A. Clinical results of long-term follow-up of a large, active surveillance cohort with localized prostate cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28:126-131.
38. Bul M, van den Bergh RC, Zhu X, Rannikko A, Vasarainen H, Bangma CH, et al. Outcomes of initially expectantly managed patients with low or intermediate risk screen-detected localized prostate cancer. *BJU Int*. 2012;110:1672-1677.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1. Clinicopathological characteristics of 95 patients with 139 prostate cancers

Item	Value
No. of patients	95
No. of prostate cancers	139
Age	
Median	69
Range	53-84
Initial PSA level (ng/mL)*	
Median	7.83
Range	1.20-38.17
Prostatectomy Gleason score	
Median	7
Score (no. of patients)	
3+3	8
3+3+4	5
3+4	41
3+4+5	2
3+5	1
4+3	27

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

4+3+5	4
4+4	3
4+5	4
Pathological tumor stage (no. of patients)	
T2a	3
T2b	0
T2c	59
T3a	25
T3b	8
D'Amico risk classification (no. of patients)	
Low	4
Intermediate	42
High	49
Lymph node metastasis present (no. of patients)	
	1
Distant metastasis present (no. of patients)	
	0

Note: Data are in 95 patients with histologically proved prostate cancer (adenocarcinoma) by prostatic resection.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2. Multiparametric MRI sequences and parameters

Sequence	T1-weighted FSE	T2-weighted FSE	T2-weighted FSE	DWI (Single-shot SE EPI)	DCE-MRI (3D GRE)	DCE-MRI (3D GRE)
Plane	Axial	Axial	Coronal	Axial	Axial	Axial
TR/TE (msec)	870/12	4300/120	5000/120	7100/95	5.5/2.5	4.0/1.3
Echo train length	4	19	19	NA	NA	NA
Flip angle (degrees)	NA	NA	NA	90	13	12
b values (s/mm ²)	NA	NA	NA	0 and 2000	NA	NA
Field of View (cm)	24 × 24	24 × 24	24 × 24	36 × 36	35 × 35	35 × 28
Matrix Size	320 × 256	384 × 384	512 × 192	128 × 256	320 × 192	192 × 144
No. of excitation	1	4	1	3	1	1
Slices thickness (mm)	3	3	3	4	3	3
Parallel Imaging Factor	2	1.8	NA	2.5	2	2.3
No. of temporal acquisitions					6	30
Temporal resolution (sec)					30	7

TR repetition time, *TE* echo time, *FSE* fast spin-echo, *DWI* diffusion-weighted imaging,

EPI echo-planar imaging, *DCE-MRI* dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging, *GRE*

gradient-echo, *NA* not applicable

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 3. Classification of PI-RADS v2 category with mpMRI of 136 clinically significant prostate cancer lesions in 95 patients

PI-RADS v2 assessment category	Total number of lesions	PZ lesion	TZ lesion	Both PZ and TZ lesion
1	18	10	8	
2	20	8	12	
3	12	1	11	
4	59	48*	10	1
5	27	17	8	2

Note.—Data are in 136 clinically significant prostatic adenocarcinomas with 95 patients who underwent radical prostatectomy.

*Data includes a lesion in central zone.

PI-RADS v2 Prostate Imaging and Reporting Data System Version 2, *mpMRI*

multiparametric MRI, *PZ* peripheral zone, *TZ* transition zone

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 4. Clinical and MRI characteristics of clinically significant prostatic cancers with undetectable tumors or detectable tumors on prostate multiparametric MRI

Data	Undetectable tumor on	Detectable tumor on	<i>P</i> value
	mpMRI (<i>n</i> = 17)	mpMRI (<i>n</i> = 118)	
Age (y)*	67.1 ± 4.34	68.6 ± 5.59	0.204
PSA (ng/mL)*	7.99 ± 4.91	10.6 ± 6.89	0.048
PSA density (ng/mL/cm ³)*	0.33 ± 0.22	0.49 ± 0.40	0.045
Prostate volume on TRUS (cm ³)*	26.2 ± 7.21	24.7 ± 9.76	0.315
Tumor size (mm)*	11.9 ± 4.00	13.9 ± 5.12	0.074
Tumor location [†]			0.364
Peripheral zone	9 (53)	74 (64)	
Transition zone	8 (47)	41 (36)	
Mean prostatectomy Gleason grade*	2.00 ± 1.17	2.40 ± 0.99	0.061
Prostatectomy Gleason score 1 [†]			0.373
GS = 3+3	5 (29)	27 (23)	
GS ≥ 3+4	12 (71)	91 (77)	
Prostatectomy Gleason score 2 [†]			0.160
GS ≤ 3+4	14 (82)	77 (65)	
GS ≥ 4+3	3 (18)	41 (35)	
D'Amico risk classification [†]			0.042
Low	2 (12)	4 (4)	
Intermediate	9 (53)	44 (37)	

