Incorporating multiparametric MRI staging and the new histological Grade Group system improves risk-stratified detection of bone metastasis in prostate cancer

David Thurtle*,[1], Ray C J Hsu[1], Madhurima Chetan[2], Artitaya Lophatananon[3,4], Rachel Hubbard[5], Vincent J Gnanapragasam[1,7] and Tristan Barrett[6,7]

[1]Academic Urology Group, Addenbrooke's Hospital, University of Cambridge, Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK; [2]Cambridge University Clinical School, Cambridge CB2 0SP, UK; [3]Institute of Population Health, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK; [4]Division of Health Sciences, Warwick Medical School, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK; [5]Department of Urology, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK and [6]Department of Radiology, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Trust, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK

Background: There remains uncertainty on the need for bone staging in men with intermediate-risk prostate cancer. Current guidelines do not use mpMRI-staging information and rely on historic pathology grading.

Methods: We investigated the ability of mpMRI and the new Grade Group system to better predict bone metastasis status in a retrospective cohort study of 438 men with prostate cancer undergoing baseline mpMRI and isotope bone scintigraphy (BS).

Results: Including mpMRI-staging information significantly increased the specificity of bone metastasis detection from 3.0% to 24.2% ($P < 0.01$) and sensitivity from 89.2% to 97.3%. The new Grade Group score demonstrated progressive increase in bone metastasis rates ($P < 0.001$). A novel risk-stratification model combining Grade Groups, PSA and mpMRI staging shows promise in predicting bone metastasis and could potentially reduce BS usage by 22.4%–34.7%.

Conclusions: Incorporating the new Grade Group system and mpMRI staging more accurately identified bone metastatic risk and suggests men with Grade Group $\leqslant 2$ and/or without radiological T3 disease could safely avoid routine bone staging.

Assessment of bone metastasis status is key for the management of prostate cancer (PCa) (NICE, 2014a; Fizazi *et al*, 2015). Clear evidence exists for staging investigations such as isotope bone scintigraphy (BS) in patients with high-risk PCa while precluding its routine use in low-risk disease (NICE, 2014a). However, the utility of BS in intermediate-risk disease is unclear with EAU, AUA and NICE offering conflicting guidance (Heidenreich *et al*, 2014; NICE, 2014a).

The International Society of Uro-Pathology (ISUP) have recently approved a new PCa 'Grade Group' classification system to improve correlation of Gleason grade to biochemical recurrence (Epstein *et al*, 2016). Concurrently, multiparametric (mp)-MRI has emerged as a crucial tool in local staging of PCa, allowing improved discrimination between T2 and T3 disease compared with clinical nomograms (Turkbey *et al*, 2013; Lawrence *et al*, 2014). However, current guidelines on bone staging do not mandate use of mpMRI information or Grade Groups (NICE, 2014a). Therefore, we investigated the ability of mpMRI-staging information or the new Grade Group system to

help predict bone metastatic status and refine the use of bone staging investigations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A radiology database was searched for all PCa patients undergoing baseline mpMRI prostate and BS from January 2010 to May 2015 in our tertiary centre (study registration CUH/3927). In cases of equivocal BS, the final status was recorded using a combination of clinical follow-up and/or any further radiological investigations. mpMRI was performed on a 3T Discovery MR750-HDx or 1.5T MR450 system (GE Healthcare, Waukesha, WI, USA) with a surface phased-array coil, including standard anatomical and functional diffusion-weighted imaging using multiple b-values, as previously described (Lawrence et al, 2014). All studies were reported by expert uro-radiologists and reviewed in a multi-disciplinary team (MDT) setting.

Gleason score was assessed according to the ISUP 2005 recommendations (Epstein et al, 2005) and recorded alongside the number of positive cores and percentage involvement of tissue. All cases were reported by a specialist uropathologist and reviewed

a second time by another uro-pathologist prior to discussion at a specialist MDT. The core with the highest grade was used to devise the Grade Group.

Patients were first categorised to low- (T1–T2a, Gleason $\leqslant 6$ and PSA < 10 ng ml^{-1}), intermediate- (T2b–c and/or Gleason = 7 and/or PSA 10–20 ng ml^{-1}) and high-risk (T3-T4, or Gleason 8–10 or PSA level > 20 ng ml^{-1}) according to NICE 2008 guidelines (NICE, 2014b). Patients were subsequently re-categorised according to the new Grade Group system (Epstein et al, 2016) and a novel five stratum Prognostic Risk Grouping system developed in our centre integrating PSA, Grade Group and mpMRI staging (Gnanapragasam et al, 2016; Table 1).

