+Model DIII-910; No. of Pages 6

ARTICLE IN PRESS

Diagnostic and Interventional Imaging (2017) xxx, xxx-xxx





ORIGINAL ARTICLE / Genitourinary imaging

Comparison of semi-automated and manual methods to measure the volume of prostate cancer on magnetic resonance imaging

- L. Marin^a, M. Ezziane^b, E. Comperat^c, P. Mozer^d,
- G. Cancel-Tassine, J.-F. Cotéf, D. Racoceanua,
- F. Boudghene^g, O. Lucidarme^b, O. Cussenot^{e,h},
- R. Renard Penna b,e,g,*
- ^a Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, Engineering Department, Electrical and Electronics Section, Medical Imaging Lab, San Miguel, Lima 32, Peru
- ^b Academic Department of Radiology, Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, AP—HP, UPMC University Paris 06, 75013 Paris, France
- ^c Academic Department of Pathology, Hôpital Tenon, AP—HP, UPMC University Paris 06, 75020 Paris, France
- ^d Academic Department of Urology, Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, AP—HP, UPMC University Paris 06, 75013 Paris, France
- ^e GRC5, ONCOTYPE-Uro, Institut Universitaire de Cancérologie, 75020 Paris, France
- ^f Academic Department of Pathology, Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, AP—HP, UPMC University Paris 06, 75013 Paris, France
- ^g Academic Department of Radiology, Tenon, Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospitals, AP—HP, UPMC University Paris 06, Paris, France
- ^h Academic Department of Urology, Hôpital Tenon, AP—HP, UPMC University Paris 06, 75020 Paris, France

KEYWORDS

Prostate neoplasms; Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI); Index lesion; Tumor volume; Comparative studies

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to determine the accuracy of manual semi-automated and volumetric measurements to assess prostate cancer volume on multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (MP-MRI) using whole-mount histopathology for validation.

Materials and methods: We evaluated 30 consecutive men (median age, 65.7 years; interquartile range [IQR], 61.5-70.9 years) with a median prostatic specific antigen of $8.5\,\text{ng/dL}$ (IQR, $5.5-10.5\,\text{ng/dL}$), who underwent MP-MRI before radical prostatectomy. Index tumor volume

Abbreviations: MP-MRI, multiparametric MRI; MTD, maximal tumor diameter; MREV, magnetic resonance elipsoid volume; MROV, magnetic resonance OsiriX volume; HV, histologic volume; TV, tumor volume; R1, reader 1; R2, reader 2; ROI, region of interest.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.diii.2017.02.004

2211-5684/© 2017 Editions françaises de radiologie. Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article in press as: Marin L, et al. Comparison of semi-automated and manual methods to measure the volume of prostate cancer on magnetic resonance imaging. Diagnostic and Interventional Imaging (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.diii.2017.02.004

^{*} Corresponding author. UPMC, AP—HP, Hôpital Tenon, 4, rue de la Chine, 75020 Paris, France. *E-mail address*: raphaele.renardpenna@aphp.fr (R. Renard Penna).

2 L. Marin et al.

was determined prospectively and independently on the basis of MRI and whole-mount section volumetric assessment using the maximum histologic diameter (MHD) and the histologic volume (HV). The MRI index tumor volume was determined by two independent radiologists using a single measurement of the maximum tumor dimension (MTD), a simplified MR ellipsoid volume (MREV) calculation and a MR region of interest volume (MROV) segmentation displayed by a commercially available OsiriX[®]. MTD was compared to MHD, whereas MREV and MROV were compared to HV.

Results: Thirty index lesions (median HV, 1.514 cm³; IQR, 0.05-3.780 cm³) were analyzed. The MREV, MROV and HD were significantly correlated with each other (r > 0.5). Inter-observer agreement for measurements was good for each method (r > 0.780). The MTD was the best predictor of maximum histologic diameter (r = 0.980 and 0.791) and had an excellent intervariability correlation (P < 0.0001).

