Prostate Int 4 (2016) 11–14

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Prostate International

journal homepage: http://p-international.com

Original Article

Incidental prostate cancer in transurethral resection of prostate specimens in men aged up to 65 years

Marlon Perera [1, 2, *], Nathan Lawrentschuk [2, 3, 4], Nayomi Perera [2], Damien Bolton [2, 3], David Clouston [5]

[1] School of Medicine, University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD, Australia
[2] Department of Surgery, University of Melbourne, VIC, Australia
[3] Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research, Austin Hospital, Heidelberg, VIC, Australia
[4] Department of Urology, Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
[5] Tissue Path, Glen Waverly, VIC, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 10 August 2015
Received in revised form
25 September 2015
Accepted 28 October 2015
Available online 26 November 2015

Keywords:
Incidental prostate cancer
Prostatic neoplasms
Radical prostatectomy
Surgery
Transurethral resection of prostate

ABSTRACT

Background: The identification of prostate cancer (PC) is important in men aged ≤ 65 years. We examined complete transurethral resection of prostate (TURP) specimens to quantify the incidence and nature of PC in men aged ≤ 65 years.
Methods: A prospective multi-institutional database included TURP specimens. The cohort was stratified into two groups according to age. For men aged ≤ 65 years, the entire specimen was submitted for histological analysis, while the TURP specimens from men aged > 65 years were sampled following standard guidelines.
Results: A total of 923 men were included, with 224 in the younger group. PC was identified in 13.4% in men aged ≤ 65 years, compared with 28.7% the older group. The younger group had a lower proportion of Gleason score ≥ 7 (30% compared with 40%) and higher rates of pT1a (57% compared with 43%). In men aged ≤ 65 years with cancer, tumor was identified in one block in 15 of 30 cases (50%). Following diagnosis, 4/30 underwent radical prostatectomy, 5/30 underwent curative radiotherapy, 10/30 androgen deprivation, and 1/30 received palliative radiotherapy.
Conclusion: Incidental PC in men aged ≤ 65 years is not uncommon. Our results suggest that TURP specimens in men aged ≤ 65 years should be completely assessed. Underidentification of cancer may occur as a result of increasing use of laser prostatectomy and the consequent loss of tissue for pathological examination.

1. Introduction

Prostate cancer is common, presenting clinically in 8% of men. On autopsy, up to 60% of 70-year-olds and 80% of 80-year-olds are found to have latent prostate cancer.[1] The landmark study by Bill-Axelson et al[2] in 2011, confirmed early prostatectomy was significantly associated with reduced mortality when compared with watchful waiting. At 23-year follow up, men aged ≤ 65 years experienced the greatest oncological benefit, with a reduction in overall mortality of 25.5% and a prostate cancer death reduction of 15.8% following prostatectomy.[3] Furthermore, this study reported that in men aged ≤ 65 years, the number needed to treat to avert one death was only four. These findings suggest that early prostate cancer diagnosis and management is critical in this younger population.

Transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) targets the transitional zone of the prostate. Prostate cancer isolated exclusively in the transitional zone (TZ) is uncommon, accounting for only 2–7% of all prostate cancers.[4–6] Several recent studies have reported that cancer arising from the TZ have a more favorable prognosis than tumors that arise in the peripheral zone (PZ).[4,7] As a result, several groups argue that the TURP specimen may hold limited diagnostic value.[8] In the postprostate-specific antigen (PSA) testing era, incidental prostate cancer (ICP) on TURP remains common, occurring in 4.1–16.7% of TURP specimens.[9,10] Despite

* Corresponding author. Department of Urology, Austin Health, 145 Studley Rd, Heidleberg, Melbourne, Victoria 3084, Australia.
E-mail address: marlonlperera@gmail.com (M. Perera).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.prnil.2015.10.016

this prevalence, oncological outcomes have been poorly studied, with small series suggesting favorable survival.[11]

Unfortunately, there is no consensus on pathological assessment of TURP specimens. *Standard handling* of these specimens includes embedding and analyzing only part of larger specimen. The College of American Pathologists (CAP) recommend that specimens weighing ≤ 12 g should be examined in entirety. For specimens weighing > 12 g, the initial 12 g should be assessed with the addition of 2 g of tissue for every 10 g of specimen.[12–14] Intuitively, embedding the entire TURP specimen for histological examination will lead to a higher rate of identification of prostate cancer.[15] Despite this, literature suggests that partial assessment detects up to 90–100% of incidental cancer on TURP specimens.[16,17]

Given the importance of diagnosis in men aged ≤ 65 years as outlined, there is an argument for assessment of the entire specimen in men of this age group. In the current study, we aimed to determine the frequency of incidental cancer on TURP accurately in men aged ≤ 65 years by completely assessing pathological specimens. Outcomes produced by Bill-Axelson et al[2] are not directly comparable with the incidental PC and thus we further aimed to establish the prostate cancer outcomes in these young patients following diagnosis. This information is of interest in the climate of laser prostatectomy, which is characterized by the absence of pathological specimens for analysis.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Patients

Following Human Research and Ethic Committee (HREC) approval, a multisurgeon, multicentre database was prospectively collected and utilized for analysis. All consecutive TURP specimens collected between January 2010 and December 2013 were recruited for the study. Pathological assessment was conducted by a single-specialist uropathologist at a high-volume uropathology service. The cohort was subdivided into two discrete groups based on age; Group A represented men aged ≤ 65 years and Group B represented patients aged > 65 years.