Contingency tables were constructed with expected frequency for bone metastasis and adjusted residuals calculated for each risk system (Supplementary Table S1). Pearson's chi-squared test was used to examine the differences in observations. Comparison of sensitivities and specificities of bone metastasis between systems was made using McNemar's test. To compare positive and negative predictive values, we used a generalised score statistic in R 3.1.2 (Leisenring et al, 2000; Stock and Hieschler, 2014). All other statistical analysis was performed in Stata14 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, USA).

Table 1. Proposed new prostate cancer Prognostic Risk Group criteria taken from Gnanapragasam et al (2016) and using the new Grade Group system (Epstein et al, 2016)

New Risk Group	Criteria
1	Gleason 6 (Grade Group 1) **AND** PSA < 10 ng ml^{-1} **AND** stage T1–T2
2	Gleason $3 + 4 = 7$ (Grade Group 2) **OR** PSA 10–20 ng ml^{-1} **AND** stage T1–T2
3	A combination of: Gleason $3 + 4 = 7$ (Grade Group 2), PSA 10–20 ng ml^{-1}, stage T1–T2 **OR** Gleason $4 + 3 = 7$ (Grade Group 3) **AND** stage T1–T2
4	Any one of: Gleason 8 (Grade Group 4) **OR** PSA > 20 ng ml^{-1} **OR** stage T3
5	Any combination of: Gleason 8 (Grade Group 4), PSA > 20 ng ml^{-1}, stage T3 **OR** any Gleason 9–10 (Grade Group 5) **OR** any stage T4
Abbreviation: PSA = prostate-specific antigen.	

Table 2A. Distribution and bone metastasis status of men categorised according to NICE classification, by clinical parameters alone and with mpMRI-staging information integrated

NICE risk group	Clinical (NICE)			Clinical (NICE) + mpMRI		
	No bone mets	Bone mets	Bone mets rate (%)	No bone mets	Bone mets	Bone mets rate (%)
Low	12	0	0	4	0	0
Intermediate	143	4	2.7	93	1	1.1
High	246	33	11.8	304	36	10.6
P-value			0.003			<0.001

Abbreviations: mpMRI = multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging; NICE = National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. P-values are calculated with Pearson's chi-squared tests using full contingency tables (Supplementary Table S1); $n = 438$.

Table 2B. Distribution and bone metastasis status of men categorised by Grade Group score (Epstein et al, 2016) and the proposed Prognostic Risk Groups (Gnanapragasam et al, 2016)

Grade/Risk Group	Grade Group score			New Prognostic Risk model		
	No none mets	Bone mets	Bone mets rate (%)	No bone mets	Bone mets	Bone mets rate (%)
1	43	0	0	10	0	0
2	108	1	0.9	40	0	0
3	67	7	9.6	46	1	2.1
4	82	9	9.9	129	8	5.8
5	101	20	16.5	176	28	13.7
			<0.001			0.004

P-values are calculated with Pearson's chi-squared tests using full contingency tables (Supplementary Table S1); $n = 438$.

RESULTS

Four hundred and thirty-eight patients underwent mpMRI and BS. Mean age (± s.d.) was 67.1 years (± 6.7) and mean PSA 21.3 ng ml^{-1} (± 48.1). In this cohort, 37 patients had bone metastases (8.4%); Tables 2A and B. The specificity of BS was 86.5%. Fourteen out of 37 (37.8%) men with bone metastases also had evidence of pelvic metastasis on prostate MRI. Using NICE intermediate-risk as a threshold for performing BS, 426 BS would have been performed. Assessing this risk stratification as if it were a diagnostic test demonstrated a sensitivity of 100% but specificity of only 3.0%. Comparisons of other decision models were made against this standard (Table 3).

Adding mpMRI to current NICE risk groups. The distribution of patients by NICE classification is shown in Table 2A. By these categories, 33 out of 37 men with bone metastases were classified as high risk and 4 as intermediate risk. All 4 intermediate-risk patients had PSA < 20.0 ng ml^{-1} but Gleason 4 + 3 disease. mpMRI staging re-categorised three of these patients to high risk (Supplementary Figures S1 and S2), improving the sensitivity of high risk for detecting bone metastases to 97.3% from 89.2% and specificity compared with intermediate risk to 24.2% from 3.0% (P < 0.01). Using mpMRI-defined high-risk disease as a threshold for BS would have reduced the number of scintigrams performed by 98 (22.4%), with a single missed diagnosis.

Applying the new Grade Group scores to predict bone metastases. Using the new Grade Group scores in isolation, there was a progressive increase in bone metastases detection from 0 out of 43 (0%) for Grade Group 1 to 20 out of 121 (16.5%) for Grade Group 5 (Gleason 9–10); P < 0.001, Table 2B. Using BS only for patients with Grade Group scores ≥ 3 significantly improved sensitivity to 97.3% and significantly improved specificity to 37.7% (P < 0.01); Table 3. Using this cutoff would have reduced the number of BS by 152 (34.7%), with a single missed diagnosis.

