

Tijdschr Urol (2020) 10:122–123  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13629-020-00304-9>



# Erratum to: ‘Clinical impact of PSMA PET in biochemically recurrent prostate cancer; a review of the literature’

Maurits Wondergem · Friso M. van der Zant · Wouter A. M. Broos · Remco J. J. Knol

Published online: 2 September 2020  
© The Author(s) 2020

### Erratum to:

**Tijdschr Urol 2020**

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13629-020-00296-6>

In the article ‘Clinical impact of PSMA PET in biochemically recurrent prostate cancer; a review of the literature’ (*Tijdschrift voor Urologie*, October 2020), the column headings of Tab. 3 are missing. The complete table is presented below.

**Open Access** This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

**Maurits Wondergem, MD, PhD**, nuclear medicine physician

**Friso M. van der Zant, MD, PhD**, nuclear medicine physician

**Wouter A.M. Broos, MD**, nuclear medicine physician

**Remco J.J. Knol, MD, PhD**, nuclear medicine physician

---

The online version of the original article can be found under  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13629-020-00296-6>.

M. Wondergem, MD, PhD (✉) · F. M. van der Zant, MD,  
PhD · W. A. M. Broos, MD · R. J. J. Knol, MD, PhD  
Department of Nuclear Medicine, Noordwest  
Ziekenhuisgroep, Alkmaar, The Netherlands  
m.wondergem@nwz.nl



**Table 3** Change of management after PSMA PET

Author	Year	Study design	Change of management	Systemic to targeted	Surveillance to targeted	Change between targeted	Targeted to systemic	Surveillance to systemic	Change between systemic	Targeted to surveillance	Systemic to surveillance	Other
Afaq et al. [38]	2018	Retrosp.	39/100 39%	8	6	5	3	3	2	1	1	10
Bashir et al. [24]	2019	Retrosp.	12/28 43%	—	1	9	2	—	—	—	—	—
Calais et al. [26]	2018	Prospl.	54/101 53%	12	9	8	6	7	5	4	3	—
Calais et al. [26]	2018	Retrosp.	52/270 19%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Farolfi et al. [37]	2019	Retrosp.	36/119 30%	17	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Grubmuller et al. [27]	2018	Retrosp.	50/117 43%	23	18	2	—	—	5	1	1	—
Hope et al. [28]	2017	Prospl.	67/126 53%	19	15	10	6	6	1	6	4	—
Kulkarni et al. [29]	2019	Prospl.	23/68 34%	2	1	3	4	2	6	4	—	1
Mattioli et al. [30]	2018	Retrosp.	66/104 63%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Mena et al. [31]	2018	Prospl.	34/68 50%	—	18	—	—	3	—	13	—	—
Muller et al. [39]	2019	Retrosp.	122/203 60%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Roach et al. [32]	2018	Prospl.	192/312 62%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Rousseau et al. [33]	2019	Prospl.	38/52 73%	9	13	8	—	2	—	4	2	—
Schmidt-Hegeman et al. [34]	2019	Retrosp.	18/90 20%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Song et al. [35]	2019	Prospl.	43/72 60%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Zacho et al. [36]	2018	Prospl.	15/69 22%	7	4	2	2	—	—	—	—	—

NR not reported. Prospl. Prospective, Retr. Retrospective