2.2. Specimen handling

All specimens were weighed. To assess incidental cancer in Group A accurately, the complete resected specimen was embedded and submitted for histopathological analysis. In Group B, *standard handling* was performed on the specimen. For specimens weighing ≤ 10 g, the entire specimen was processed and examined histologically. For specimens weighing > 10 g, the first 10 g were processed with an additional 2 g for every 10 g of tissue resected. Thus, any specimen weight that exceeded 12 g marked the point at which a limited specimen would be assessed as per the *standard handling* protocol as outlined by CAP.[14]

The specimens were fixed in 10% neutral buffered formalin with overnight processing. A single hematoxylin and eosin-stained section was cut from each block and examined histologically. All foci were outlined on the glass slides and an estimate of tumor volume as a visual estimate of the percentage of surface area of tumor to the entire specimen determined. Gleason scoring was based on the 2005 International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) consensus guidelines. Small malignant foci were confirmed with immunoperoxidase stains using a cocktail of p504S (Dako, Carpinteria, CA, USA. Clone 13H4 dilution 1:50), 34BE12 (Dako, Carpinteria, CA, USA. Clone 34BE12 dilution 1:50) and p63 (Leica, Buffalo Grove, IL, USA. Clone 7JUL dilution 1:25), using the Ventana Ultra automated immunoperoxidase stainer, Roche, Switzerland).

Reporting of incidental cancer on TURP aligned with the CAP recommendations.[14] pT1a disease was defined as incidental tumor in ≤ 5% of TURP specimens. pT1b disease was defined as incidental tumor in > 5% of TURP specimens.

2.3. Data collection and analysis

Limited preoperative and postoperative data were collected from medical records. Such data included patient demographics. Follow-up data were collected prospectively in a similar method, variables collected included: subsequent transrectal ultrasonography (TRUS) biopsy, prostatectomy, radiotherapy, androgen deprivation, or chemotherapy.

Data were collated on an Excel 2003 database (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA). Statistical analysis was completed on SPSS statistical package v20 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA). Groups were classed based on the aforementioned age criterion. Chi-square *t* test was used to assess categorical data where possible. Two-sided $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

3. Results

A total of 923 patients were recruited into the study, 224 in Group A and 699 in Group B. The patient demographics and cancer detection rates are outlined in Table 1. On histopathological assessment of the TURP specimen, prostate cancer was diagnosed in 13.4% of the younger group and 28.7% in the older group. The younger group had a higher proportion of low-volume disease (pT1a). Of the diagnosed prostate cancers, the 92.2% were of acinar adenocarcinoma subtype, with similar proportions between subgroups. Within the younger group, a significantly higher rate of low-grade prostate cancer was diagnosed (Gleason score ≤ 6).

Each group was further subdivided into categories based on specimen weight. Within the younger group, 57% of the patients diagnosed with cancer had a specimen weight > 12 g. In the younger group, the median number of blocks embedded for analysis was seven (range, 1–27) and the median number of positive blocks with cancer was one (range, 1–5). In the younger group, 15/30 cancers diagnosed had cancer in only one block. These results are summarized in Table 2.

Following TURP, of the men in Group A diagnosed with cancer, 6/30 underwent TRUS biopsy. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 1
Patient Demographics and Cancer Detection Rates in Each Group.

	Group A (age ≤ 65 y)	Group B (age > 65 y)	*P*
n	224	699	
Specimen weight (g)	14.0 (2–65)	11.0 (0.1–74)	0.33
Prostate cancer	30 (13.4%)	213 (28.7%)	< 0.001
pT1a	17	92	
pT1b	13	115	
Acinar	27	197	0.50
Ductal	3	12	
Urothelial	0	4	
HGPIN	8 (3.6%)	24 (3.1%)	0.9

HGPIN, High-grade Prostatic Intraepithelial Neoplasia.

Table 2
Proportion of Patients in Each Group Categorized by Diagnosis and Specimen Weight.

Diagnosis	Group A (age ≤ 65 y)		Group B (age > 65 y)	
Specimen weight (g)	< 12	> 12	< 12	> 12
Benign	91 (48.9)	95 (51.1)	290 (55.7)	231 (44.3)
Malignant	13 (43.3)	17 (56.6)	113 (53.1)	100 (46.9)

Data are presented as *n* (%).