Combining mpMRI and Grade Group scores in a novel risk-stratification system. This model defines five prognostic risk strata for prostate cancer (Table 1; Gnanapragasam et al, 2016). Within this model, no men in Risk Groups 1 or 2 had bone metastasis. Bone metastasis rate increased progressively in Risk Groups 3 (2.13%), 4 (5.8%) and 5 (13.7%); P = 0.004. Using Risk Group 4 as a threshold for bone staging demonstrated improvement in specificity to 23.9% (P < 0.01) and 97.3% sensitivity, with a 22.1% reduction in the need for BS.

DISCUSSION

Detection of bone metastasis confers a significantly worse prognosis in men with PCa and is thus an important part of the staging work-up (Fizazi et al, 2015). In our study, we showed that only 8.4% of men had bone metastasis out of the 438 men scanned, emphasising the need to refine use of this resource-intensive investigation. Of note, we did not find that a high PSA alone was a good discriminator; in our cohort, we identified 4 men with bone metastases and a PSA < 20 ng ml^{-1}, which is at odds with other reports (McArthur et al, 2012).

In this study, we have demonstrated evidence that mpMRI staging provides a useful adjunct in appropriately identifying men who will benefit most from BS. The integration of mpMRI alongside traditional biochemical and pathological markers, to re-categorise patients as high-risk disease, would have led to a 99.0% NPV for bone metastases at this threshold, alongside a significant increase in specificity to 24.2% and reduction in BS use. We also provide early validation of the new histological Grade Group

Table 3. Summary statistics for each stratification system and risk group using the stated cutoffs, as if it were a diagnostic test for bone metastasis

	NICE (BS for ≥ intermediate risk)	NICE + mpMRI (BS for high-risk men only)	P-value	Grade Group (BS for score ≥ 3)	P-value	Grade Group (BS for is score ≥ 4)	P-value	New prognostic risk model (BS for Risk Group ≥ 3)	P-value	New prognostic risk model (BS for Risk Group ≥ 4)	P-value
BS performed	426	340	—	286	—	212	—	388	—	341	—
Sensitivity (%) (95% CI)	100 (90.5, 100)	97.3 (85.8, 99.9)	0.32	97.3 (85.8, 99.9)	0.32	78.4 (61.8, 90.2)	<0.01	100 (90.5, 100)	—	97.3 (85.8, 99.9)	0.32
Specificity (%) (95% CI)	3.0 (1.6, 5.2)	24.2 (20.1, 28.7)	<0.01	37.7 (32.9, 42.6)	<0.01	54.4 (49.3, 59.3)	<0.01	12.5 (9.4, 16.1)	<0.01	23.9 (19.8, 28.4)	<0.01
PPV (%) (95% CI)	8.69 (6.2, 11.8)	10.6 (7.5, 14.4)	<0.01	12.6 (9.0, 17.0)	<0.01	13.7 (9.4, 19.1)	<0.01	9.5 (6.8, 12.9)	<0.01	10.6 (7.5, 14.3)	<0.01
NPV (%) (95%CI)	100 (73.5, 100)	99.0 (94.4, 100)	0.33	99.3 (96.4, 100)	0.33	96.5 (93.1, 98.5)	0.02	100 (92.9, 100)	—	99.0 (94.4, 100)	0.33

Abbreviations: BS = bone scintigraphy; CI = confidence interval; mpMRI = multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging; NICE = National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; NPV = negative predictive value; PPV = positive predictive value. Comparisons (P values) are made against the current NICE classification (column 1), using McNemar's test. The number of patients requiring BS using each classification is recorded in the first row.

system, with BS yield being higher in Grade Group 3 (bone metastasis rate of 5.8%) compared with Grade Group 2 (0.6%). Setting a threshold for BS of Grade Group $\geqslant 3$ would have reduced the number of BS performed by 152 (34.7%), with a single false negative. This correlates with data used to inform the 2015 update to EAU guidelines (Heidenreich et al, 2014) and should encourage adoption of these proposed grading groups (Epstein et al, 2016).

It should be noted that grade and stage data are not used in isolation in clinical management. We therefore tested the proof-of-principle of a new prognostic risk model incorporating the new Grade Group system, mpMRI and biochemical information. This refinement demonstrated promising results with an NPV of 100% for Risk Groups 1 and 2. Taken together, our data demonstrate that the combined use of more accurate mpMRI staging and histological grade stratification better defines men who benefit most from bone staging investigations. These promising results show potential for reductions in the use of BS by up to a third while maintaining sensitivity and NPV above 97% and 99%, respectively.