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

High	6 (35)	70 (59)	
Pathological			0.217
T stage [†]			
T2	13 (76)	72 (61)	
T3	4 (24)	46 (39)	
Tumor ADC* ($\times 10^{-3}$ mm ² /s)	1.04 \pm 0.15	0.76 \pm 0.24	< 0.001
Region of interest* (mm ²) on tumor ADC measurement	28.4 \pm 22.7	30.1 \pm 20.2	0.674
Suspected extracapsular extension [†]			0.214
Yes	1 (6)	20 (17)	
No	16 (94)	98 (83)	

Note.—Data are in 17 undetectable prostatic adenocarcinomas on mpMRI with 16 patients and 118 detectable prostatic adenocarcinomas on mpMRI with 87 patients who underwent radical prostatectomy.

*Data are the mean \pm standard deviation.

[†]Numbers in parentheses are percentages.

mpMRI multiparametric MRI, *PSA* prostate-specific antigen, *TRUS* transrectal ultrasound, *ADC* apparent diffusion coefficient

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 5. Clinical and MRI characteristics of clinically significant prostatic cancers with the early enhancement effect or without the early enhancement effect on dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI

Data	Tumor without early enhancement effect on	Tumor with early enhancement effect on	<i>P</i> value
	DCE-MRI (<i>n</i> = 38)	DCE-MRI (<i>n</i> = 89)	
Age (y)*	68.0 ± 3.89	68.6 ± 5.59	0.418
PSA (ng/mL)*	8.40 ± 5.71	10.9 ± 6.96	0.031
PSA density (ng/mL/cm ³)*	0.35 ± 0.19	0.51 ± 0.42	0.059
Prostate volume on TRUS (cm ³)*	24.4 ± 7.28	25.1 ± 9.97	0.963
Tumor size (mm)*	12.4 ± 4.63	14.4 ± 5.20	0.015
Tumor location [†]			0.908
35 Peripheral zone	23 (61)	53 (62)	
36 Transition zone	15 (39)	33 (38)	
37			
38			
39 Mean prostatectomy	2.03 ± 1.08	2.34 ± 1.11	0.017
40 Gleason grade*			
41			
42 Prostatectomy			0.219
43			
44 Gleason score 1 [†]			
45 GS = 3+3	12 (32)	19 (21)	
46 GS ≥ 3+4	26 (68)	70 (79)	
47			
48 Prostatectomy			0.046
49			
50 Gleason score 2 [†]			
51 GS ≤ 3+4	30 (79)	54 (61)	
52 GS ≥ 4+3	8 (21)	35 (39)	
53			
54			
55 D'Amico risk			0.166
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			
61			
62			
63			
64			
65			

classification [†]			
Low	3 (8)	3 (3)	
Intermediate	17 (45)	33 (37)	
High	18 (47)	53 (60)	
Pathological			0.265
T stage [†]			
T2	27 (71)	54 (61)	
T3	11 (29)	35 (39)	
Tumor ADC* ($\times 10^{-3}$ mm ² /s)	0.90 \pm 0.26	0.76 \pm 0.24	0.001
Region of interest* (mm ²) on tumor ADC measurement	26.2 \pm 18.1	32.2 \pm 21.7	0.113
T2-weighted imaging score*	2.82 \pm 1.11	3.58 \pm 1.16	0.001
DWI score*	2.89 \pm 1.27	3.78 \pm 1.07	< 0.001
PI-RADS v2 assessment category*	2.66 \pm 1.28	3.76 \pm 1.16	< 0.001
Suspected extracapsular extension [†]			0.034
Yes	2 (5)	18 (20)	
No	36 (95)	71 (80)	

Note.—Data are in 38 undetectable prostatic adenocarcinomas on DCE-MRI with 30 patients and 89 detectable prostatic adenocarcinomas on DCE-MRI with 71 patients who underwent radical prostatectomy.