Conclusion: Prostate cancer histologic volume can be assessed using MREV or MROV with a good accuracy and low inter-observer variability. MTD has the lowest inter-observer variability and provides best degrees of correlation with MHD. MTD should be used on MRI for selecting and following patients for active surveillance and staging before focal treatment of prostate cancer. © 2017 Editions françaises de radiologie. Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

There is increasing interest in active surveillance and minimally invasive focal therapies for patients with prostate cancer. In this regard, image-guided tumor ablation has been developed to avoid morbidities associated with whole gland therapy. Tumor volume (TV) is a well-known prognostic factor of prostate cancer [1] and the definition of index lesion volume is important for appropriate decision making, especially for image-guided focal treatment [2] or in case of active surveillance [3]. Multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging (MP-MRI) is the modality of choice for detection and localization of prostate cancer foci [4-8]. However, little has been published on MP-MRI accuracy in determining prostate cancer volume, especially at 3T. There is insufficient evidence and no agreed consensus concerning which method of measurement should be used to determine tumor volume.

The purpose of our study was to determine the accuracy of manual semi-automated and volumetric measurements to assess prostate cancer volume on MP-MRI using whole-mount histopathology for validation.

Patients and methods

Patients

This is a retrospective analysis of a prospectively maintained database. We evaluated 30 consecutive men (median age, 65.7 years; interquartile range [IQR], 61.5—70.9 years) with a median prostatic specific antigen of 8.5 ng/dL (IQR, 5.5—10.5 ng/dL), who underwent MP-MRI before radical prostatectomy.

The current study was approved by the institutional review board and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

MP-MRI protocol

MP-MRI examinations were performed on a 3-T MR scanner (Magnetom Skyra®, Siemens AG, Erlangen, Germany)

using an 18-channel phased-array body coil. To suppress peristalsis, patients received 20 mg of butyl-scopolamine (Buscopan®, Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma, Ingelheim, Germany) intravenously before the examination. MP-MRI included T2-weighted imaging (T2W), diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI), and dynamic contrast- enhanced imaging (DCE). A T2-weighted three-dimensional (3D) turbo spinecho seguence with variable flip angle (3D SPACE seguence) was used in the axial plane. Axial diffusion-weighted imaging of the prostate, using b-values of 50, 400, and 2000 s/mm² was performed with inline reconstruction from an apparent diffusion-coefficient (ADC) map from which the ADC map was constructed on a voxel-wide basis with a standard mono-exponential. Dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI was obtained using a fat-saturated T1-weighted fast-field echo sequence. After acquisition of unenhanced T1-weighted MR images, dynamic sequences were further acquired after an intravenous administration of 0.2 mL/kg of gadoterate meglumine (Dotarem®; Guerbet, Roissy Charles de Gaulle, France). This study followed the START consortium guidelines [9].

Image analysis

MP-MRI images were analyzed independently by two uroradiologists with 11 years (R. R.-P., reader 2) and 3 years (M. E., reader 1) of experience in prostate imaging at the start of the study. They knew that patients had undergone radical prostatectomy but were blinded to other patient data. Readers evaluated the MR images obtained with the 3 pulse sequences during the same session. First, they evaluated all prostate lesions of the peripheral zone that showed low signal intensity on T2-weighted images and/or ADC maps and an early enhancement on DCE images. Then, they evaluated all transition zone lesions that showed homogeneous low signal intensity on T2-weighted images, with ill-defined margins, no capsule, and no cyst [10].

All MRI sequences were used to assess TV of the index lesion, whereas the following measurements were performed on T2-weighted images using 3 different techniques

Please cite this article in press as: Marin L, et al. Comparison of semi-automated and manual methods to measure the volume of prostate cancer on magnetic resonance imaging. Diagnostic and Interventional Imaging (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.diii.2017.02.004

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5578966

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5578966

<u>Daneshyari.com</u>