The main limitation of our study is its retrospective nature and a selected population only including men undergoing both mpMRI and BS. The relatively small absolute numbers of men with intermediate-risk disease or men with bone metastases in this cohort should lead to caution when interpreting sensitivity or specificity values in isolation. Additionally, bone scintigraphy can be questioned as an ideal standard for diagnosing bone metastases; however, our data reflects current clinical practice and should be useful in guiding clinical management. PET-CT using fluorine or choline tracers has been shown to be a superior, albeit more expensive option for assessing metastatic bone involvement (Fuccio et al, 2012). Our results would require further validation in external cohorts in a prospective study and preferably using these modalities.

CONCLUSION

We demonstrate for the first time that the new histological Grade Group system and mpMRI staging more accurately identified men at risk of harbouring bone metastases. Importantly, our data strongly suggest that men without histology in Grade Group $\geqslant 3$ and/or radiological T3 disease could safely avoid routine bone staging.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Epstein JI, Zelefsky MJ, Sjoberg DD, Nelson JB, Egevad L, Magi-Galluzzi C, Vickers AJ, Parwani AV, Reuter VE, Fine SW, Eastham JA, Wiklund P, Han M, Reddy CA, Ciezki JP, Nyberg T, Klein EA (2016) A contemporary prostate cancer grading system: a validated alternative to the gleason score. *Eur Urol* **69**(3): 428–435.

Epstein JI, Allsbrook WC, Amin MB, Egevad LI. Committee IG (2005) The 2005 International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) consensus conference on gleason grading of prostatic carcinoma. *Am J Surg Pathol* **29**: 1228–1242.

Fizazi K, Massard C, Smith M, Rader M, Brown J, Milecki P, Shore N, Oudard S, Karsh L, Carducci M, Damião R, Wang H, Ying W, Goessl C (2015) Bone-related parameters are the main prognostic factors for overall survival in men with bone metastases from castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* **68**(1): 42–50.

Fuccio C, Castellucci P, Schiavina R, Guidalotti PL, Gavaruzzi G, Montini GC, Nanni C, Marzola MC, Rubello D, Fanti S (2012) Role of 11C-choline PET/CT in the re-staging of prostate cancer patients with biochemical relapse and negative results at bone scintigraphy. *Eur J Radiol* **81**(8): e893–e896.

Gnanapragasam VJ, Lophatananon A, Wright KA, Muir KR, Gavin A, Greenberg DC (2016) Improving clinical risk stratification at diagnosis in primary prostate cancer: a prognostic modelling study. *PLoS Med* **13**(8): e1002063.

Heidenreich A, Bastian PJ, Bellmunt J, Bolla M, Joniau S, van der Kwast T, Mason M, Matveev V, Wiegel T, Zattoni F, Mottet N. European Association of Urology (2014) EAU guidelines on prostate cancer. part 1: screening, diagnosis, and local treatment with curative intent-update 2013. *Eur Urol* **65**(1): 124–137.

Lawrence EM, Gallagher FA, Barrett T, Warren AY, Priest AN, Goldman DA, Goldman D, Sala E, Gnanapragasam VJ (2014) Preoperative 3-T diffusion-weighted MRI for the qualitative and quantitative assessment of extracapsular extension in patients with intermediate- or high-risk prostate cancer. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* **203**(3): W280–W286.

Lawrence EM, Tang SY, Barrett T, Koo B, Goldman DA, Warren AY, Axell RG, Doble A, Gallagher FA, Gnanapragasam VJ, Kastner C, Sala E (2014) Prostate cancer: performance characteristics of combined T-W and DW-MRI scoring in the setting of template transperineal re-biopsy using MR-TRUS fusion. *Eur Radiol* **24**(7): 1497–1505.

Leisenring W, Alonzo T, Pepe MS (2000) Comparisons of predictive values of binary medical diagnostic tests for paired designs. *Biometrics* **56**(2): 345–351.

McArthur C, McLaughlin G, Meddings RN (2012) Changing the referral criteria for bone scan in newly diagnosed prostate cancer patients. *Br J Radiol* **85**(1012): 390–394.

NICE. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2014a) NICE Guidelines [CG175] Prostate cancer: diagnosis and treatment. Available at: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg175.

NICE. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2014b) Prostate cancer: diagnosis and treatment. Update of clinical guideline 58. Appendices J-L., p 31. Available at: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg175/evidence/appendices-jl-191710766.

Stock C, Hieschler T (2014) DTComPair: comparison of binary diagnostic tests for paired designs. R Package. Version 1.0.3.

Turkbey B, Mani H, Aras O, Ho J, Hoang A, Rastinehad AR, Agarwal H, Shah V, Bernardo M, Pang Y, Daar D, McKinney YL, Linehan WM, Kaushal A, Merino MJ, Wood BJ, Pinto PA, Choyke PL (2013) Prostate cancer: can multiparametric MR imaging help identify patients who are candidates for active surveillance? *Radiology* **268**(1): 144–152.

Supplementary Information accompanies this paper on British Journal of Cancer website (http://www.nature.com/bjc)