*Data are the mean \pm standard deviation.

[†]Numbers in parentheses are percentages.

DCE-MRI dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI, *PSA* prostate-specific antigen, *TRUS*

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

transrectal ultrasound, *ADC* apparent diffusion coefficient, *DWI* diffusion-weighted imaging, *PI-RADS v2* Prostate Imaging and Reporting Data System Version 2

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 6. Comparison of the degree of the early enhancement effect on dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI among three Gleason score groups

	GS = 3+3 (n=31)	GS = 3+4 (n=53)	GS ≥ 4+3 (n=43)	<i>P</i> value at Kruskal-Wallis test
EEE score*	1.74 ± 0.18 [†]	1.89 ± 0.16 [‡]	2.40 ± 0.13	0.01

Note.—Data are in 31 prostatic adenocarcinomas with GS = 3+3, 53 prostatic adenocarcinomas with GS = 3+4, and 43 prostatic adenocarcinomas with GS ≥ 4+3 in 88 patients who underwent radical prostatectomy.

*Data are the mean ± standard deviation.

[†]Significantly different from the GS ≥ 4+3 at P=0.003.

[‡]Significantly different from the GS ≥ 4+3 at P=0.022

EEE early enhancement effect, GS Gleason score

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure legends

Fig. 1: Patient selection flowchart.

GS, Gleason score; PI-RADS v2, Prostate Imaging and Reporting Data System Version 2; T2WI, T2-weighted imaging; DWI, diffusion-weighted imaging; DCE-MRI, dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI; PZ, peripheral zone.

Fig. 2: A 62-year-old man with prostate cancer (prostate-specific antigen level of 6.35 ng/mL, PSA density of 0.13 ng/mL/cm³) in the middle right region in the peripheral zone (pT2a, pN0, M0, R0, prostatectomy Gleason score of 4 + 5). (a) T2-weighted image shows an area of focal heterogeneous hypointensity with a capsule in the middle right region of the peripheral zone (arrow). (b) Apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) map shows an indistinct hypointense lesion (arrow). (c) DWI shows isointensity (arrow). (d) Early phase T1-weighted image on DCE-MRI shows focal strong early enhancement (arrow). The lesion was assigned a T2-weighted imaging score of 3, DWI/ADC map score of 2, and DCE-MRI score of positive. The overall category of PI-RADS v2 is 2. (e) Photograph of a macroscopic specimen shows the location of the cancer lesion (arrow).

Fig. 3: A 70-year-old man with prostate cancer (prostate-specific antigen level of 12.4 ng/mL, PSA density of 0.50 ng/mL/cm³) in the bilateral anterior region in the transition zone. (pT2c, pN0, M0, R0, prostatectomy Gleason score of 4 + 3). (a) T2-weighted image shows an area of heterogeneous hypointensity in the apex region of the transition zone (arrow). (b) Apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) map shows indistinct hypointensity (arrow). (c) No abnormal signal intensity is observed on DWI (arrow). (d)

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Early phase T1-weighted image on DCE-MRI shows focal moderate early enhancement (arrow). The lesion was assigned a T2-weighted imaging score of 2, DWI/ADC map score of 2, and DCE-MRI score of positive. By PI-RADS v2 decision rules, the overall category is 2. (e) Photograph of a macroscopic specimen shows the location of the cancer lesion (arrow).

Fig. 4: A 66-year-old man with prostate cancer (prostate-specific antigen level of 4.25 ng/mL, PSA density of 0.18 ng/mL/cm³) in the middle right region of the peripheral zone (pT2a, pN0, M0, R0, prostatectomy Gleason score of 3 + 3). (a) T2-weighted image shows an area of diffuse slightly low signal intensity in the middle right region of the peripheral zone (arrow). (b), (c) No abnormal signal intensity is observed on the apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) map and DWI. (d) Early phase T1-weighted image on DCE-MRI shows no focal early enhancement. The lesion was assigned a T2-weighted imaging score of 2, DWI/ADC map score of 1, and DCE-MRI score of negative. By PI-RADS v2 decision rules, the overall category is 1. (e) Photograph of a macroscopic specimen shows the location of the cancer lesion (arrow).

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65































